

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Efficacy of psychoanalytically oriented long-term treatments and determinants of outcome-Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis of Long-term Analytic Treatment Studies (MeLAS)

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-069332
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-Oct-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Krakau, Lina; University Medical Center of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Dept. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Leuzinger-Bohleber, Marianne; University Medical Center Mainz, Dept. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Brähler, Elmar; University Medical Center of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Dep. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Schmidt, Peter; University Medical Center Mainz, Dept. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Rost, Felicitas; Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust Huber, Dorothea; International Psychoanalytic University Berlin gGmbH, Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychosomatics Klug, Guenther; Technical University of Munich Löffler-Stastka, Henriette ; Medizinische Universität Wien Rössler-Schüle, Hemma; Vienna Psychoanalytic Society Leichsenring, Falk; University Hospitals Giessen and Marburg Campus Giessen Salzer, Simone; Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Clinical Psychology and Psychoanalysis Brockmann, Josef; Private Outpatient Clinic Jakobsen, Thorsten; Private Outpatient Clinic Ernst, Mareike; University Medical Centre of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Beutel, Manfred; University Medical Center Mainz, Department of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Mainz, Germany
Keywords:	Clinical trials < THERAPEUTICS, Adult psychiatry < PSYCHIATRY, Anxiety disorders < PSYCHIATRY, Depression & mood disorders < PSYCHIATRY, Personality disorders < PSYCHIATRY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 1 **Efficacy of psychoanalytically oriented long-term treatments and determinants of**
4 **outcome** -Individual Participant Data **Meta-Analysis of Long-term Analytic Treatment**
5 **Studies (MeLAS)**

6
7
8 4 Lina Krakau¹), Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber¹), Elmar Brähler¹), Peter Schmidt¹), Felicitas
9 Rost²), Dorothea Huber³), Guenther Klug⁴), Henriette Löffler-Stastka⁵), Hemma Rössler-
10 Schüle⁶), Falk Leichsenring⁷), Simone Salzer⁸), Josef Brockmann⁹), Thorsten Jakobsen¹⁰,
11 Mareike Ernst¹), Manfred Beutel ¹)

12
13
14 8 1) Dept. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, University Medical Center
15 Mainz, Germany

16 9
17 10 2) Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

18
19 11 3) Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychosomatics, International
20 Psychoanalytic University Berlin, Germany

21 12
22 13 4) Clinic and Polyclinic for Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, Technical
23 University of Munich, Germany

24 15 5) Department of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy, Medical University Vienna,
25 Austria

26 16
27 17 6) Outpatient Clinic, Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, Austria

28
29 18 7) Department of Psychosomatics and Psychotherapy, Justus-Liebig-University
30 Giessen

31 20 8) Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychoanalysis, International
32 Psychoanalytic University Berlin, Germany

33 21
34 22 9) Private Outpatient Clinic, Frankfurt, Germany

35 23 10) Private Outpatient Clinic, Basel, Switzerland

36 24
37
38 26 Correspondence:

39
40 27 Lina Krakau

41
42 28 Lina.krakau@unimedizin-mainz.de

43
44 29 Untere Zahlbacher Str. 8

45
46 30 55131 Mainz

47
48 31
49 32 Word Count: 3956
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 ABSTRACT

2 **Introduction:** Long-term psychodynamic/ psychoanalytic psychotherapy (LTPT) is
3 an important treatment option for complex mental disorders. Compared to short-term
4 therapies only few trials are available, often lacking statistical power due to small
5 samples. Their statistical synthesis will facilitate the investigation of important
6 questions for research and praxis, such as the role of therapy dose in LTPT.

7 **Methods and Analysis:** We present a study protocol for a systematic review and
8 individual participant data (IPD) meta-analysis aggregating and analyzing individual
9 data from original trials by meta-analysis. The purpose is to 1a) determine treatment
10 effectiveness of LTPT with low vs. high dose, 1b) compare their effectiveness to
11 shorter therapies, 2) Identify moderators of treatment outcomes, and 3) determine
12 reciprocal relationships between different outcome domains (symptomatic and
13 structural/personality change) over the courses of LTPT. Primary outcome criteria are
14 global and disorder specific measures of symptomology, secondary outcome criteria
15 are functional capacities, personality, and interpersonal pathology. The study aims at
16 closing the research gap between psychodynamic practice and research which to
17 date has been mostly based on short-term trials with brief follow-up periods. It will
18 contribute to the question of who benefits most from long-term treatments and how
19 different outcome domains interact over time. **Ethics and dissemination:**
20 Aggregation of data from primary trials collected based on ethics votes.
21 Dissemination into clinical practice via open access publications of findings. The
22 study is an IPD meta-analysis, registered on the International prospective register of
23 systematic reviews (PROSPERO; 304982) before conducting the main search and
24 soliciting data.

25 26 27 **Keywords**

28 psychodynamic, psychoanalytic, long-term therapy, long-term follow up, anxiety,
29 depression, personality disorder, personalized psychotherapy
30

STRENGTH AND LIMITATION OF THIS STUDY

- The IPD meta-analysis systematically addresses the efficacy of high vs. low dose LTPT by combining data from rarely conducted long-term studies
- IPD meta-analysis has increased power to detect differences between treatment groups and to examine prognostic and prescriptive factors associated with outcome
- As we rely on variables assessed by previously conducted trials not all variables of interest can be examined
- In IPD meta-analysis bias may be introduced as not all relevant studies identified can be included, e.g., non-response of the authors, difficulties with data-sharing

INTRODUCTION

Short-term psychodynamic psychotherapy (STPP) has demonstrated comparable efficacy to cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) and other bona fide psychotherapies,[1–3]. However, common mental disorders often take a chronic course,[e.g.; 4,5] and short-term treatments have been shown to be insufficient for patients with complex (e.g., personality, chronic, or multiple) mental disorders,[5,6]. This is consistent with data on dose-effect relations indicating that patients with such disorders need longer treatments,[7,8]. Nevertheless, evidence for psychotherapy is based mostly upon short-term treatments and short-term outcomes, the latter usually assessed at treatment termination,[9]. Only a few trials report one-year follow-up, and longer-term follow-ups of two and more years are scarce,[2,10]. To our best knowledge, long-term remission rates of bona fide STPP and CBT treatments are often unsatisfactory,[10], and up to half of the study, patients have been found to seek auxiliary psychotherapy during follow-up,[11]. Naturalistic trials further indicate that many patients require and receive long-term treatments up to several years,[12].

A basic claim of long-term psychoanalytic therapies (LTPT), comprising psychoanalysis and long-term psychoanalytic/psychodynamic psychotherapy (LTPP), has been to improve structural capacities related to the personality organization,[13–15] in addition to symptoms. Structural integration (i.e. personality functioning) comprises different domains of psychological functioning e.g., identity, affect differentiation and tolerance, and self-other regulation which relate to core developmental tasks of attachment/relatedness and individuation/self-definition,[e.g., 16–18]. Conceptualized by the term personality functioning, the alternative model of personality disorders has introduced a similar,[19,20] model to the DSM-5,[21,22]. Here, impairment in personality functioning is described along the dimensions of self (identity perception, self-regulation) and interpersonal (empathy, intimacy) functioning as shared characteristic of all personality disorders. In psychoanalytic literature,

1 improvements in these domains have been described as structural change,[13–15] and have
2 been related to treatments with higher frequency promoting greater capacity for self-
3 analysis,[23]. In line with the traditionally transdiagnostic scope of psychoanalysis, LTPT
4 studies have focused on global or disorder-specific symptom improvement, and social and
5 personality functioning with long-term outcomes up to 10 years,[e.g., 11]. However, the
6 number of available trials on LTPT with long-term follow-up is comparably small, as they
7 pose special methodological challenges of recruitment, study design, duration, and funding.
8 For ethical reasons, placebo or waiting-list control conditions are not feasible over extended
9 periods, and it would be difficult to conceptualize plausible interventions with similar
10 frequency and duration of intervention. Studies that included long-term follow-ups have
11 shown that LTPT indeed led to lasting changes at the level of symptoms and other domains
12 of functioning,[11,24–28]. In the long run, several studies indicated LTPP to be more
13 effective than treatment as usual (TAU),[25] or short-term treatments,[11,29].

14 Huber et al.,[26] found psychoanalytic treatment to be more effective than CBT at long-term
15 follow-up, while others reported a comparable reduction of symptoms in psychoanalytic
16 therapy and CBT at the three-year assessment,[30], but stronger evidence of personality
17 change in psychoanalytic treatment groups,[28]. Other studies have focused on the
18 comparison of psychodynamic psychotherapy with more intensive and longer psychoanalytic
19 treatment and found the latter to be more effective at one-,[31] or three-year follow-up,[32].
20 Yet, in a meta-analysis on psychodynamic psychotherapy. Town et al.,[33] found that therapy
21 effects were maintained and continued to improve following termination of psychodynamic
22 therapies of different frequency and length. To our knowledge, only four conventional meta-
23 analyses have focused on the effectiveness of LTPT specifically. Focusing on RCTs,
24 Leichsenring & Rabung,[6,34,35] found LTPP to be more effective than STPT with medium
25 to large effect sizes in terms of symptom reduction and social and personality functioning.
26 Using different inclusion criteria, the meta-analysis of Smit et al.,[36] questioned the
27 effectiveness of LTPP, as they found it more effective only in comparison to control
28 conditions that were no specialized forms of therapy. Exploratory analyses indicated that a
29 greater difference in treatment intensity between LTPP and the control group was related to
30 effect size. The seemingly conflicting findings between Leichsenring and Rabung's,[6,34] and
31 Smit et al's.,[36] meta-analyses have been discussed elsewhere,[e.g., 35,37]. More recently,
32 Woll and Schönbrodt aimed to replicate and update Leichsenring et al.'s,[35] meta-analysis,
33 but only found small additional gains for LTPP in comparison to other forms of
34 psychotherapy, regarding symptoms and social functioning. No significant differences were
35 found with respect to personality functioning. Restricting their meta-analysis to
36 psychoanalysis proper, defined as the patient lying on the couch with at least two sessions,
37 one research group found large within-group effect sizes regarding symptomatic

1 improvement and personality characteristics. Yet, most of the trials they examined were
2 naturalistic and did not have control groups,[38].

3 Beyond efficacy studies, psychotherapy research, in general, has identified
4 numerous patient, therapist, and relational prognostic factors (predictors) for
5 psychotherapy outcome, e.g., racial or social minority status, high symptom load, or
6 high self-criticism,[39]. However, less is known about prescriptive variables
7 (moderators) associated with different outcomes depending on the type of treatment,
8 e.g., maladaptive defenses or rigid relationship patterns for psychodynamic
9 treatments,[1,40,41]. Identifying prescriptive variables that reliably predict differential
10 treatment outcomes has become the main target of personalized treatment
11 approaches,[39,42]. To our knowledge, no meta-analysis has examined prognostic or
12 prescriptive variables in LTPT.

13 Given the evidence outlined above, we presume that LTPT facilitates changes in
14 intrapsychic, structural processes underlying mental disorders in addition to
15 improving symptoms. Yet, it remains unclear whether this is due to effects of
16 psychoanalytic technique or its high treatment frequency and duration,[8,36].

17 Changes in structural functioning have been posited as a mechanism of change in
18 psychotherapy, and psychoanalytic/psychodynamic psychotherapies specifically, with
19 a stronger focus on insight and self-understanding,[43]. Several studies found greater
20 changes e.g. in personality or reflective functioning associated with greater,[30,44]
21 and sustained,[45,46] symptom reduction. However, the studies mostly focused on
22 between-person effects and did not apply lagged analysis over multiple time points to
23 investigate if changes in structural capacities were associated with a decrease in
24 symptoms at subsequent assessment.

25 Due to the limitations of the individual trials, empirical evidence on the role of
26 treatment intensity for the efficacy of LTPT and the identification of prescriptive
27 variables has been limited. Small samples and unequal group sizes as well as
28 decreasing case numbers throughout therapy and follow-up have led to
29 methodological problems in data analysis of individual trials, including a lack of
30 statistical power. Hence, small differences between different treatment approaches
31 cannot be identified and testing for sub-groups with differential outcome is
32 prohibited,[47]. Additional problems include the utilization of different designs (RCT
33 vs. quasi-experimental), varying definitions of LTPT (e.g., ranging from 42 to over
34 300 sessions), varying frequency of measurements, definition and timing of follow-

ups, and the comparability of measures of relevant variables (e.g., sociodemographic, clinical characteristics) and different outcome measures.

The current study aims to conduct a systematic review and individual participant data (IPD) meta-analysis concerning the efficacy of LTPT treatments of different intensities and associated prognostic and prescriptive factors in common mental disorders. IPD meta-analysis is a technique to examine treatment effects by combining participant-level data of multiple trials collected from the original data and is currently considered the gold standard in evidence synthesis,[48,49]. A one-stage approach is favored, especially when the original trials have small samples,[50]. It has increased statistical power to detect differences between treatment conditions and to examine prognostic and prescriptive variables associated with treatment efficacy,[42]. Compared to conventional meta-analyses that rely on the aggregated level data extracted from published reports, with IDP the same statistical methods can be applied across all studies involved. This allows for the application of newer statistical modeling techniques and similar handling of missing data, thus increasing comparability,[51]. The use of the original data may further circumvent bias related to the publication of positive results or the removal of patients before analysis in published trials,[52].

In summary, the current project aims to:

- 1) Compare treatment effectiveness of LTPT of low vs. high dose (based on session frequency and duration)
 - a. At treatment termination
 - b. At long-term follow-up (stability of outcome)
 - c. Compared to shorter therapies as included in the trials
- 2) Identify individual characteristics that reliably predict or moderate differential treatment outcomes
- 3) Examine the reciprocal relationship of symptoms and personality functioning over time

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

The study is an IPD meta-analysis, registered on the International prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO; CRD42022304982)

1 before conducting the main search and soliciting any data. Amendments will be
2 documented here. Eligible studies will be identified through systematic literature
3 research. Study results will be reported following the Preferred Reporting Items for
4 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis for Individual Participant Data (PRISMA-IPD;
5 Stewart et al. 2015). The project is expected to start in June 2022 and be completed
6 in about two years.

7 **Selection of studies**

8 Due to randomization difficulties for LTPT, especially psychoanalysis, we include
9 quasi-experimental cohort studies along with prospective randomized controlled trials
10 (RCT). Eligible studies must contain LTPT. LTPT is defined according to
11 Leichsenring & Rabung 2011 criteria for LTPP by 1) Studies of psychodynamic
12 therapy; 2) Working with transference and resistance and 3) Duration of at least 50
13 sessions or at least one year. Moreover, we will include psychoanalysis proper,
14 meaning up to five sessions per week in a supine position. Control conditions are
15 psychodynamic treatments of shorter duration (fewer than 50 sessions), other
16 treatments (e.g., CBT) from various psychotherapeutic backgrounds, or TAU.
17 Treatment must be individual therapy for common mental disorders (e.g., depression,
18 anxiety, or personality disorders) in adults. The exact inclusion and exclusion criteria
19 can be found in Table 1. We will apply a three-step selection process. During the first
20 step, two independent raters (one post-doc and one doctoral candidate) will apply the
21 outlined selection criteria to the titles and abstracts of the references retrieved from
22 the systematic literature research. In case of disagreement, consensus will be
23 reached through discussion. If a study is considered as potentially fulfilling inclusion
24 criteria, we will request full texts. Next, full texts will be rated according to the
25 selection criteria by two independent raters. Disagreements will be resolved through
26 discussion or involvement of a third rater. Finally, selected studies will be rated by
27 experts (full professor with analytic training) to confirm that the treatment investigated
28 is LTPT.

29

1 **Table 1. Selection criteria**

Inclusion	Prospective RCT or quasi-experimental cohort study
	Baseline assessment and Post/Follow-Up assessment that exceeds at least one year
	Outpatient individual treatment
	Participants (≥ 18 -65 Jahre)
	Treatment is LTPP (psychodynamic or -analytic long-term psychotherapy, psychoanalysis)
	Long-term is defined as ≥ 1 year or ≥ 50 sessions
	Standardized outcome measure with at least one empirical proof of reliability
	Data on frequency of sessions are available
	Treatment is carried out by licensed therapists
Exclusion	Focus on psychotic disorders
	Focus on organic disorders
	Single-case studies
	Serial case studies
	Qualitative studies
	Information on session frequency and therapy duration is not available
Outcomes	Primary:
	Standardized global symptom assessment
	Standardized disorder specific symptom assessment
	Secondary:
	Standardized assessment of personality/structure
	treatment adherence/ drop-out
	additional treatments (medication, psychotherapy)

2

3

1 **Search Strategy**

2 To identify as many relevant studies as possible, different search strategies will be
3 used. Firstly, we will conduct a systematic literature review using the following
4 databases: PubMed, PsycINFO (via EBSCO), Web of Science (via Elsevier), and
5 theCochrane's Central Register of Controlled Trials (via Wiley). We define five
6 categories of search strings (1) treatment, (2) long-term (3) study, (4) effectiveness
7 and (5) common mental disorders, with synonyms that will be searched as index and
8 free text terms. The Boolean combination of search strings is depicted in table 2. We
9 will not apply language or date restrictions for the searches, yet the included studies
10 must be written in English, French, or German for our team to conduct risk of bias
11 (RoB) assessments. Secondly, we will search the controlled-trial register to identify
12 ongoing and unpublished studies
13 [https://www.isrctn.com/search?q=&filters=conditionCategory%3AMental+and+Behavioural+D](https://www.isrctn.com/search?q=&filters=conditionCategory%3AMental+and+Behavioural+Disorders)
14 [isorders](#) and the Open Door Review of Clinical, Conceptual, Process and Outcome
15 Studies in Psychoanalysis, 3rd edition
16 https://www.ipa.world/en/Psychoanalytic_Theory/Research/open_door.aspx;
17 accessed 11/21/21. Thirdly, we will hand-search published meta-analyses,[36–38]
18 and the citations of the included trials to identify other possibly eligible trials. We will
19 contact experts in the field through a listserv of related societies (e.g., Society for
20 Psychotherapy Research, Psychoanalytic Research Society, International
21 Psychoanalytic Society) to ask for yet unpublished trials or studies we have missed.

1 **Table 2. Systematic literature search**

Data banks	PubMed PsycInfo Web of Science Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials
Category:	Search terms:
Treatment	emotion focused OR mentalization OR mentalization OR self-psychology OR transference-focused OR insight-oriented OR interpretativ* OR psychodynamic* OR psychoanalys* OR psychoanalytic* OR "psychotherapy, psychodynamic" OR "psychoanalytic therapy"
	AND
Long-term	"follow-up studies" OR follow OR long-term OR longer-term OR open-ended
	AND
study	study OR studies OR trial*
	AND
Effectiveness	treatment outcome OR outcome OR effect* OR efficacy OR result* OR change*
	AND
Common mental disorder	mental disorder*OR psychiatric illness*OR psychiatric disease*OR mental illness*OR psychiatric disorder* OR behavior disorder*OR behaviour disorder* OR psychiatric diagnos* OR anxiet*OR mood disorder* OR affective disorder* OR

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2

	personality disorder*OR borderline personalit* OR depress*OR post-traumatic stress disorder* OR post-traumatic neuros* OR PTSD
--	---

For peer review only

Enseignement Supérieur (ABES) .
Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

1 **Data collection and management**

2 Named corresponding authors will be contacted via e-mail. They will be provided with
3 all necessary information (including a link to the project's PROSPERO registration
4 and the protocol) and asked whether they would be willing to participate/collaborate.
5 Contact information will be retrieved from the relevant publications or if unavailable or
6 outdated through online searches. Authors will be offered co-authorship on the
7 published paper in return for sharing the studies' de-identified individual participant
8 data. Following Driessen et al.,[53], authors who do not respond will be contacted
9 three times by mail. If we do not get a response, we will try to establish contact by
10 phone, next send up to three letters by post. This procedure will be repeated first with
11 the corresponding author, then the PI, and then sequentially with all other authors of
12 the study. If we still do not get a response, we will contact colleagues or other
13 persons who may help to establish contact. If we do not succeed in contacting the
14 authors with the above-outlined efforts, or if authors respond that the individual
15 participant data cannot be shared or has been deleted, study data is considered
16 unavailable. If authors choose to share their data, data-sharing agreements between
17 all parties will need to be drawn up. The procedures are country-dependent and will
18 need to be taken into consideration. Once data-sharing agreements in line with
19 GDPR ethical standards are arranged, authors will be asked to transfer de-identified
20 individual-level data sets encrypted using a save cloud service, procedures will be
21 provided by the University Medical Center Mainz. Authors will be asked to send item-
22 based data sets if available and to provide a description of how the data was coded
23 (codebook). Datasets will contain de-identified participant-level data comprising
24 sociodemographic data, prognostic and prescriptive variables assessed at baseline,
25 outcome variables assessed at baseline, during and after treatment, therapy duration
26 and session frequency, additional treatment, and case status (ITT/ATP). Study-level
27 data, e.g., requirements of therapists' professional experience (e.g., years of licensed
28 practice), supervision, treatment integrity, and adherence, and interrater reliability for
29 diagnostic assessment of primary outcome measures will be retrieved from the
30 publication or requested, if unavailable. Example code for analyses, detailed RoB
31 ratings, list of studies excluded at full-text stage including reasons for exclusion will
32 be shared via the Open Science Framework (OSF).

33

1 Measures

2 The primary outcome is treatment effectiveness of low- vs. high dose LTPT as
3 assessed by a global measure of symptomology, most commonly the Symptom
4 Checklist-90 (SCL-90),[54] or disorder-specific measures at treatment termination
5 and follow-up. Secondary outcomes are functional capacities, personality, or
6 relationship pathology, most commonly the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems
7 (IIP),[55] at treatment termination and long-term follow-up. Additional subgroup
8 analyses will be performed for specific mental disorders (major depression, anxiety,
9 personality disorders). To identify prognostic and prescriptive factors for treatment
10 response we include patient-specific characteristics at baseline: Sociodemographic
11 data (e.g., gender, education, employment, income, migration background), previous
12 treatments including psychopharmacological treatments, and continuous measures of
13 personality, relationships, functional capacities, and life events (e.g., social
14 occupational functioning, comorbid disorders, childhood adversity).

15 Data Integrity and preparation

16 Received data sets will be thoroughly examined to identify out of range items or
17 invalid scoring and will be compared with the original publication (sample size,
18 missing data, gender, age, mean pre-treatment scores in the primary outcome as
19 defined by the study, and mean post-treatment scores in the primary outcome as
20 defined by the study). In case of deviations, we will contact the authors to resolve the
21 issue (e.g., cases dropped from the analysis, imputation method used for computing
22 mean scores of the questionnaires received). Next, all variables relevant for the IPD
23 meta-analysis will be extracted from each study including all potential prognostic or
24 prescriptive variables, treatment information received, and outcomes at baseline,
25 intermediate, and follow-up assessment. The resulting variables will be copied into a
26 new data set and study-level criteria (study type, treatment integrity, RoB
27 assessment) and a participant ID containing numeric ID and an abbreviation of the
28 study will be added. A copy of this file containing a study's raw data relevant to IPD
29 will be standardized to the variable names and coding used in the IPD database. All
30 studies will be integrated into the database structured by the created ID. RoB will be
31 evaluated in line with Cochrane's assessments tools,[56,57]
32 As the type of measures applied by individual studies will likely vary, individual scores
33 will be standardized (using z-transformation or a common metric approach,[58]).
34 Centering will be applied within individual trials.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2 **Missing Data**

3 We intend to conduct intention to treat analysis. Missing data will be assessed in
4 each study received, including the amount of missing data per participant and
5 variable and possible reasons for missing. We will compare subsamples of
6 participants without missing data to those with missing data per study and summarize
7 distributions per variable. Missing Data will be handled using multilevel multiple
8 imputation, an approach that handles sporadically (missing data on variables for
9 some but not all participants) and systematically (variables that have not been
10 assessed by a specific study) missing values and can adequately preserve between-
11 study heterogeneity. As we expect some of the included studies to have small
12 sample size and the overall number of studies to be rather small, we will use a full
13 conditional specification approach (FCS; also Multiple imputation by chained
14 equations; MICE),[59–62]. We will follow White’s et al.,[63] rule of thumb and impute
15 one data set per percent of participants with one or more missing variables. We will
16 include all variables and interactions relevant to our analysis model and variables
17 potentially predictive for missing data. Specifically, we will use the R-packages mice
18 and its extension micemd,[60]

1 Data Analysis

2 To address research question 1 and 2, we will carry out a one-stage IPD meta-analysis. To
3 analyze effectiveness, we will statistically predict symptom severity (global if available,
4 otherwise specific) and remission (binary) controlling for baseline severity. To predict
5 symptom severity over time we will use a generalized linear mixed model framework
6 (GLMM), as participants are clustered in trials and treatment groups. Following Riley et al.'s
7 [64] recommendations for IPD-meta-analysis, we will use restricted maximum likelihood
8 estimation (REML) and obtain 95% confidence intervals for treatment effects using the
9 Kenward-Roger approach. We will specify a random treatment effect to account for
10 heterogeneity in study populations (intercept) and treatment effects (slope). To account for
11 clustering within trials, we will fit a random intercept for each trial. Separate models will be
12 estimated to compare LTPT of low vs. high dose, and to compare LTPT against control
13 groups as provided by the trials. The estimation procedure will be repeated using our
14 secondary outcome measures based on the trials providing these additional measures.
15 Remission will be analyzed for symptom outcome only using multilevel logistic regression. To
16 define remission, we will use the cut-offs of the given questionnaire. We intend to perform
17 subgroup analysis by repeating analyses steps in subgroups with different mental disorders
18 (a) Depressive Disorders, (b) Anxiety disorders, (c) Personality Disorders. The primary
19 diagnosis given in the original trial will define group membership. Next, we will analyze
20 prognostic factors by adding available participant- and study-level variables as predictors to
21 the specified models. The selection of variables builds on the summarized evidence but will
22 ultimately depend on the available data provided by the trials. If possible, continuous
23 variables will be kept on a continuous scale to avoid loss of power. We will analyze
24 prescriptive variables by adding interaction terms between the predictor and treatment
25 groups. The third research question will be addressed by a two-stage individual participant
26 data meta-analysis approach. We will first, estimate multi-group random intercept cross-
27 lagged panel models (RI-CLPM,[65,66]) to examine the respective lagged and cross-lagged
28 effects of personality functioning and symptoms on between person (BP) and within person
29 (WP) level per study. We will consider every study providing data of personality functioning
30 and symptoms for baseline, treatment termination and follow-up. We will use within person
31 (WP) centering,[67,68] of scores prior to analyses to derive at standardized coefficients for
32 lagged and cross-lagged effects. Next, findings will be meta-analyzed using random effects
33 meta-analytic structural equation modelling (MASEM), a technique to meta-analyze path or
34 structural equation models. Analyses will be carried out in R-lavaan [69] and R-metaSEM
35 [70]. Sensitivity analysis for all research questions will be carried out based on complete
36 cases. If enough studies have used the same instrument, we will rerun analysis for RQ1 and
37 RQ2 based on these studies without standardizing the variables.

1 Patient and Public Involvement
2 No Patient and Public Involvement.
3

4 ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

5 Given that all studies obtained ethical approval from the relevant ethics boards,
6 further ethical approval is not necessary but requirements for data-sharing need to be
7 met. A data-sharing agreement based according to principles of the General Data
8 Protection Rules (GDPR) of the European Union will be signed between the
9 University Medical Center Mainz and all parties involved (shared responsibility). All
10 parties sharing their data are responsible to ensure that data sharing is in line with
11 their institutional, local, and international requirements, which they confirm by signing
12 the agreement on shared responsibility. All data transferred will be de-identified. The
13 results of the study will be presented at international conferences for clinician
14 scientists and practitioners. Scientific reports of the study results will be submitted for
15 publication in international, preferably open access journals.

16 DISCUSSION

17 This study protocol describes a systematic review with meta-analysis of individual
18 participant data to determine the effectiveness of low vs. high dose LTPT at the end
19 of treatment and long-term follow-up. Additionally, we aim to identify associated
20 prognostic and prescriptive variables and the interaction of different outcome
21 domains over time.

22 Clinical and scientific relevance

23 The evidence base of effectiveness for psychotherapy in general but also for
24 psychodynamic treatments has been predominantly based on short-term therapies
25 and short-term outcomes,[9]. Previous research found a potential benefit of LTPP
26 over short-term treatments for complex mental disorders,[6,34,35,37]. Yet, little is
27 known about the role of treatment dose in LTPT, including psychoanalysis, and
28 psychoanalytic/ psychodynamic long-term psychotherapy. Given unsatisfactory
29 response rates, e.g., about 41 % for (short-term) psychotherapy,[71], but high
30 additional costs of extensive treatment, the effectiveness of LTPT at long-term follow-
31 up represents a health outcome of public interest. Individual studies lack sufficient
32 power to reliably examine prognostic and prescriptive variables, however, identifying

1 factors associated with benefits from (specific) treatments is an important step
2 towards optimized treatment planning,[42]. The project serves to close this gap, by
3 consolidating the evidence base for LTPT for the major common mental disorders
4 (e.g., depression, anxiety, and personality disorders). As LTPT treatments strive to
5 achieve structural and personality changes, outcomes will go beyond symptom
6 change and cover relevant outcome domains, such as personality, interpersonal and
7 social-occupational functioning. This is consistent with the recommendations for
8 updating the criteria of evidence-based therapies,[72]. Of particular interest is the
9 stability of therapeutic gains during long-term follow-up, as psychoanalytic theory
10 posits that change does not necessarily cease at the end of treatment. Rather,
11 insights gained during therapy are understood to promote further development during
12 follow-up, when autonomy and greater capacity for self-analysis evolve,[73]. Hence,
13 changing underlying structural capacities should enable patients to gain further
14 benefit in the follow-up phase,[33,45,46].

15 **Limitations**

16 Limitations of data aggregation and analyses include different designs regarding the
17 assessment of process and follow-up. Moreover, definitions of LTPT differ between
18 studies regarding the frequency of sessions and setting. We cannot conduct a
19 conventional meta-analysis to compare our results with trials not providing original
20 data if some original studies will have analyzed low-and-high dose LTPT together. If
21 enough trials provide separate analyses, we will conduct a conventional meta-
22 analysis based on these trials. Not all trials included will be RCTs. An important
23 limitation of IPD meta-analysis is that some trials may not be integrated due to non-
24 response, problems with data-sharing, or the deletion of the original data. Thus, even
25 if IPD meta-analyses are considered the gold standard in evidence synthesis, bias
26 cannot be precluded, and information obtained by IPD should be used in addition to
27 conventional meta-analyses and reviews. Identifying, collecting, and aggregating
28 relevant data will require a certain time, and newly published trials cannot easily be
29 incorporated. Even though IPD meta-analysis will likely have enough power to
30 examine prognostic and prescriptive treatment variables, the choice of variables
31 examined depends on the variables included in the original trials. Moreover, results
32 may be restricted to individuals who choose to participate in treatment trials.

1 **Conclusion**

2 The present study will aggregate and analyze data of patients from LTPT over long follow-up
3 periods. It will go beyond previous individual trials by targeting a large sample size and
4 include different outcome domains, e.g., personality, structural and social-occupational
5 functioning. It will contribute to the key question of personalized psychotherapy, that is
6 differential indication.
7

For peer review only

References

- 1 Barber JP, Muran JC, McCarthy KS, *et al.* Research on dynamic therapies. In: Barkham M, Lutz W, Castonguay LG, eds. *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change*. Hoboken, NJ: : Wiley 2021. 387–419.
- 2 Cuijpers P, Quero S, Noma H, *et al.* Psychotherapies for depression: a network meta-analysis covering efficacy, acceptability and long-term outcomes of all main treatment types. *World Psychiatry* 2021;**20**:283–93. doi:10.1002/wps.20860
- 3 Steinert C, Munder T, Rabung S, *et al.* Psychodynamic Therapy: As Efficacious as Other Empirically Supported Treatments? A Meta-Analysis Testing Equivalence of Outcomes. *Am J Psychiatry* 2017;**174**:943–53. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2017.17010057
- 4 Bruce SE, Yonkers KA, Otto MW, *et al.* Influence of Psychiatric Comorbidity on Recovery and Recurrence in Generalized Anxiety Disorder, Social Phobia, and Panic Disorder: A 12-Year Prospective Study. *Am J Psychiatry* 2005;**162**:1179–87. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.162.6.1179
- 5 Maj M, Stein DJ, Parker G, *et al.* The clinical characterization of the adult patient with depression aimed at personalization of management. *World Psychiatry* 2020;**19**:269–93. doi:10.1002/wps.20771
- 6 Leichsenring F, Rabung S. Long-term psychodynamic psychotherapy in complex mental disorders: update of a meta-analysis. *Br J Psychiatry* 2011;**199**:15–22. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.110.082776
- 7 Kopta SM, Howard KI, Lowry JL, *et al.* Patterns of symptomatic recovery in psychotherapy. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 1994;**62**:1009–16. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.62.5.1009
- 8 Zimmermann J, Löffler-Stastka H, Huber D, *et al.* Is It All about the Higher Dose? Why Psychoanalytic Therapy Is an Effective Treatment for Major Depression: Is It All about the Higher Dose? *Clin Psychol Psychother* 2015;**22**:469–87. doi:10.1002/cpp.1917
- 9 Leichsenring F, Steinert C, Rabung S, *et al.* The efficacy of psychotherapies and pharmacotherapies for mental disorders in adults: an umbrella review and meta-analytic evaluation of recent meta-analyses. *World Psychiatry* 2022;**21**:133–45. doi:10.1002/wps.20941
- 10 Steinert C, Hofmann M, Kruse J, *et al.* Relapse rates after psychotherapy for depression – stable long-term effects? A meta-analysis. *J Affect Disord* 2014;**168**:107–18. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2014.06.043
- 11 Knekt P, Virtala E, Härkänen T, *et al.* The outcome of short- and long-term psychotherapy 10 years after start of treatment. *Psychol Med* 2016;**46**:1175–88. doi:10.1017/S0033291715002718
- 12 Leuzinger-Bohleber M, Stuhr U, Rüger B, *et al.* How to study the ‘quality of psychoanalytic treatments’ and their long-term effects on patients’ well-being: A representative, multi-perspective follow-up study. *Int J Psychoanal* 2003;**84**:263–90. doi:10.1516/C387-0AFM-4P34-M4BT

- 1
2
3 1 13 Kernberg OF. *Object relations theory and clinical psychoanalysis*. Northvale, NJ: : Jason
4 2 Aronson 1984.
5
6 3 14 Kernberg OF. Psychic structure and structural change: An ego psychology-object
7 4 relations theory viewpoint. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* 1988;**36**:315–37.
8
9 5 15 Wallerstein RS. Assessment of structural change in psychoanalytic therapy and research.
10 6 *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* 1988;**36**:241–61.
11
12 7 16 Blatt SJ. Levels of Object Representation in Anaclitic and Introjective Depression.
13 8 *Psychoanal Study Child* 1974;**29**:107–57. doi:10.1080/00797308.1974.11822616
14
15 9 17 Blatt SJ. A Fundamental Polarity in Psychoanalysis: Implications for Personality
16 Development, Psychopathology, and the Therapeutic Process. *Psychoanal Inq*
17 10 2007;**26**:494–520. doi:10.1080/07351690701310581
18 11
19 12 18 Ehrental JC, Benecke C. Tailored Treatment Planning for Individuals With Personality
20 13 Disorders. In: *Case Formulation for Personality Disorders*. Elsevier 2019. 291–314.
21 14 doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-813521-1.00015-1
22
23 15 19 Zimmermann J, Brakemeier E-L, Benecke C. Alternatives DSM-5-Modell zur
24 16 Klassifikation von Persönlichkeitsstörungen: Bezüge zu psychodynamischer und
25 17 verhaltenstherapeutischer Diagnostik [The DSM-5 alternative model for the classification
26 18 of personality disorders: references to psychodynamic and behavioral diagnostics].
27 19 *Psychotherapeut* 2015;**60**:269–79. doi:10.1007/s00278-015-0033-8
28
29 20 20 Zimmermann J, Ehrental JC, Cierpka M, *et al*. Assessing the Level of Structural
30 21 Integration Using Operationalized Psychodynamic Diagnosis (OPD): Implications for
31 22 *DSM–5*. *J Pers Assess* 2012;**94**:522–32. doi:10.1080/00223891.2012.700664
32
33 23 21 Bach B, Kerber A, Aluja A, *et al*. International Assessment of DSM-5 and ICD-11
34 24 Personality Disorder Traits: Toward a Common Nosology in DSM-5.1. *Psychopathology*
35 25 2020;**53**:179–88. doi:10.1159/000507589
36
37 26 22 Bender DS, Morey LC, Skodol AE. Toward a Model for Assessing Level of Personality
38 27 Functioning in *DSM–5* , Part I: A Review of Theory and Methods. *J Pers Assess*
39 28 2011;**93**:332–46. doi:10.1080/00223891.2011.583808
40
41 29 23 Falkenström F, Grant J, Broberg J, *et al*. Self-Analysis and Post-Termination
42 30 Improvement After Psychoanalysis and Long-Term Psychotherapy. *J Am Psychoanal*
43 31 *Assoc* 2007;**55**:629–74. doi:10.1177/00030651070550020401
44
45 32 24 Brockmann J, Schlüter T, Eckert J. Langzeitwirkungen psychoanalytischer und
46 33 verhaltenstherapeutischer Langzeitpsychotherapien: Eine vergleichende Studie aus der
47 34 Praxis niedergelassener Psychotherapeuten [Long-term effects of long-term
48 35 psychoanalytic and long-term behavior therapy. A comparative study from the general
49 36 practices of psychotherapists]. *Psychotherapeut* 2006;**51**:15–25. doi:10.1007/s00278-005-
50 37 0454-x
51
52 38 25 Fonagy P, Rost F, Carlyle J, *et al*. Pragmatic randomized controlled trial of long-term
53 39 psychoanalytic psychotherapy for treatment-resistant depression: the Tavistock Adult
54 40 Depression Study (TADS). *World Psychiatry* 2015;**14**:312–21. doi:10.1002/wps.20267

- 1
2
3 1 26 Huber D, Zimmermann J, Henrich G, *et al.* Comparison of cognitive-behaviour therapy
4 2 with psychoanalytic and psychodynamic therapy for depressed patients – A three-year
5 3 follow-up study. *Z Für Psychosom Med Psychother* 2012;**58**:299–316.
6 4 doi:10.13109/zptm.2012.58.3.299
7
8
9 5 27 Leichsenring F, Biskup J, Kreische R, *et al.* The Göttingen study of psychoanalytic
10 6 therapy: First results. *Int J Psychoanal* 2005;**86**:433–55. doi:10.1516/XX6F-AU0W-
11 7 KWM3-G6LU
12
13 8 28 Leuzinger-Bohleber M, Kaufhold J, Kallenbach L, *et al.* How to measure sustained
14 9 psychic transformations in long-term treatments of chronically depressed patients:
15 10 Symptomatic and structural changes in the LAC Depression Study of the outcome of
16 11 cognitive-behavioural and psychoanalytic long-term treatments. *Int J Psychoanal*
17 12 2019;**100**:99–127. doi:10.1080/00207578.2018.1533377
18
19
20 13 29 Knekt P, Lindfors O, Laaksonen MA, *et al.* Quasi-experimental study on the effectiveness
21 14 of psychoanalysis, long-term and short-term psychotherapy on psychiatric symptoms,
22 15 work ability and functional capacity during a 5-year follow-up. *J Affect Disord*
23 16 2011;**132**:37–47. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2011.01.014
24
25
26 17 30 Leuzinger-Bohleber M, Hautzinger M, Fiedler G, *et al.* Outcome of Psychoanalytic and
27 18 Cognitive-Behavioural Long-Term Therapy with Chronically Depressed Patients: A
28 19 Controlled Trial with Preferential and Randomized Allocation. *Can J Psychiatry*
29 20 2019;**64**:47–58. doi:10.1177/0706743718780340
30
31 21 31 Jakobsen T, Rudolf G, Brockmann J, *et al.* Ergebnisse analytischer
32 22 Langzeitpsychotherapien bei spezifischen psychischen Störungen: Verbesserungen in der
33 23 Symptomatik und in interpersonellen Beziehungen [Results of psychoanalytic long-term
34 24 therapy in specific diagnostic groups: improvement in symptoms and interpersonal
35 25 relationships]. *Z Für Psychosom Med Psychother* 2007;**53**:87–110.
36 26 doi:10.13109/zptm.2007.53.2.87
37
38
39 27 32 Huber D, Henrich G, Clarkin J, *et al.* Psychoanalytic Versus Psychodynamic Therapy for
40 28 Depression: A Three-Year Follow-Up Study. *Psychiatry Interpers Biol Process*
41 29 2013;**76**:132–49. doi:10.1521/psyc.2013.76.2.132
42
43
44 30 33 Town JM, Diener MJ, Abbass A, *et al.* A meta-analysis of psychodynamic psychotherapy
45 31 outcomes: Evaluating the effects of research-specific procedures. *Psychotherapy*
46 32 2012;**49**:276–90. doi:10.1037/a0029564
47
48 33 34 Leichsenring F. Effectiveness of Long-term Psychodynamic Psychotherapy: A Meta-
49 34 analysis. *JAMA* 2008;**300**:1551. doi:10.1001/jama.300.13.1551
50
51 35 35 Leichsenring F, Abbass A, Luyten P, *et al.* The Emerging Evidence for Long-Term
52 36 Psychodynamic Therapy. *Psychodyn Psychiatry* 2013;**41**:361–84.
53 37 doi:10.1521/pdps.2013.41.3.361
54
55
56 38 36 Smit Y, Huibers MJH, Ioannidis JPA, *et al.* The effectiveness of long-term psychoanalytic
57 39 psychotherapy—A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin Psychol Rev*
58 40 2012;**32**:81–92. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2011.11.003
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 37 Woll CFJ, Schönbrodt FD. A Series of Meta-Analytic Tests of the Efficacy of Long-Term
4 2 Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy. *Eur Psychol* 2020;**25**:51–72. doi:10.1027/1016-
5 3 9040/a000385
6
7
8 4 38 de Maat S, de Jonghe F, de Kraker R, *et al.* The Current State of the Empirical Evidence
9 5 for Psychoanalysis: A Meta-analytic Approach. *Harv Rev Psychiatry* 2013;**21**:107–37.
10 6 doi:10.1097/HRP.0b013e318294f5fd
11
12 7 39 Constantino MJ, Boswell JF, Coyne AE. Patient, therapist, and relational factors. In:
13 8 Barkham M, Lutz W, Castonguay LG, eds. *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior*
14 9 *Change*. Hoboken, NJ: : Wiley 2021. 225–62.
15
16 10 40 Löffler-Stastka H, Rössler-Schüle H, Skale E. Prädiktoren des Therapieabbruchs in
17 11 psychoanalytischen Behandlungen von Patienten mit Persönlichkeitsstörungen [Predictors
18 12 of therapy discontinuation in psychoanalytic treatment of patients with personality
19 13 disorders]. *Z Für Psychosom Med Psychother* 2008;**54**:63–76.
20 14 doi:10.13109/zptm.2008.54.1.63
21
22
23 15 41 Löffler-Stastka H, Blueml V, Boes C. Exploration of personality factors and their
24 16 predictive impact on therapy utilization: The externalizing mode of functioning.
25 17 *Psychother Res* 2010;**20**:295–308. doi:10.1080/10503300903436710
26
27
28 18 42 Cuijpers P, Ciharova M, Quero S, *et al.* The Contribution of “Individual Participant Data”
29 19 Meta-Analyses of Psychotherapies for Depression to the Development of Personalized
30 20 Treatments: A Systematic Review. *J Pers Med* 2022;**12**:93. doi:10.3390/jpm12010093
31
32 21 43 Crits-Christoph P, Connolly Gibbons MB. Psychotherapy Process-Outcome Research:
33 22 Advances in Understanding Causal Connections. In: Barkham M, Lutz W, Castonguay
34 23 LG, eds. *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change*. Hoboken, NJ: : Wiley 2021.
35 24 263–97.
36
37
38 25 44 De Meulemeester C, Vansteelandt K, Luyten P, *et al.* Mentalizing as a mechanism of
39 26 change in the treatment of patients with borderline personality disorder: A parallel process
40 27 growth modeling approach. *Personal Disord Theory Res Treat* 2018;**9**:22–9.
41 28 doi:10.1037/per0000256
42
43
44 29 45 Grande T, Dilg R, Jakobsen T, *et al.* Structural change as a predictor of long-term follow-
45 30 up outcome. *Psychother Res* 2009;**19**:344–57. doi:10.1080/10503300902914147
46
47 31 46 Huber D, Zimmermann J, Klug G. Change in personality functioning during
48 32 psychotherapy for depression predicts long-term outcome. *Psychoanal Psychol*
49 33 2017;**34**:434–45. doi:10.1037/pap0000129
50
51 34 47 Brookes ST, Whitely E, Egger M, *et al.* Subgroup analyses in randomized trials: risks of
52 35 subgroup-specific analyses; *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004;**57**:229–36.
53 36 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2003.08.009
54
55
56 37 48 Thomas CL, Cassady JC, Heller ML. The influence of emotional intelligence, cognitive
57 38 test anxiety, and coping strategies on undergraduate academic performance. *Learn Individ*
58 39 *Differ* 2017;**55**:40–8. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2017.03.001
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 49 Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Clarke M, *et al.* Individual participant data. In: Higgins JPT,
4 2 Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al.*, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*
5 3 *Interventions*. Wiley 2019. 643–58. doi:10.1002/9781119536604.ch26
6
7 4 50 Burke RM, Killerby ME, Newton S, *et al.* Symptom Profiles of a Convenience Sample of
8 5 Patients with COVID-19 — United States, January–April 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal*
9 6 *Wkly Rep* 2020;**69**:904–8. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6928a2
10
11 7 51 Riley RD, Lambert PC, Abo-Zaid G. Meta-analysis of individual participant data:
12 8 rationale, conduct, and reporting. *BMJ* 2010;**340**:c221–c221. doi:10.1136/bmj.c221
13
14 9 52 Stewart LA, Parmar MKB. Meta-analysis of the literature or of individual patient data: is
15 10 there a difference? *The Lancet* 1993;**341**:418–22. doi:10.1016/0140-6736(93)93004-K
16
17 11 53 Driessen E, Abbass AA, Barber JP, *et al.* Which patients benefit specifically from short-
18 12 term psychodynamic psychotherapy (STPP) for depression? Study protocol of a
19 13 systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data. *BMJ Open*
20 14 2018;**8**:e018900. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018900
21
22 15 54 Derogatis LR, Unger R. Symptom Checklist-90-Revised. In: Weiner IB, Craighead WE,
23 16 eds. *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: : John Wiley & Sons,
24 17 Inc. 2010. corpsy0970. doi:10.1002/9780470479216.corpsy0970
25
26 18 55 Horowitz LM, Alden LE, Wiggins JS, *et al.* *Inventory of interpersonal problems manual*.
27 19 Menlo Park, CA: : Mind Garden Inc 2003.
28
29 20 56 Sterne JAC, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, *et al.* ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in
30 21 non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ* 2016;:i4919. doi:10.1136/bmj.i4919
31
32 22 57 Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, *et al.* RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in
33 23 randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;:l4898. doi:10.1136/bmj.l4898
34
35 24 58 Wahl I, Löwe B, Bjorner JB, *et al.* Standardization of depression measurement: a
36 25 common metric was developed for 11 self-report depression measures. *J Clin Epidemiol*
37 26 2014;**67**:73–86. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.04.019
38
39 27 59 Audigier V, White IR, Jolani S, *et al.* Multiple Imputation for Multilevel Data with
40 28 Continuous and Binary Variables. *Stat Sci* 2018;**33**. doi:10.1214/18-STS646
41
42 29 60 Buuren S van, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. **mice** : Multivariate Imputation by Chained
43 30 Equations in R. *J Stat Softw* 2011;**45**. doi:10.18637/jss.v045.i03
44
45 31 61 Jolani S, Debray TPA, Koffijberg H, *et al.* Imputation of systematically missing
46 32 predictors in an individual participant data meta-analysis: a generalized approach using
47 33 MICE: S. JOLANI ET AL . *Stat Med* 2015;**34**:1841–63. doi:10.1002/sim.6451
48
49 34 62 Kunkel D, Kaizar EE. A comparison of existing methods for multiple imputation in
50 35 individual participant data meta-analysis: D. KUNKEL AND E. E KAIZAR. *Stat Med*
51 36 2017;**36**:3507–32. doi:10.1002/sim.7388
52
53 37 63 White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and
54 38 guidance for practice. *Stat Med* 2011;**30**:377–99. doi:10.1002/sim.4067

- 1
2
3 1 64 Riley RD, Tierney JF, Stewart LA, editors. *Individual participant data meta-analysis: a*
4 2 *handbook for healthcare research*. Hoboken, NJ: : Wiley 2021.
- 5
6 3 65 Hamaker EL, Kuiper RM, Grasman RPPP. A critique of the cross-lagged panel model.
7 4 *Psychol Methods* 2015;**20**:102–16. doi:10.1037/a0038889
- 8
9 5 66 Mulder JD, Hamaker EL. Three Extensions of the Random Intercept Cross-Lagged Panel
10 6 Model. *Struct Equ Model Multidiscip J* 2021;**28**:638–48.
11 7 doi:10.1080/10705511.2020.1784738
- 12
13 8 67 Schuurman NK, Ferrer E, de Boer-Sonnenschein M, *et al*. How to compare cross-lagged
14 9 associations in a multilevel autoregressive model. *Psychol Methods* 2016;**21**:206–21.
15 10 doi:10.1037/met0000062
- 16
17 11 68 Wang L, Zhang Q, Maxwell SE, *et al*. On Standardizing Within-Person Effects: Potential
18 12 Problems of Global Standardization. *Multivar Behav Res* 2019;**54**:382–403.
19 13 doi:10.1080/00273171.2018.1532280
- 20
21 14 69 Rosseel Y. lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *J Stat Softw* 2012;**48**.
22 15 doi:10.18637/jss.v048.i02
- 23
24 16 70 Cheung MW-L. metaSEM: an R package for meta-analysis using structural equation
25 17 modeling. *Front Psychol* 2015;**5**. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01521
- 26
27 18 71 Cuijpers P, Karyotaki E, Ciharova M, *et al*. The effects of psychotherapies for depression
28 19 on response, remission, reliable change, and deterioration: A meta-analysis. *Acta*
29 20 *Psychiatr Scand* 2021;**144**:288–99. doi:10.1111/acps.13335
- 30
31 21 72 Tolin DF, McKay D, Forman EM, *et al*. Empirically supported treatment:
32 22 Recommendations for a new model. *Clin Psychol Sci Pract* 2015;**22**:317–38.
33 23 doi:10.1037/h0101729
- 34
35 24 73 Thomä H, Kächele H, Bilger A, *et al*. *Psychoanalytic therapy. Vol. 1: Principles / Helmut*
36 25 *Thomä, Horst Kächele ; with the collaboration of Andreas Bilger [und 11 weiteren] ;*
37 26 *translated by Michael Wilson and David Roseveare ; bibliographic support by Regine*
38 27 *Lederer (University Library Ulm) and Lisa Malmheden*. Revised second edition. Gießen: :
39 28 Psychozial-Verlag 2020.

29

1 Authors Contributions

2 MEB, MLB and EB conceived the original idea. LK wrote the first draft of the
3 manuscript reviewed and edited by MEB, MLB and EB. LK and PS developed the
4 analysis plan. HLS, JB, GK, TJ, HRS, FR, SS, FL and ME revised the manuscript for
5 important intellectual content. All authors have reviewed the final version of the
6 manuscript, agree with its submission and are responsible for all aspects of the work.

8 Acknowledgements

9 We would like to thank Lorena Cascant Ortolano for helping with the development
10 and critical review of the search strings and Anouk Olivia Bonay for support in
11 coordinating and preliminary literature research. Moreover, we are grateful to all
12 patients, therapists and former staff involved in carrying out the original trials.

14 Funding

15 This work was supported by the DGPT (German Society for Psychoanalysis,
16 Psychotherapy, Psychosomatics and Psychodynamic Psychology). No grant number
17 is associated with this project.

19 Disclaimer

20 The funder had no role in the development of this study protocol, nor was there
21 editorial direction or censorship from the sponsor in this manuscript.

23 Competing interests

24 Manfred E. Beutel, Falk Leichsenring, Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber, Henriette
25 Löffler-Stastka, are state-licensed psychoanalysts, involved in the training of
26 psychodynamic therapists/ psychoanalysts. Josef Brockmann, Dorothea Huber,
27 Guenther Klug, Thorsten Jakobsen, Hemma Rössler-Schülelein, Felicitas Rost and
28 Simone Salzer are state-licensed psychoanalysts/ psychodynamic therapist. Mareike
29 Ernst is training as psychodynamic therapist.

1
2
3 1 They have conceived and/or performed trials that will serve as a data source for the
4 proposed study (*Frankfurt-Hamburg Study*, Josef Brockmann; *Göttingen Study*, Falk
5 2
6 3 Leichsenring, *Heidelberg-Berlin Study*, Thorsten Jakobsen; *Munich Psychotherapy*
7
8 4 *Study*, Dorothea Huber, Guenther Klug, *LAC Study*, Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber,
9
10 5 Manfred E. Beutel, Mareike Ernst; *Tavistock Depression Study*, Felicitas Rost;
11
12 6 *Viennese Psychoanalytic Process and Outcome Study*, Henriette Löffler-Stastka,
13
14 7 Hemma Rössler-Schülein)
15
16 8
17 9 Elmar Brähler, Peter Schmidt, and Lina Krakau declare no competing interests.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

BMJ Open

Efficacy of high- vs. low-intensity psychoanalytically oriented long-term treatments and determinants of outcome -Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis of Long-term Analytic Treatment Studies (MeLAS)

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-069332.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Mar-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Krakau, Lina; University Medical Center of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Dept. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Leuzinger-Bohleber, Marianne; University Medical Center Mainz, Dept. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Brähler, Elmar; University Medical Center of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Dep. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Schmidt, Peter; University Medical Center Mainz, Dept. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Rost, Felicitas; Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust Huber, Dorothea; International Psychoanalytic University Berlin gGmbH, Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychosomatics Klug, Guenther; Technical University of Munich Löffler-Stastka, Henriette ; Medizinische Universität Wien Rössler-Schüle, Hemma; Vienna Psychoanalytic Society Leichsenring, Falk; University Hospitals Giessen and Marburg Campus Giessen Salzer, Simone; Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Clinical Psychology and Psychoanalysis Brockmann, Josef; Private Outpatient Clinic Jakobsen, Thorsten; Private Outpatient Clinic Ernst, Mareike; University Medical Centre of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Beutel, Manfred; University Medical Center Mainz, Department of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Mainz, Germany
Primary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice
Keywords:	Clinical trials < THERAPEUTICS, Adult psychiatry < PSYCHIATRY, Anxiety disorders < PSYCHIATRY, Depression & mood disorders < PSYCHIATRY, Personality disorders < PSYCHIATRY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



1
2
3 1 **Efficacy of high- vs. low-intensity psychoanalytically oriented long-term treatments**
4 **and determinants of outcome** -Individual Participant Data **Meta-Analysis of Long-term**
5 **Analytic Treatment Studies (MeLAS)**

6
7
8 4 Lina Krakau¹⁾, Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber¹⁾, Elmar Brähler¹⁾, Peter Schmidt¹⁾, Felicitas
9 Rost^{2),12)}, Dorothea Huber³⁾, Guenther Klug⁴⁾, Henriette Löffler-Stastka⁵⁾, Hemma Rössler-
10 Schüle⁶⁾, Falk Leichsenring⁷⁾, Simone Salzer⁸⁾, Josef Brockmann⁹⁾, Thorsten Jakobsen¹⁰⁾,
11 Mareike Ernst^{1), 11)}, Manfred Beutel¹⁾

12
13
14 8 1) Department of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, University Medical
15 Center Mainz, Germany

16 9
17 10 2) Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

18
19 11 3) Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychosomatics, International
20 Psychoanalytic University Berlin, Germany

21 12
22 13 4) Clinic and Polyclinic for Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, Technical
23 University of Munich, Germany

24 15 5) Department of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy, Medical University Vienna,
25 Austria

26 16
27 17 6) Outpatient Clinic, Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, Austria

28
29 18 7) Department of Psychosomatics and Psychotherapy, Justus-Liebig-University
30 Giessen, Germany

31 20 8) Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychoanalysis, International
32 Psychoanalytic University Berlin, Germany

33 21
34 22 9) Private Outpatient Clinic, Frankfurt, Germany

35 23 10) Private Outpatient Clinic, Basel, Switzerland

36 24
37 25 11) Department of Clinical Psychology, Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis, Institute of
38 Psychology, Alpen-Adria University Klagenfurt, Klagenfurt am Wörthersee, Austria

39 26
40 27 12) The Open University, United Kingdom

41
42
43
44
45
46 29 Correspondence:

47
48 30 Lina Krakau

49
50 31 Lina.krakau@unimedizin-mainz.de

51
52 32 Untere Zahlbacher Str. 8

53
54 33 55131 Mainz

55
56 34
57 35 Word Count: 4522

1 ABSTRACT

2 **Introduction:** Long-term psychodynamic/ psychoanalytic psychotherapy (LTPP) is a
3 prevalent treatment option for complex mental disorders. Yet, little is known about the
4 role of treatment intensity in LTPP. We present a study protocol for a systematic
5 review and individual participant data (IPD) meta-analysis aggregating and analyzing
6 individual data from randomized and quasi-experimental trials by meta-analysis. The
7 purpose is to 1a) determine the treatment effectiveness of LTPP with low vs. high
8 intensity (up to two weekly sessions vs. three or more), 1b) compare their joint
9 effectiveness to shorter therapies and TAU, 2) Identify predictors and moderators of
10 treatment outcomes, and 3) determine reciprocal relationships between different
11 outcome domains (symptomatic and structural/personality change) over the courses
12 of LTPP. **Methods and Analysis:** We include studies from randomized (RCT) and
13 quasi-experimental trials, where at least one condition was LTPP of high or low
14 frequency. Long-term treatment is defined as \geq one year or \geq 50 sessions. To be
15 eligible studies must include a standardized outcome measure of symptoms (global
16 or disorder specific) with at least one proof of reliability. The primary outcome is
17 symptom reduction (global or specific), secondary outcome criteria are reliable
18 change, remission, functional capacities, personality, personality functioning, and
19 interpersonal pathology. Relevant studies will mainly be identified by searching
20 relevant databases: PubMed, PsycINFO (via EBSCO), Web of Science (via Elsevier),
21 Cochrane's Central Register of Controlled Trials (via Wiley). Risk of bias will be
22 evaluated in line with the Cochrane assessments tools for quasi-experimental trials
23 and RCTs, respectively. **Ethics and dissemination:** Aggregation of data from
24 primary trials collected based on ethics votes. Dissemination into clinical practice via
25 open access publications of findings. The study is an IPD meta-analysis, registered
26 on the International prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO;
27 304982) before conducting the main search and soliciting data.

28 **Keywords**

29 psychodynamic, psychoanalytic, long-term therapy, long-term follow up, anxiety,
30 depression, personality disorder
31
32

STRENGTH AND LIMITATION OF THIS STUDY

- IPD meta-analysis has increased power to detect differences between treatment groups and to examine prognostic and prescriptive factors associated with outcome.
- Combining individual participant data allows for comparisons that were not carried out in the original trials and can therefore not be examined in conventional meta-analysis (i.e., regrouping of patients according to treatment intensity).
- The inclusion of quasi-experimental trials and the examination of non-randomized conditions (high vs. low treatment intensity) lowers the quality of the evidence according to gold standard.
- In IPD meta-analysis bias may be introduced as not all relevant studies identified can be included, e.g., non-response of the authors, difficulties with data-sharing.

INTRODUCTION

Short-term psychodynamic psychotherapy (STPP) has demonstrated comparable efficacy to cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) and other bona fide psychotherapies,[1–3]. However, common mental disorders often take a chronic course,[e.g.; 4,5] and short-term treatments might be insufficient for patients with complex mental disorders ,[5,6]. Complex mental disorders have been defined as mental disorders characterized by rigidity or inflexibility, e.g., personality disorders (PD), chronic mental disorders (e.g., chronic depression),[7]. They show high comorbidity with other mental and physical health conditions [8] and are associated with considerable functional impairments [9]. Regardless of a categorical diagnosis of PD, lower levels of personality organization are typically found in more severe mental disorders [10]. Previous data on dose-effect relations has indicated that patients with such disorders need longer treatments,[11,12]. Nevertheless, most evidence for psychotherapy is based upon short-term treatments and short-term outcomes, the latter usually assessed at treatment termination,[13]. Only a few trials report one-year follow-up, and longer-term follow-ups of two and more years are scarce,[2,14]. To our best knowledge, long-term remission rates of bona fide short-term psychotherapies are often unsatisfactory,[14], and up to half of the study, patients have been found to seek auxiliary psychotherapy during follow-up,[15]. Naturalistic trials further indicate that many patients require and receive long-term treatments up to several years,[16].

A basic claim of long-term psychoanalytic psychotherapies (LTPP), comprising psychoanalysis and long-term psychoanalytic/psychodynamic psychotherapy, has been to improve structural capacities related to the personality organization,[17–19] in addition to symptoms. Structural integration (i.e. personality functioning) comprises different domains of

1 psychological functioning e.g., identity, affect differentiation and tolerance, and self-other
2 regulation which relate to core developmental tasks of attachment/relatedness and
3 individuation/self-definition,[e.g., 20–22]. Conceptualized by the term personality functioning,
4 the alternative model of personality disorders has introduced a similar,[23,24] model to the
5 DSM-5,[25,26]. Here, impairment in personality functioning is described along the
6 dimensions of self (identity perception, self-regulation) and interpersonal (empathy, intimacy)
7 functioning as shared characteristic of all personality disorders. In the psychoanalytic
8 literature, improvements in these domains have been described as structural change,[17–19]
9 and have been related to treatments with higher frequency promoting greater capacity for
10 self-analysis,[27]. In line with the traditionally transdiagnostic scope of psychoanalysis, LTPP
11 studies have focused on global or disorder-specific symptom improvement, and social and
12 personality functioning with long-term outcomes up to 10 years,[e.g., 15]. However, the
13 number of available trials on LTPP with long-term follow-up is comparably small, as they
14 pose special methodological challenges of recruitment, study design, duration, and funding.
15 For ethical reasons, placebo or waiting-list control conditions are not feasible over extended
16 periods, and it would be difficult to conceptualize plausible interventions with similar
17 frequency and duration of intervention. Studies that included long-term follow-ups have
18 shown that LTPP indeed led to lasting changes at the level of symptoms and other domains
19 of functioning,[15,28–32]. In the long run, several studies indicated LTPP to be more
20 effective than treatment as usual (TAU),[29] or short-term treatments,[15,33].

21 Huber et al.,[30] found psychoanalytic treatment to be more effective than CBT at long-term
22 follow-up, while others reported a comparable reduction of symptoms in psychoanalytic
23 therapy and CBT at the three-year assessment,[34], but stronger evidence of personality
24 change in psychoanalytic treatment groups,[32]. Other studies have focused on the
25 comparison of psychodynamic psychotherapy with more intensive and longer psychoanalytic
26 treatment and found the latter to be more effective at one-, [35] or three-year follow-up,[36].
27 Yet, in a meta-analysis on psychodynamic psychotherapy. Town et al.,[37] found that therapy
28 effects were maintained and continued to improve following termination of psychodynamic
29 therapies of different frequencies and lengths. To our knowledge, only four conventional
30 meta-analyses have focused on the effectiveness of LTPP specifically. Focusing on RCTs,
31 Leichsenring & Rabung,[6,7,38] found LTPP to be more effective than STPT with medium to
32 large effect sizes in terms of symptom reduction and social and personality functioning.
33 Using different inclusion criteria, the meta-analysis of Smit et al.,[39] questioned the
34 effectiveness of LTPP, as they found it more effective only in comparison to control
35 conditions that were no specialized forms of therapy. Exploratory analyses indicated that a
36 greater difference in treatment intensity between LTPP and the control group was related to
37 effect size. The seemingly conflicting findings between Leichsenring and Rabung's,[6,7] and

1 Smit et al's.,[39] meta-analyses have been discussed elsewhere,[e.g., 38,40]. More recently,
2 Woll and Schönbrodt aimed to replicate and update Leichsenring et al.'s,[38] meta-analysis,
3 but only found small additional gains for LTPP in comparison to other forms of
4 psychotherapy, regarding symptoms and social functioning. No significant differences were
5 found with respect to personality functioning. Restricting their meta-analysis to
6 psychoanalysis proper, defined as the patient lying on the couch with at least two sessions,
7 one research group found large within-group effect sizes regarding symptomatic
8 improvement and personality characteristics. Yet, most of the trials they examined were
9 naturalistic and did not have control groups,[41].

10 Beyond efficacy studies, psychotherapy research, in general, has identified
11 numerous patient, psychotherapist, and relational prognostic factors (predictors) for
12 psychotherapy outcome, e.g., racial or social minority status, high symptom load, or
13 high self-criticism,[42]. However, less is known about prescriptive variables
14 (moderators) associated with different outcomes depending on the type of treatment,
15 e.g., maladaptive defenses or rigid relationship patterns for psychodynamic
16 treatments,[1,43,44]. Identifying prescriptive variables that reliably predict differential
17 treatment outcomes has become the main target of personalized treatment
18 approaches,[42,45]. To our knowledge, no meta-analysis has examined prognostic or
19 prescriptive variables in LTPP.

20 Given the evidence outlined above, we presume that LTPP facilitates changes in
21 intrapsychic, structural processes underlying mental disorders in addition to
22 improving symptoms. Yet, it remains unclear whether this is due to the effects of
23 psychoanalytic technique or its treatment frequency and duration,[12,39]. Changes in
24 structural functioning have been posited as a mechanism of change in
25 psychotherapy, and LTPP specifically, with a stronger focus on insight and self-
26 understanding,[46]. Several studies found greater changes e.g. in personality or
27 reflective functioning associated with greater,[34,47] and sustained,[48,49] symptom
28 reduction. However, the studies mostly focused on between-person effects and did
29 not apply lagged analysis over multiple time points to investigate if changes in
30 structural capacities were associated with a decrease in symptoms at subsequent
31 assessment.

32 Due to the limitations of the individual trials, empirical evidence on the role of
33 treatment intensity for the efficacy of LTPP and the identification of prescriptive
34 variables has been limited. Small samples and unequal group sizes as well as
35 decreasing case numbers throughout therapy and follow-up have led to

1
2
3 1 methodological problems in data analysis of individual trials, including a lack of
4 2 statistical power. Hence, small differences between different treatment approaches
5 3 cannot be identified and testing for sub-groups with differential outcome is
6 4 prohibited,[50]. Additional problems include the utilization of different designs (RCT
7 5 vs. quasi-experimental), varying definitions of LTPP (e.g., ranging from 42 to over
8 6 300 sessions), varying frequency of measurements, definition and timing of follow-
9 7 ups, and the comparability of measures of relevant variables (e.g., sociodemographic
10 8 and clinical characteristics) and different outcome measures.
11 9

12 10 The current study aims to conduct a systematic review and individual participant data
13 11 (IPD) meta-analysis concerning the efficacy of LTPP treatments of different
14 12 intensities and associated prognostic and prescriptive factors in common mental
15 13 disorders. IPD meta-analysis is a technique to examine treatment effects by
16 14 combining participant-level data of multiple trials collected from the original data and
17 15 is currently considered the gold standard in evidence synthesis,[51,52]. A one-stage
18 16 approach is favored, especially when the original trials have small samples,[53]. It
19 17 has increased statistical power to detect differences between treatment conditions
20 18 and to examine prognostic and prescriptive variables associated with treatment
21 19 efficacy,[45]. Compared to conventional meta-analyses that rely on the aggregated
22 20 level data extracted from published reports, with IDP the same statistical methods
23 21 can be applied across all studies involved. This allows for the application of newer
24 22 statistical modeling techniques and similar handling of missing data, thus increasing
25 23 comparability,[54]. The use of the original data may further circumvent bias related to
26 24 the publication of positive results or the removal of patients before analysis in
27 25 published trials,[55].

28 26 In summary, the current project aims to:

- 29 27 1) Compare treatment effectiveness of LTPP of low vs. high intensity (based on
30 28 average weekly sessions)
 - 31 29 a. At treatment termination
 - 32 30 b. At long-term follow-up (stability of outcome)
 - 33 31 c. Compare their joint efficacy to shorter therapies and TAU as included
34 32 as control groups in the trials
- 35 33 2) Identify individual characteristics that reliably predict or moderate differential
36 34 treatment outcomes of low- and high-intensity LTPP

- 1 3) Examine the reciprocal relationship of symptoms and personality functioning
- 2 over time

3 METHODS AND ANALYSIS

4 The study is an IPD meta-analysis, registered on the International prospective
5 register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO; CRD42022304982)
6 before conducting the main search and soliciting any data. Amendments will be
7 documented here. Eligible studies will be identified through systematic literature
8 research. Study results will be reported following the Preferred Reporting Items for
9 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis for Individual Participant Data (PRISMA-IPD;
10 Stewart et al. 2015). Project planning and preliminary literature research have started
11 in June 2022, and we expect the completion of the project within three years.

12 Selection of studies

13 The aim of the study is the examination of the efficacy of LTPP with different intensity
14 in adult outpatient populations with common mental disorders. Low-intensity
15 treatments are defined as treatments with up to two weekly sessions, and high-
16 intensity treatments are treatments with three or more weekly sessions. We will
17 include randomized and quasi-experimental clinical trials on LTPP. We will include
18 trials that directly compared high- vs. low-intensity LTPP, and trials that compared
19 high- and/or low-intensity LTPP to shorter treatments or treatments as usual /TAU).
20 In our main analysis, we will compare high- vs. low-intensity LTPP. A sensitivity
21 analysis will be conducted to contrast one weekly session (instead of up to two) with
22 three or more. In a second analysis, we will compare high- and-low intensity LTPP
23 (combined) to shorter treatments and TAU (combined). We will conduct a sensitivity
24 analysis excluding TAU. Due to randomization difficulties for LTPP, especially
25 psychoanalysis, we include quasi-experimental cohort studies along with prospective
26 randomized controlled trials (RCT). Eligible studies must contain LTPP. LTPP is
27 defined according to Leichsenring & Rabung 2011 criteria for LTPP by 1) Studies of
28 psychodynamic therapy; 2) Working with transference and resistance and 3) Duration
29 of at least 50 sessions or at least one year. Moreover, we will include psychoanalysis
30 proper, meaning up to five sessions per week in a supine position. Control conditions
31 are psychodynamic treatments of shorter duration (fewer than 50 sessions), other
32 treatments (e.g., CBT) from various psychotherapeutic backgrounds, or TAU.
33 Treatment must be individual therapy for common mental disorders (e.g., depression,

1 anxiety, or personality disorders) in adults. The exact inclusion and exclusion criteria
2 can be found in Table 1. We will apply a three-step selection process. During the first
3 step, two independent raters (one post-doc and one doctoral candidate) will apply the
4 outlined selection criteria to the titles and abstracts of the references retrieved from
5 the systematic literature research. In case of disagreement, consensus will be
6 reached through discussion. If a study is considered as potentially fulfilling inclusion
7 criteria, we will request full texts. Next, full texts will be rated according to the
8 selection criteria by two independent raters. Disagreements will be resolved through
9 discussion or the involvement of a third rater. Finally, selected studies will be rated by
10 experts (full professors with analytic training) to confirm that the treatment
11 investigated is LTPP.
12

1 **Table 1. Selection criteria**

Inclusion	Prospective RCT or quasi-experimental cohort study
	Baseline assessment and Post/Follow-Up assessment that exceeds at least one year
	Outpatient individual treatment
	Participants (≥ 18 -65 Jahre)
	One treatment is LTPP (psychodynamic or -analytic long-term psychotherapy, psychoanalysis)
	Long-term is defined as ≥ 1 year or ≥ 50 sessions
	Standardized outcome measure of symptoms (global or specific) with at least one empirical proof of reliability
	Data on frequency of sessions are available
	Treatment is carried out by licensed psychotherapists
Exclusion	Focus on psychotic disorders
	Focus on organic disorders
	Single-case studies
	Serial case studies
	Qualitative studies
	Information on session frequency and therapy duration is not available
Outcomes	Primary:
	Standardized symptom assessment (global symptom level or disorder-specific)
	Secondary:
	Reliable change, no change and deterioration, calculated based on the primary outcome measure; Standardized assessments of personality/personality functioning, functional capacities, or relationship pathology

2

3

1 **Search Strategy**

2 To identify as many relevant studies as possible, different search strategies will be
3 used. Firstly, we will conduct a systematic literature review using the following
4 databases: PubMed, PsycINFO (via EBSCO), Web of Science (via Elsevier), and the
5 Cochrane's Central Register of Controlled Trials (via Wiley). We define five
6 categories of search strings (1) treatment, (2) long-term (3) study, (4) effectiveness
7 and (5) common mental disorders, with synonyms that will be searched as index and
8 free text terms. The Boolean combination of search strings is depicted in Table 2. We
9 will not apply language or date restrictions for the searches, however, the included
10 studies must be published in English, French, or German for our team to conduct risk
11 of bias (RoB) assessments. Secondly, we will search the controlled-trial register to
12 identify ongoing and unpublished studies
13 [https://www.isrctn.com/search?q=&filters=conditionCategory%3AMental+and+Behavioural+D](https://www.isrctn.com/search?q=&filters=conditionCategory%3AMental+and+Behavioural+Disorders)
14 [isorders](https://www.isrctn.com/search?q=&filters=conditionCategory%3AMental+and+Behavioural+Disorders) and the Open Door Review of Clinical, Conceptual, Process and Outcome
15 Studies in Psychoanalysis, 3rd edition
16 https://www.ipa.world/en/Psychoanalytic_Theory/Research/open_door.aspx;
17 accessed 11/21/21. Thirdly, we will hand-search published meta-analyses,[39–41]
18 and the citations of the included trials to identify other possibly eligible trials. We will
19 contact experts in the field through a listserv of related societies (e.g., Society for
20 Psychotherapy Research, Psychoanalytic Research Society, International
21 Psychoanalytic Society) to ask for yet unpublished trials or studies we have missed.

1 **Table 2. Systematic literature search**

Data banks	PubMed PsycInfo Web of Science Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials
Category:	Search terms:
Treatment	emotion focused OR mentalization OR mentalization OR self-psychology OR transference-focused OR insight-oriented OR interpretativ* OR psychodynamic* OR psychoanalys* OR psychoanalytic* OR "psychotherapy, psychodynamic" OR "psychoanalytic therapy"
	AND
Long-term	"follow-up studies" OR follow OR long-term OR longer-term OR open-ended
	AND
study	study OR studies OR trial*
	AND
Effectiveness	treatment outcome OR outcome OR effect* OR efficacy OR result* OR change*
	AND
Common mental disorder	mental disorder*OR psychiatric illness*OR psychiatric disease*OR mental illness*OR psychiatric disorder* OR behavior disorder*OR behaviour disorder* OR psychiatric diagnos* OR anxiet*OR mood disorder* OR affective disorder* OR

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2

	<p>personality disorder*OR borderline personalit* OR depress*OR post-traumatic stress disorder* OR post-traumatic neuros* OR PTSD</p>
--	--

For peer review only

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies. Enseignement Supérieur (ABES).

1 **Data collection and management**

2 Named corresponding authors will be contacted via e-mail. They will be provided with
3 all necessary information (including a link to the project's PROSPERO registration
4 and the protocol) and asked whether they would be willing to participate/collaborate.
5 Contact information will be retrieved from the relevant publications or if unavailable or
6 outdated through online searches. Authors will be offered co-authorship on the
7 published paper in return for sharing the studies' de-identified individual participant
8 data. Following Driessen et al.,[56], authors who do not respond will be contacted
9 three times by mail. If we do not get a response, we will try to establish contact by
10 phone, next send up to three letters by post. This procedure will be repeated first with
11 the corresponding author, then the PI, and then sequentially with all other authors of
12 the study. If we still do not get a response, we will contact colleagues or other
13 persons who may help to establish contact. If we do not succeed in contacting the
14 authors with the above-outlined efforts, or if authors respond that the individual
15 participant data cannot be shared or has been deleted, study data is considered
16 unavailable. If authors choose to share their data, data-sharing agreements between
17 all parties will need to be drawn up. The procedures are country-dependent and will
18 need to be taken into consideration. Once data-sharing agreements in line with
19 GDPR ethical standards are arranged, authors will be asked to transfer de-identified
20 individual-level data sets encrypted using a save cloud service, procedures will be
21 provided by the University Medical Center Mainz. Authors will be asked to send item-
22 based data sets if available and to provide a description of how the data was coded
23 (codebook). Datasets will contain de-identified participant-level data comprising
24 sociodemographic data, prognostic and prescriptive variables assessed at baseline,
25 outcome variables assessed at baseline, during and after treatment, therapy duration
26 and session frequency, additional treatment, and case status (ITT/ATP). Study-level
27 data, e.g., requirements of therapists' professional experience (e.g., years of licensed
28 practice), supervision, treatment integrity, and adherence, and interrater reliability for
29 diagnostic assessment of primary outcome measures will be retrieved from the
30 publication or requested, if unavailable. Example code for analyses, detailed RoB
31 ratings, list of studies excluded at full-text stage including reasons for exclusion will
32 be shared via the Open Science Framework (OSF).

33

1 Measures

2 The primary outcome is treatment effectiveness of low- vs. high-intensity LTPP as
3 assessed by a global measure of symptomology, most commonly the Symptom
4 Checklist-90 (SCL-90),[57] or disorder-specific measures at treatment termination
5 and follow-up. Secondary outcomes are functional capacities, personality, personality
6 functioning, or relationship pathology, most commonly the Inventory of Interpersonal
7 Problems (IIP),[58] at treatment termination and long-term follow-up. Additional
8 subgroup analyses will be performed for specific mental disorders (major depression,
9 anxiety, personality disorders). For the primary outcome, we will also assess reliable
10 change criteria [59] including no change, and deterioration, to account for the fact
11 that psychotherapy has not always been found to be beneficial. Moreover, we will
12 assess the occurrence of adverse events (0 = no adverse event, 1 = adverse event)
13 during trial participation. If enough data is available this will be added as a secondary
14 outcome. To identify potential prognostic and prescriptive factors for treatment
15 response we include patient-specific characteristics at baseline: Sociodemographic
16 data (e.g., gender, education, employment, income, migration background, clinical
17 characteristics, (diagnosis given by the trial, previous treatments including
18 psychopharmacological treatments) and continuous measures of symptom severity,
19 personality and personality functioning, relationships, functional capacities, and life
20 events (e.g., social occupational functioning, comorbid disorders, childhood
21 adversity). Patient characteristics will be included when they are consistently reported
22 among trials and can be standardized in a coherent way (e.g., by collapsing
23 categories). We will include a variable referring to the original trial design
24 (predetermined length vs. Open ended treatment) and a variable indicating whether
25 cases were treated according to protocol (ATP vs. Drop-out).

26 Data Integrity and preparation

27 Received data sets will be thoroughly examined to identify out-of-range items or
28 invalid scoring and will be compared with the original publication (sample size,
29 missing data, gender, age, mean pre-treatment scores in the primary outcome as
30 defined by the study, and mean post-treatment scores in the primary outcome as
31 defined by the study). In case of deviations, we will contact the authors to resolve the
32 issue (e.g., cases dropped from the analysis, imputation method used for computing
33 mean scores of the questionnaires received). Next, all variables relevant for the IPD
34 meta-analysis will be extracted from each study including prognostic and prescriptive

1 variables, treatment information received, the diagnoses given within the original trial,
2 and primary and secondary outcomes at baseline, intermediate, and follow-up
3 assessment. The resulting variables will be copied into a new data set and study-
4 level criteria (study type, treatment integrity, RoB assessment) and a participant ID
5 containing numeric ID and an abbreviation of the study will be added. A copy of this
6 file containing a study's raw data relevant to IPD will be standardized to the variable
7 names and coding used in the IPD database. A variable will be created indicating the
8 participants' group membership (high intensity LTPP, low intensity LTPP, Shorter
9 Treatment/TAU). For the planned sensitivity analyses, we will create a second
10 grouping variable (one weekly session vs. three or more and separating shorter
11 treatment from TAU). All studies will be integrated into the database structured by the
12 created ID. RoB will be evaluated in line with the Cochrane assessments tools for
13 quasi-experimental trials,[60] and RCTs, [61], respectively. The results of the RoB
14 ratings will be presented in tables listing each original study. They will be used for an
15 overall appraisal for the quality of evidence of the IPD-MA, which is carried out
16 following Tierney et al. [62]. As the type of measures applied by individual studies will
17 likely vary, individual scores will be standardized (using z-transformation or a
18 common metric approach,[63]) for continuous measures. Centering will be applied
19 within individual trials. Data screening, data extraction and risk of bias assessment
20 will be performed independently by two researchers (one postdoctoral researcher
21 and one doctoral candidate).

22 23 **Missing Data**

24 We intend to conduct an intention-to-treat analysis. Missing data will be assessed in
25 each study received, including the amount of missing data per participant and
26 variable and possible reasons for missingness. We will compare subsamples of
27 participants without missing data to those with missing data per study and summarize
28 distributions per variable. Missing Data will be handled using multilevel multiple
29 imputation, an approach that handles sporadically (missing data on variables for
30 some but not all participants) and systematically (variables that have not been
31 assessed by a specific study) missing values and can adequately preserve between-
32 study heterogeneity. As we expect some of the included studies to have a small
33 sample size and the overall number of studies to be rather low, we will use a full
34 conditional specification approach (FCS; also Multiple imputation by chained

1 equations; MICE),[64–67]. We will follow White's et al.,[68] rule of thumb and impute
2 one data set per percent of participants with one or more missing variables. We will
3 include all variables and interactions relevant to our analysis model and variables
4 potentially predictive for missing data. Specifically, we will use the R-packages mice
5 and its extension micemd,[65].

For peer review only

1 Data Analysis

2 To address research questions 1(RQ1) and 2(RQ2), we will carry out a one-stage IPD meta-
3 analysis. To analyze effectiveness, we will statistically predict symptom severity (global if
4 available, otherwise specific) and remission (binary) controlling for baseline severity. To
5 predict symptom severity over time we will use a generalized linear mixed model framework
6 (GLMM), as participants are clustered in trials and treatment groups. Following Riley et al.'s
7 [69] recommendations for IPD-meta-analysis, we will use restricted maximum likelihood
8 estimation (REML) and obtain 95% confidence intervals for treatment effects using the
9 Kenward-Roger approach. We will specify a random treatment effect to account for
10 heterogeneity in study populations (intercept) and treatment effects (slope). To account for
11 clustering within trials, we will fit a random intercept for each trial. Separate models will be
12 estimated to compare LTPP of low vs. high intensity, and to compare joint LTPP against
13 control groups as provided by the trials. The estimation procedure will be repeated using our
14 secondary outcome measures based on the trials providing these additional measures.
15 Reliable response, no change and deterioration will be analyzed for symptom outcome only
16 using multilevel logistic regression. Response type will be calculated based on the reliable
17 change index [59] of the symptom assessment within a given trial. We intend to perform
18 subgroup analysis by repeating analysis steps in subgroups with different mental disorders
19 (a) Depressive Disorders, (b) Anxiety disorders, (c) Personality Disorders. The primary
20 diagnosis given in the original trial will define group membership. Next, we will analyze
21 prognostic factors by adding available participant- and study-level variables as predictors to
22 the specified models. If possible, continuous variables will be kept on a continuous scale to
23 avoid loss of power. We will analyze prescriptive variables by adding interaction terms
24 between the predictor and treatment groups. The third research question will be addressed
25 by a two-stage individual participant data meta-analysis approach. We will first, estimate
26 multi-group random intercept cross-lagged panel models (RI-CLPM,[70,71]) to examine the
27 respective lagged and cross-lagged effects of personality functioning and symptoms on
28 between-person (BP) and within-person (WP) level per study. We will consider every study
29 providing data on personality functioning and symptoms for baseline, treatment termination
30 and follow-up. We will use within-person (WP) centering,[72,73] of scores prior to analyses to
31 derive standardized coefficients for lagged and cross-lagged effects. Next, findings will be
32 meta-analyzed using random effects meta-analytic structural equation modelling (MASEM), a
33 technique to meta-analyze path or structural equation models. Analyses will be carried out in
34 R-lavaan [74] and R-metaSEM [75]. Sensitivity analyses for all research questions will be
35 carried out based on complete cases. If enough studies have used the same instrument, we
36 will rerun analysis for RQ1 and RQ2 based on these studies without standardizing the
37 variables.

1
2
3 1 Patient and Public Involvement
4 2 No Patient and Public Involvement.
5 3
6
7

8 4 ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION 9

10
11 5 Given that all studies obtained ethical approval from the relevant ethics boards,
12 6 further ethical approval is not necessary but requirements for data-sharing need to be
13 7 met. A data-sharing agreement based according to principles of the General Data
14 8 Protection Rules (GDPR) of the European Union will be signed between the
15 9 University Medical Center Mainz and all parties involved (shared responsibility). All
16 10 parties sharing their data are responsible to ensure that data sharing is in line with
17 11 their institutional, local, and international requirements, which they confirm by signing
18 12 the agreement on shared responsibility. All data transferred will be de-identified. The
19 13 results of the study will be presented at international conferences for clinician
20 14 scientists and practitioners. Scientific reports of the study results will be submitted for
21 15 publication in international, preferably open-access journals.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 16 DISCUSSION 32

33
34
35 17 This study protocol describes a systematic review with meta-analysis of individual
36 18 participant data to determine the effectiveness of low vs. high intensity LTPP at the
37 19 end of treatment and long-term follow-up. Additionally, we aim to identify associated
38 20 prognostic and prescriptive variables and the interaction of different outcome
39 21 domains over time.
40
41
42

43 22 Clinical and scientific relevance 44

45 23 The evidence base of effectiveness for psychotherapy in general but also for
46 24 psychodynamic treatments has been predominantly based on short-term therapies
47 25 and short-term outcomes,[13]. Previous research found a potential benefit of LTPP
48 26 over short-term treatments for complex mental disorders,[6,7,38,40]. Yet, little is
49 27 known about the role of treatment intensity in LTPP, including psychoanalysis, and
50 28 psychoanalytic/ psychodynamic long-term psychotherapy. Given unsatisfactory
51 29 response rates, e.g., about 41 % for (short-term) psychotherapy,[76], but high
52 30 additional costs of extensive treatment, the effectiveness of LTPP at long-term follow-
53 31 up represents a health outcome of public interest. Individual studies lack sufficient
54 32 power to reliably examine prognostic and prescriptive variables, however, identifying
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 factors associated with benefits from (specific) treatments is an important step
2 towards optimized treatment planning,[45]. The project serves to close this gap, by
3 consolidating the evidence base for LTPP for the major common mental disorders
4 (e.g., depression, anxiety, and personality disorders). As LTPP treatments strive to
5 achieve structural and personality changes, outcomes will go beyond symptom
6 change and cover relevant outcome domains, such as personality, interpersonal and
7 social-occupational functioning. This is consistent with the recommendations for
8 updating the criteria of evidence-based therapies,[77]. The stability of therapeutic
9 gains during long-term follow-up is of particular interest, as psychoanalytic theory
10 posits that change does not necessarily cease at the end of treatment. Rather,
11 insights gained during therapy are understood to promote further development during
12 follow-up, when autonomy and greater capacity for self-analysis evolve,[78]. Hence,
13 changing underlying structural capacities should enable patients to gain further
14 benefits in the follow-up phase,[37,48,49].

15 **Limitations**

16 Limitations of data aggregation and analyses include different designs regarding the
17 assessment of process and follow-up. Moreover, definitions of LTPP differ between
18 studies regarding the frequency of sessions and setting. We cannot conduct a
19 conventional meta-analysis to compare our results with trials not providing original
20 data as some original studies will have analyzed low-and-high intensity LTPP
21 together. If enough trials provide separate analyses, we will conduct a conventional
22 meta-analysis based on these trials. The study includes RCTs and quasi-
23 experimental cohort studies, lowering the quality of evidence according to gold-
24 standards. Yet, the inclusion of quasi-experimental trials in diverse settings, where
25 patients self-select their treatment, enhances the external validity of the results as
26 treatment length and techniques in practice are individually adapted. An important
27 limitation of IPD meta-analysis is that some trials may not be integrated due to non-
28 response, problems with data-sharing, or the deletion of the original data. Thus, even
29 if IPD meta-analyses are considered the gold standard in evidence synthesis, bias
30 cannot be precluded, and information obtained by IPD should be used in addition to
31 conventional meta-analyses and reviews. Identifying, collecting, and aggregating
32 relevant data will require a certain time, and newly published trials cannot easily be
33 incorporated. Even though IPD meta-analysis will likely have enough power to
34 examine prognostic and prescriptive treatment variables, the choice of variables

1 examined depends on the variables included in the original trials. Moreover, results
2 may be restricted to individuals who choose to participate in treatment trials. We have
3 specified secondary outcomes, however, our analyses will not be controlled for type I
4 and type II errors. To our knowledge, studies conducted in the field have not
5 incorporated explicit measures on harmful effects, such as negative experiences
6 during psychotherapy. Our analyses will therefore fall short of an equal focus on
7 efficacy and harmful effects of LTPP. We try to counterbalance this with modeling no
8 reliable change, deterioration, and adverse events.
9
10

For peer review only

References

- 1 Barber JP, Muran JC, McCarthy KS, *et al*. Research on dynamic therapies. In: Barkham M, Lutz W, Castonguay LG, eds. *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change*. Hoboken, NJ: : Wiley 2021. 387–419.
- 2 Cuijpers P, Quero S, Noma H, *et al*. Psychotherapies for depression: a network meta-analysis covering efficacy, acceptability and long-term outcomes of all main treatment types. *World Psychiatry* 2021;**20**:283–93. doi:10.1002/wps.20860
- 3 Steinert C, Munder T, Rabung S, *et al*. Psychodynamic Therapy: As Efficacious as Other Empirically Supported Treatments? A Meta-Analysis Testing Equivalence of Outcomes. *Am J Psychiatry* 2017;**174**:943–53. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2017.17010057
- 4 Bruce SE, Yonkers KA, Otto MW, *et al*. Influence of Psychiatric Comorbidity on Recovery and Recurrence in Generalized Anxiety Disorder, Social Phobia, and Panic Disorder: A 12-Year Prospective Study. *Am J Psychiatry* 2005;**162**:1179–87. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.162.6.1179
- 5 Maj M, Stein DJ, Parker G, *et al*. The clinical characterization of the adult patient with depression aimed at personalization of management. *World Psychiatry* 2020;**19**:269–93. doi:10.1002/wps.20771
- 6 Leichsenring F, Rabung S. Long-term psychodynamic psychotherapy in complex mental disorders: update of a meta-analysis. *Br J Psychiatry* 2011;**199**:15–22. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.110.082776
- 7 Leichsenring F. Effectiveness of Long-term Psychodynamic Psychotherapy: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2008;**300**:1551. doi:10.1001/jama.300.13.1551
- 8 Saxena S, Maj M. Physical health of people with severe mental disorders: leave no one behind. *World Psychiatry* 2017;**16**:1–2. doi:10.1002/wps.20403
- 9 Jacobi F, Grafiadeli R, Volkmann H, *et al*. Krankheitslast der Borderline-Persönlichkeitsstörung: Krankheitskosten, somatische Komorbidität und Mortalität. *Nervenarzt* 2021;**92**:660–9. doi:10.1007/s00115-021-01139-4
- 10 Luyten P, Fonagy P. Integrating and differentiating personality and psychopathology: A psychodynamic perspective. *J Pers* 2022;**90**:75–88. doi:10.1111/jopy.12656
- 11 Kopta SM, Howard KI, Lowry JL, *et al*. Patterns of symptomatic recovery in psychotherapy. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 1994;**62**:1009–16. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.62.5.1009
- 12 Zimmermann J, Löffler-Stastka H, Huber D, *et al*. Is It All about the Higher Dose? Why Psychoanalytic Therapy Is an Effective Treatment for Major Depression: Is It All about the Higher Dose? *Clin Psychol Psychother* 2015;**22**:469–87. doi:10.1002/cpp.1917
- 13 Leichsenring F, Steinert C, Rabung S, *et al*. The efficacy of psychotherapies and pharmacotherapies for mental disorders in adults: an umbrella review and meta-analytic evaluation of recent meta-analyses. *World Psychiatry* 2022;**21**:133–45. doi:10.1002/wps.20941
- 14 Steinert C, Hofmann M, Kruse J, *et al*. Relapse rates after psychotherapy for depression – stable long-term effects? A meta-analysis. *J Affect Disord* 2014;**168**:107–18. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2014.06.043
- 15 Knekt P, Virtala E, Härkänen T, *et al*. The outcome of short- and long-term psychotherapy 10 years after start of treatment. *Psychol Med* 2016;**46**:1175–88. doi:10.1017/S0033291715002718
- 16 Leuzinger-Bohleber M, Stuhr U, Rieger B, *et al*. How to study the ‘quality of psychoanalytic treatments’ and their long-term effects on patients’ well-being: A

- 1
2
3 1 representative, multi-perspective follow-up study. *Int J Psychoanal* 2003;**84**:263–90.
4 2 doi:10.1516/C387-0AFM-4P34-M4BT
- 5 3 17 Kernberg OF. *Object relations theory and clinical psychoanalysis*. Northvale,
6 4 NJ: : Jason Aronson 1984.
- 7 5 18 Kernberg OF. Psychic structure and structural change: An ego psychology-
8 6 object relations theory viewpoint. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* 1988;**36**:315–37.
- 9 7 19 Wallerstein RS. Assessment of structural change in psychoanalytic therapy
10 8 and research. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* 1988;**36**:241–61.
- 11 9 20 Blatt SJ. Levels of Object Representation in Anaclitic and Introjective
12 10 Depression. *Psychoanal Study Child* 1974;**29**:107–57.
13 11 doi:10.1080/00797308.1974.11822616
- 14 12 21 Blatt SJ. A Fundamental Polarity in Psychoanalysis: Implications for
15 13 Personality Development, Psychopathology, and the Therapeutic Process.
16 14 *Psychoanal Inq* 2007;**26**:494–520. doi:10.1080/07351690701310581
- 17 15 22 Ehrenthal JC, Benecke C. Tailored Treatment Planning for Individuals With
18 16 Personality Disorders. In: *Case Formulation for Personality Disorders*. Elsevier 2019.
19 17 291–314. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-813521-1.00015-1
- 20 18 23 Zimmermann J, Brakemeier E-L, Benecke C. Alternatives DSM-5-Modell zur
21 19 Klassifikation von Persönlichkeitsstörungen: Bezüge zu psychodynamischer und
22 20 verhaltenstherapeutischer Diagnostik [The DSM-5 alternative model for the
23 21 classification of personality disorders: references to psychodynamic and behavioral
24 22 diagnostics]. *Psychotherapeut* 2015;**60**:269–79. doi:10.1007/s00278-015-0033-8
- 25 23 24 Zimmermann J, Ehrenthal JC, Cierpka M, *et al*. Assessing the Level of
26 24 Structural Integration Using Operationalized Psychodynamic Diagnosis (OPD):
27 25 Implications for DSM–5. *J Pers Assess* 2012;**94**:522–32.
28 26 doi:10.1080/00223891.2012.700664
- 29 27 25 Bach B, Kerber A, Aluja A, *et al*. International Assessment of DSM-5 and ICD-
30 28 11 Personality Disorder Traits: Toward a Common Nosology in DSM-5.1.
31 29 *Psychopathology* 2020;**53**:179–88. doi:10.1159/000507589
- 32 30 26 Bender DS, Morey LC, Skodol AE. Toward a Model for Assessing Level of
33 31 Personality Functioning in DSM–5 , Part I: A Review of Theory and Methods. *J Pers
34 32 Assess* 2011;**93**:332–46. doi:10.1080/00223891.2011.583808
- 35 33 27 Falkenström F, Grant J, Broberg J, *et al*. Self-Analysis and Post-Termination
36 34 Improvement After Psychoanalysis and Long-Term Psychotherapy. *J Am Psychoanal
37 35 Assoc* 2007;**55**:629–74. doi:10.1177/00030651070550020401
- 38 36 28 Brockmann J, Schlüter T, Eckert J. Langzeitwirkungen psychoanalytischer und
39 37 verhaltenstherapeutischer Langzeitpsychotherapien: Eine vergleichende Studie aus
40 38 der Praxis niedergelassener Psychotherapeuten [Long-term effects of long-term
41 39 psychoanalytic and long-term behavior therapy. A comparative study from the
42 40 general practices of psychotherapists]. *Psychotherapeut* 2006;**51**:15–25.
43 41 doi:10.1007/s00278-005-0454-x
- 44 42 29 Fonagy P, Rost F, Carlyle J, *et al*. Pragmatic randomized controlled trial of
45 43 long-term psychoanalytic psychotherapy for treatment-resistant depression: the
46 44 Tavistock Adult Depression Study (TADS). *World Psychiatry* 2015;**14**:312–21.
47 45 doi:10.1002/wps.20267
- 48 46 30 Huber D, Zimmermann J, Henrich G, *et al*. Comparison of cognitive-behaviour
49 47 therapy with psychoanalytic and psychodynamic therapy for depressed patients – A
50 48 three-year follow-up study. *Z Für Psychosom Med Psychother* 2012;**58**:299–316.
51 49 doi:10.13109/zptm.2012.58.3.299
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 31 Leichsenring F, Biskup J, Kreische R, *et al.* The Göttingen study of
4 2 psychoanalytic therapy: First results. *Int J Psychoanal* 2005;**86**:433–55.
5 3 doi:10.1516/XX6F-AU0W-KWM3-G6LU
6 4 32 Leuzinger-Bohleber M, Kaufhold J, Kallenbach L, *et al.* How to measure
7 5 sustained psychic transformations in long-term treatments of chronically depressed
8 6 patients: Symptomatic and structural changes in the LAC Depression Study of the
9 7 outcome of cognitive-behavioural and psychoanalytic long-term treatments. *Int J*
10 8 *Psychoanal* 2019;**100**:99–127. doi:10.1080/00207578.2018.1533377
11 9 33 Knekt P, Lindfors O, Laaksonen MA, *et al.* Quasi-experimental study on the
12 10 effectiveness of psychoanalysis, long-term and short-term psychotherapy on
13 11 psychiatric symptoms, work ability and functional capacity during a 5-year follow-up.
14 12 *J Affect Disord* 2011;**132**:37–47. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2011.01.014
15 13 34 Leuzinger-Bohleber M, Hautzinger M, Fiedler G, *et al.* Outcome of
16 14 Psychoanalytic and Cognitive-Behavioural Long-Term Therapy with Chronically
17 15 Depressed Patients: A Controlled Trial with Preferential and Randomized Allocation.
18 16 *Can J Psychiatry* 2019;**64**:47–58. doi:10.1177/0706743718780340
19 17 35 Jakobsen T, Rudolf G, Brockmann J, *et al.* Ergebnisse analytischer
20 18 Langzeitpsychotherapien bei spezifischen psychischen Störungen: Verbesserungen
21 19 in der Symptomatik und in interpersonellen Beziehungen [Results of psychoanalytic
22 20 long-term therapy in specific diagnostic groups: improvement in symptoms and
23 21 interpersonal relationships]. *Z Für Psychosom Med Psychother* 2007;**53**:87–110.
24 22 doi:10.13109/zptm.2007.53.2.87
25 23 36 Huber D, Henrich G, Clarkin J, *et al.* Psychoanalytic Versus Psychodynamic
26 24 Therapy for Depression: A Three-Year Follow-Up Study. *Psychiatry Interpers Biol*
27 25 *Process* 2013;**76**:132–49. doi:10.1521/psyc.2013.76.2.132
28 26 37 Town JM, Diener MJ, Abbass A, *et al.* A meta-analysis of psychodynamic
29 27 psychotherapy outcomes: Evaluating the effects of research-specific procedures.
30 28 *Psychotherapy* 2012;**49**:276–90. doi:10.1037/a0029564
31 29 38 Leichsenring F, Abbass A, Luyten P, *et al.* The Emerging Evidence for Long-
32 30 Term Psychodynamic Therapy. *Psychodyn Psychiatry* 2013;**41**:361–84.
33 31 doi:10.1521/pdps.2013.41.3.361
34 32 39 Smit Y, Huibers MJH, Ioannidis JPA, *et al.* The effectiveness of long-term
35 33 psychoanalytic psychotherapy—A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin*
36 34 *Psychol Rev* 2012;**32**:81–92. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2011.11.003
37 35 40 Woll CFJ, Schönbrodt FD. A Series of Meta-Analytic Tests of the Efficacy of
38 36 Long-Term Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy. *Eur Psychol* 2020;**25**:51–72.
39 37 doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000385
40 38 41 de Maat S, de Jonghe F, de Kraker R, *et al.* The Current State of the Empirical
41 39 Evidence for Psychoanalysis: A Meta-analytic Approach. *Harv Rev Psychiatry*
42 40 2013;**21**:107–37. doi:10.1097/HRP.0b013e318294f5fd
43 41 42 Constantino MJ, Boswell JF, Coyne AE. Patient, therapist, and relational
44 42 factors. In: Barkham M, Lutz W, Castonguay LG, eds. *Handbook of Psychotherapy*
45 43 *and Behavior Change*. Hoboken, NJ: : Wiley 2021. 225–62.
46 44 43 Löffler-Stastka H, Rössler-Schüle H, Skale E. Prädiktoren des
47 45 Therapieabbruchs in psychoanalytischen Behandlungen von Patienten mit
48 46 Persönlichkeitsstörungen [Predictors of therapy discontinuation in psychoanalytic
49 47 treatment of patients with personality disorders]. *Z Für Psychosom Med Psychother*
50 48 2008;**54**:63–76. doi:10.13109/zptm.2008.54.1.63
51 49 44 Löffler-Stastka H, Blueml V, Boes C. Exploration of personality factors and
52 50 their predictive impact on therapy utilization: The externalizing mode of functioning.
53 51 *Psychother Res* 2010;**20**:295–308. doi:10.1080/10503300903436710

- 1
2
3 1 45 Cuijpers P, Ciharova M, Quero S, *et al*. The Contribution of “Individual
4 2 Participant Data” Meta-Analyses of Psychotherapies for Depression to the
5 3 Development of Personalized Treatments: A Systematic Review. *J Pers Med*
6 4 2022;**12**:93. doi:10.3390/jpm12010093
7 4
8 5 46 Crits-Christoph P, Connolly Gibbons MB. Psychotherapy Process-Outcome
9 6 Research: Advances in Understanding Causal Connections. In: Barkham M, Lutz W,
10 7 Castonguay LG, eds. *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change*. Hoboken,
11 8 NJ: : Wiley 2021. 263–97.
12 9 47 De Meulemeester C, Vansteelandt K, Luyten P, *et al*. Mentalizing as a
13 10 mechanism of change in the treatment of patients with borderline personality
14 11 disorder: A parallel process growth modeling approach. *Personal Disord Theory Res*
15 12 *Treat* 2018;**9**:22–9. doi:10.1037/per0000256
16 12
17 13 48 Grande T, Dilg R, Jakobsen T, *et al*. Structural change as a predictor of long-
18 14 term follow-up outcome. *Psychother Res* 2009;**19**:344–57.
19 15 doi:10.1080/10503300902914147
20 16 49 Huber D, Zimmermann J, Klug G. Change in personality functioning during
21 17 psychotherapy for depression predicts long-term outcome. *Psychoanal Psychol*
22 18 2017;**34**:434–45. doi:10.1037/pap0000129
23 18
24 19 50 Brookes ST, Whitely E, Egger M, *et al*. Subgroup analyses in randomized
25 20 trials: risks of subgroup-specific analyses; *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004;**57**:229–36.
26 21 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2003.08.009
27 22 51 Thomas CL, Cassady JC, Heller ML. The influence of emotional intelligence,
28 23 cognitive test anxiety, and coping strategies on undergraduate academic
29 24 performance. *Learn Individ Differ* 2017;**55**:40–8. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2017.03.001
30 25 52 Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Clarke M, *et al*. Individual participant data. In: Higgins
31 26 JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al.*, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews*
32 27 *of Interventions*. Wiley 2019. 643–58. doi:10.1002/9781119536604.ch26
33 27
34 28 53 Burke RM, Killerby ME, Newton S, *et al*. Symptom Profiles of a Convenience
35 29 Sample of Patients with COVID-19 — United States, January–April 2020. *MMWR*
36 30 *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;**69**:904–8. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6928a2
37 30
38 31 54 Riley RD, Lambert PC, Abo-Zaid G. Meta-analysis of individual participant
39 32 data: rationale, conduct, and reporting. *BMJ* 2010;**340**:c221–c221.
40 33 doi:10.1136/bmj.c221
41 34 55 Stewart LA, Parmar MKB. Meta-analysis of the literature or of individual patient
42 35 data: is there a difference? *The Lancet* 1993;**341**:418–22. doi:10.1016/0140-
43 36 6736(93)93004-K
44 37 56 Driessen E, Abbass AA, Barber JP, *et al*. Which patients benefit specifically
45 38 from short-term psychodynamic psychotherapy (STPP) for depression? Study
46 39 protocol of a systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data. *BMJ*
47 40 *Open* 2018;**8**:e018900. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018900
48 40
49 41 57 Derogatis LR, Unger R. Symptom Checklist-90-Revised. In: Weiner IB,
50 42 Craighead WE, eds. *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: :
51 43 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 2010. corpsy0970. doi:10.1002/9780470479216.corpsy0970
52 44 58 Horowitz LM, Alden LE, Wiggins JS, *et al*. *Inventory of interpersonal problems*
53 45 *manual*. Menlo Park. CA: : Mind Garden Inc 2003.
54 45
55 46 59 Jacobson NS, Truax P. Clinical significance: A statistical approach to defining
56 47 meaningful change in psychotherapy research. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 1991;**59**:12–9.
57 48 doi:10.1037/0022-006X.59.1.12
58 49 60 Sterne JAC, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, *et al*. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk
59 50 of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ* 2016;:i4919.
60 50
61 51 doi:10.1136/bmj.i4919

- 1
2
3 1 61 Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, *et al*. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk
4 2 of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;:l4898. doi:10.1136/bmj.l4898
- 5 3 62 Tierney JF, Vale C, Riley R, *et al*. Individual Participant Data (IPD) Meta-
6 4 analyses of Randomised Controlled Trials: Guidance on Their Use. *PLOS Med*
7 5 2015;**12**:e1001855. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001855
- 8 6 63 Wahl I, Löwe B, Bjorner JB, *et al*. Standardization of depression
9 7 measurement: a common metric was developed for 11 self-report depression
10 8 measures. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014;**67**:73–86. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.04.019
- 11 9 64 Audigier V, White IR, Jolani S, *et al*. Multiple Imputation for Multilevel Data with
12 10 Continuous and Binary Variables. *Stat Sci* 2018;**33**. doi:10.1214/18-STS646
- 13 11 65 Buuren S van, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. **mice** : Multivariate Imputation by
14 12 Chained Equations in R. *J Stat Softw* 2011;**45**. doi:10.18637/jss.v045.i03
- 15 13 66 Jolani S, Debray TPA, Koffijberg H, *et al*. Imputation of systematically missing
16 14 predictors in an individual participant data meta-analysis: a generalized approach
17 15 using MICE: S. JOLANI *ET AL* . *Stat Med* 2015;**34**:1841–63. doi:10.1002/sim.6451
- 18 16 67 Kunkel D, Kaizar EE. A comparison of existing methods for multiple imputation
19 17 in individual participant data meta-analysis: D. KUNKEL AND E. E KAIZAR. *Stat Med*
20 18 2017;**36**:3507–32. doi:10.1002/sim.7388
- 21 19 68 White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations:
22 20 Issues and guidance for practice. *Stat Med* 2011;**30**:377–99. doi:10.1002/sim.4067
- 23 21 69 Riley RD, Tierney JF, Stewart LA, editors. *Individual participant data meta-*
24 22 *analysis: a handbook for healthcare research*. Hoboken, NJ: : Wiley 2021.
- 25 23 70 Hamaker EL, Kuiper RM, Grasman RPPP. A critique of the cross-lagged panel
26 24 model. *Psychol Methods* 2015;**20**:102–16. doi:10.1037/a0038889
- 27 25 71 Mulder JD, Hamaker EL. Three Extensions of the Random Intercept Cross-
28 26 Lagged Panel Model. *Struct Equ Model Multidiscip J* 2021;**28**:638–48.
29 27 doi:10.1080/10705511.2020.1784738
- 30 28 72 Schuurman NK, Ferrer E, de Boer-Sonnenschein M, *et al*. How to compare
31 29 cross-lagged associations in a multilevel autoregressive model. *Psychol Methods*
32 30 2016;**21**:206–21. doi:10.1037/met0000062
- 33 31 73 Wang L, Zhang Q, Maxwell SE, *et al*. On Standardizing Within-Person Effects:
34 32 Potential Problems of Global Standardization. *Multivar Behav Res* 2019;**54**:382–403.
35 33 doi:10.1080/00273171.2018.1532280
- 36 34 74 Rosseel Y. lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *J Stat*
37 35 *Softw* 2012;**48**. doi:10.18637/jss.v048.i02
- 38 36 75 Cheung MW-L. metaSEM: an R package for meta-analysis using structural
39 37 equation modeling. *Front Psychol* 2015;**5**. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01521
- 40 38 76 Cuijpers P, Karyotaki E, Ciharova M, *et al*. The effects of psychotherapies for
41 39 depression on response, remission, reliable change, and deterioration: A
42 40 meta-analysis. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 2021;**144**:288–99. doi:10.1111/acps.13335
- 43 41 77 Tolin DF, McKay D, Forman EM, *et al*. Empirically supported treatment:
44 42 Recommendations for a new model. *Clin Psychol Sci Pract* 2015;**22**:317–38.
45 43 doi:10.1037/h0101729
- 46 44 78 Thomä H, Kächele H, Bilger A, *et al*. *Psychoanalytic therapy. Vol. 1: Principles*
47 45 */ Helmut Thomä, Horst Kächele ; with the collaboration of Andreas Bilger [und 11*
48 46 *weiteren] ; translated by Michael Wilson and David Roseveare ; bibliographic support*
49 47 *by Regine Lederer (University Library Ulm) and Lisa Malmheden*. Revised second
50 48 edition. Gießen: : Psychosozial-Verlag 2020.
51 49

1 Authors Contributions

2 MEB, MLB and EB conceived the original idea. LK wrote the first draft of the
3 manuscript reviewed and edited by MEB, MLB and EB. LK and PS developed the
4 analysis plan. HLS, JB, DH, GK, TJ, HRS, FR, SS, FL and ME revised the
5 manuscript for important intellectual content. All authors have reviewed the final
6 version of the manuscript, agree with its submission and are responsible for all
7 aspects of the work.
8

9 Acknowledgements

10 We would like to thank Lorena Cascant Ortolano for helping with the development
11 and critical review of the search strings and Anouk Olivia Bonay for support in
12 coordinating and preliminary literature research. Moreover, we are grateful to all
13 patients, therapists and former staff involved in carrying out the original trials.
14

15 Funding

16 This work was supported by the DGPT (German Society for Psychoanalysis,
17 Psychotherapy, Psychosomatics and Psychodynamic Psychology). No grant number
18 is associated with this project.
19

20 Disclaimer

21 The funder had no role in the development of this study protocol, nor was there
22 editorial direction or censorship from the sponsor in this manuscript.
23

24 Competing interests

25 Manfred E. Beutel, Falk Leichsenring, Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber, Henriette
26 Löffler-Stastka, are state-licensed psychoanalysts, involved in the training of
27 psychodynamic therapists/psychoanalysts. Josef Brockmann, Dorothea Huber,
28 Guenther Klug, Thorsten Jakobsen, Hemma Rössler-Schüle, Felicitas Rost and
29 Simone Salzer are state-licensed psychoanalysts/psychodynamic psychotherapists.
30 Mareike Ernst is training as a psychodynamic psychotherapist.

1
2
3 1
4
5 2 They have conceived and/or performed trials that will serve as a data source for the
6
7 3 proposed study (*Frankfurt-Hamburg Study*, Josef Brockmann; *Göttingen Study*, Falk
8
9 4 Leichsenring, *Heidelberg-Berlin Study*, Thorsten Jakobsen; *Munich Psychotherapy*
10
11 5 *Study*, Dorothea Huber, Guenther Klug, *LAC Study*, Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber,
12
13 6 Manfred E. Beutel, Mareike Ernst; *Tavistock Adult Depression Study*, Felicitas Rost;
14
15 7 *Viennese Psychoanalytic Process and Outcome Study*, Henriette Löffler-Stastka,
16
17 8 Hemma Rössler-Schülelein)
18
19 9

10 Elmar Brähler, Peter Schmidt, and Lina Krakau declare no competing interests.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

PRISMA-IPD Checklist of items to include when reporting a systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data (IPD)

PRISMA-IPD Section/topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page
Title			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data.	1
Abstract			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including as applicable:	2
		Background: state research question and main objectives, with information on participants, interventions, comparators and outcomes.	
		Methods: report eligibility criteria; data sources including dates of last bibliographic search or elicitation; reporting that IPD were sought; methods of assessing risk of bias.	
		Results: provide number and type of studies and participants identified and number (%) obtained; summary effect estimates for main outcomes (benefits and harms) with confidence intervals and measures of statistical heterogeneity. Describe the direction and size of summary effects in terms meaningful to those who would put findings into practice.	
		Discussion: state main strengths and limitations of the evidence, general interpretation of the results and any important implications.	
Other: report primary funding source, registration number and registry name for the systematic review and IPD meta-analysis.			
Introduction			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	3-6
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions being addressed with reference, as applicable, to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes and study design (PICOS). Include any hypotheses that relate to particular types of participant-level subgroups.	6-7
Methods			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a protocol exists and where it can be accessed. If available, provide registration information including registration number and registry name. Provide publication details, if applicable.	2
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify inclusion and exclusion criteria including those relating to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, study design and characteristics (e.g. years when conducted, required minimum follow-up). Note whether these were applied at the study or individual level i.e. whether eligible participants were included (and ineligible participants excluded) from a study that included a wider population than specified by the review inclusion criteria. The rationale for criteria should be stated.	7-8
Identifying studies -	7	Describe all methods of identifying published and unpublished studies including, as applicable: which bibliographic databases were searched with dates of coverage; details of any hand searching including of conference proceedings; use of study registers	10

information sources		and agency or company databases; contact with the original research team and experts in the field; open adverts and surveys. Give the date of last search or elicitation.	
Identifying studies - search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	11-12
Study selection processes	9	State the process for determining which studies were eligible for inclusion.	nA
Data collection processes	10	Describe how IPD were requested, collected and managed, including any processes for querying and confirming data with investigators. If IPD were not sought from any eligible study, the reason for this should be stated (for each such study). If applicable, describe how any studies for which IPD were not available were dealt with. This should include whether, how and what aggregate data were sought or extracted from study reports and publications (such as extracting data independently in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming these data with investigators.	13
Data items	11	Describe how the information and variables to be collected were chosen. List and define all study level and participant level data that were sought, including baseline and follow-up information. If applicable, describe methods for standardising or translating variables within the IPD datasets to ensure common scales or measurements across studies.	14-15
IPD integrity	A1	Describe what aspects of IPD were subject to data checking (such as sequence generation, data consistency and completeness, baseline imbalance) and how this was done.	14-15
Risk of bias assessment in individual studies.	12	Describe methods used to assess risk of bias in the individual studies and whether this was applied separately for each outcome. If applicable, describe how findings of IPD checking were used to inform the assessment. Report if and how risk of bias assessment was used in any data synthesis.	15
Specification of outcomes and effect measures	13	State all treatment comparisons of interests. State all outcomes addressed and define them in detail. State whether they were pre-specified for the review and, if applicable, whether they were primary/main or secondary/additional outcomes. Give the principal measures of effect (such as risk ratio, hazard ratio, difference in means) used for each outcome.	14;17
Synthesis methods	14	Describe the meta-analysis methods used to synthesise IPD. Specify any statistical methods and models used. Issues should include (but are not restricted to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of a one-stage or two-stage approach. • How effect estimates were generated separately within each study and combined across studies (where applicable). • Specification of one-stage models (where applicable) including how clustering of patients within studies was accounted for. • Use of fixed or random effects models and any other model assumptions, such as proportional hazards. • How (summary) survival curves were generated (where applicable). • Methods for quantifying statistical heterogeneity (such as I^2 and τ^2). • How studies providing IPD and not providing IPD were analysed together (where applicable). • How missing data within the IPD were dealt with (where applicable). 	17

Exploration of variation in effects	A2	If applicable, describe any methods used to explore variation in effects by study or participant level characteristics (such as estimation of interactions between effect and covariates). State all participant-level characteristics that were analysed as potential effect modifiers, and whether these were pre-specified.	17
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias relating to the accumulated body of evidence, including any pertaining to not obtaining IPD for particular studies, outcomes or other variables.	15
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of any additional analyses, including sensitivity analyses. State which of these were pre-specified.	27
Results			
Study selection and IPD obtained	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the systematic review with reasons for exclusions at each stage. Indicate the number of studies and participants for which IPD were sought and for which they were obtained. For those studies where IPD were not available, give the numbers of studies and participants for which a complete data set was available. Report reasons for non-availability of IPD. Include a flow diagram.	nA
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present information on key study and participant characteristics (such as description of interventions, numbers of participants, demographic data, unavailability of outcomes, funding source, and if applicable duration of follow-up). Provide (main) citations for each study. Where applicable, also report similar study characteristics for any studies not providing IPD.	nA
IPD integrity	A3	Report any important issues identified in checking IPD or state that there were none.	nA
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias assessments. If applicable, describe whether data checking led to the up-weighting or down-weighting of these assessments. Consider how any potential bias impacts on the robustness of meta-analysis conclusions.	nA
Results of individual studies	20	For each comparison and for each main outcome (benefit or harm), for each individual study report the number of eligible participants for which data were obtained and show simple summary data for each intervention group (including, where applicable, the number of events), effect estimates and confidence intervals. These may be tabulated or included on a forest plot.	nA
Results of syntheses	21	Present summary effects for each meta-analysis undertaken, including confidence intervals and measures of statistical heterogeneity. State whether the analysis was pre-specified, and report the numbers of studies and participants and, where applicable, the number of events on which it is based.	nA
		When exploring variation in effects due to patient or study characteristics, present summary interaction estimates for each characteristic examined, including confidence intervals and measures of statistical heterogeneity. State whether the analysis was pre-specified. State whether any interaction is consistent across trials.	
		Provide a description of the direction and size of effect in terms meaningful to those who would put findings into practice.	

Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias relating to the accumulated body of evidence, including any pertaining to the availability and representativeness of available studies, outcomes or other variables.	nA
Additional analyses	23	Give results of any additional analyses (e.g. sensitivity analyses). If applicable, this should also include any analyses that incorporate aggregate data for studies that do not have IPD. If applicable, summarise the main meta-analysis results following the inclusion or exclusion of studies for which IPD were not available.	nA
Discussion			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarise the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome.	nA
Strengths and limitations	25	Discuss any important strengths and limitations of the evidence including the benefits of access to IPD and any limitations arising from IPD that were not available.	19-20
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the findings in the context of other evidence.	nA
Implications	A4	Consider relevance to key groups (such as policy makers, service providers and service users). Consider implications for future research.	18-19
Funding			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding and other support (such as supply of IPD), and the role in the systematic review of those providing such support.	21

A1 – A3 denote new items that are additional to standard PRISMA items. A4 has been created as a result of re-arranging content of the standard PRISMA statement to suit the way that systematic review IPD meta-analyses are reported.

© Reproduced with permission of the PRISMA IPD Group, which encourages sharing and reuse for non-commercial purposes

Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on June 13, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l'Enseignement Supérieur (ABES) - A training, and similar technologies.

bmjopen-2022-069332 on 19 July 2023. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on June 13, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l'Enseignement Supérieur (ABES) . All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission. See <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml> for information on re-use. This article is intended solely for the individual user user and not to be disseminated broadly. This article is intended solely for the individual user user and not to be disseminated broadly. All training, and similar technologies.

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

BMJ Open

Efficacy of high- vs. low-intensity psychoanalytically oriented long-term treatments and determinants of outcome -Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis of Long-term Analytic Treatment Studies (MeLAS)

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-069332.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-May-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Krakau, Lina; University Medical Center of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Dept. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Leuzinger-Bohleber, Marianne; University Medical Center Mainz, Dept. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Brähler, Elmar; University Medical Center of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Dep. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Schmidt, Peter; University Medical Center Mainz, Dept. of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Rost, Felicitas; Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust Huber, Dorothea; International Psychoanalytic University Berlin gGmbH, Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychosomatics Klug, Guenther; Technical University of Munich Löffler-Stastka, Henriette ; Medizinische Universität Wien Rössler-Schüle, Hemma; Vienna Psychoanalytic Society Leichsenring, Falk; University Hospitals Giessen and Marburg Campus Giessen Salzer, Simone; Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Clinical Psychology and Psychoanalysis Brockmann, Josef; Private Outpatient Clinic Jakobsen, Thorsten; Private Outpatient Clinic Ernst, Mareike; University Medical Centre of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Beutel, Manfred; University Medical Center Mainz, Department of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy Mainz, Germany
Primary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice
Keywords:	Clinical trials < THERAPEUTICS, Adult psychiatry < PSYCHIATRY, Anxiety disorders < PSYCHIATRY, Depression & mood disorders < PSYCHIATRY, Personality disorders < PSYCHIATRY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



1
2
3 1 **Efficacy of high- vs. low-intensity psychoanalytically oriented long-term treatments**
4 **and determinants of outcome** -Individual Participant Data **Meta-Analysis of Long-term**
5 **Analytic Treatment Studies (MeLAS)**

6
7
8 4 Lina Krakau¹⁾, Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber¹⁾, Elmar Brähler¹⁾, Peter Schmidt¹⁾, Felicitas
9 Rost^{2),12)}, Dorothea Huber³⁾, Guenther Klug⁴⁾, Henriette Löffler-Stastka⁵⁾, Hemma Rössler-
10 Schüle⁶⁾, Falk Leichsenring⁷⁾, Simone Salzer⁸⁾, Josef Brockmann⁹⁾, Thorsten Jakobsen¹⁰⁾,
11 Mareike Ernst^{1), 11)}, Manfred Beutel¹⁾

12
13
14 8 1) Department of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, University Medical
15 Center Mainz, Germany

16 9
17 10 2) Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

18
19 11 3) Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychosomatics, International
20 Psychoanalytic University Berlin, Germany

21 12
22 13 4) Clinic and Polyclinic for Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, Technical
23 University of Munich, Germany

24 14
25 15 5) Department of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy, Medical University Vienna,
26 Austria

27 16
28 17 6) Outpatient Clinic, Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, Austria

29 18
30 19 7) Department of Psychosomatics and Psychotherapy, Justus-Liebig-University
31 Giessen, Germany

32 20
33 21 8) Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychoanalysis, International
34 Psychoanalytic University Berlin, Germany

35 22
36 23 9) Private Outpatient Clinic, Frankfurt, Germany

37 24
38 25 10) Private Outpatient Clinic, Basel, Switzerland

39 26
40 27 11) Department of Clinical Psychology, Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis, Institute of
41 Psychology, Alpen-Adria University Klagenfurt, Klagenfurt am Wörthersee, Austria

42 28
43 29 12) The Open University, United Kingdom

44
45
46 29 Correspondence:

47
48 30 Lina Krakau

49
50 31 Lina.krakau@unimedizin-mainz.de

51
52 32 Untere Zahlbacher Str. 8

53
54 33 55131 Mainz

55
56 34
57 35 Word Count: 4594

1 ABSTRACT

2 **Introduction:** Long-term psychodynamic/ psychoanalytic psychotherapy (LTPP) is a
3 prevalent treatment option for complex mental disorders. Yet, little is known about the
4 role of treatment intensity in LTPP. We present a study protocol for a systematic
5 review and individual participant data (IPD) meta-analysis aggregating and analyzing
6 individual data from randomized and quasi-experimental trials by meta-analysis. The
7 purpose is to 1a) determine the treatment effectiveness of LTPP with low vs. high
8 intensity (up to two weekly sessions vs. three or more), 1b) compare their joint
9 effectiveness to shorter therapies and TAU, 2) Identify predictors and moderators of
10 treatment outcomes, and 3) determine reciprocal relationships between different
11 outcome domains (symptomatic and structural/personality change) over the courses
12 of LTPP. **Methods and Analysis:** We include studies from randomized (RCT) and
13 quasi-experimental trials, where at least one condition was LTPP of high or low
14 frequency. Long-term treatment is defined as \geq one year or \geq 50 sessions. To be
15 eligible studies must include a standardized outcome measure of symptoms (global
16 or disorder specific) with at least one proof of reliability. The primary outcome is
17 symptom reduction (global or specific), secondary outcome criteria are reliable
18 change, remission, functional capacities, personality, personality functioning, and
19 interpersonal pathology. Relevant studies will mainly be identified by searching
20 relevant databases: PubMed, PsycINFO (via EBSCO), Web of Science (via Elsevier),
21 Cochrane's Central Register of Controlled Trials (via Wiley). Risk of bias will be
22 evaluated in line with the Cochrane assessments tools for quasi-experimental trials
23 and RCTs, respectively. **Ethics and dissemination:** Aggregation of data from
24 primary trials collected based on ethics votes. Dissemination into clinical practice via
25 open access publications of findings. The study is an IPD meta-analysis, registered
26 on the International prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO;
27 304982) before conducting the main search and soliciting data.

28 **Keywords**

29 psychodynamic, psychoanalytic, long-term therapy, long-term follow up, anxiety,
30 depression, personality disorder
31
32

STRENGTH AND LIMITATION OF THIS STUDY

- IPD meta-analysis has increased power to detect differences between treatment groups and to examine prognostic and prescriptive factors associated with outcome.
- Combining individual participant data allows for comparisons that were not carried out in the original trials and can therefore not be examined in conventional meta-analysis (i.e., regrouping of patients according to treatment intensity).
- The inclusion of quasi-experimental trials and the examination of non-randomized conditions (high vs. low treatment intensity) lowers the quality of the evidence according to gold standard.
- In IPD meta-analysis bias may be introduced as not all relevant studies identified can be included, e.g., non-response of the authors, difficulties with data-sharing.

INTRODUCTION

Short-term psychodynamic psychotherapy (STPP) has demonstrated comparable efficacy to cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) and other bona fide psychotherapies,[1–3]. However, common mental disorders often take a chronic course,[e.g.; 4,5] and short-term treatments might be insufficient for patients with complex mental disorders ,[5,6]. Complex mental disorders have been defined as mental disorders characterized by rigidity or inflexibility, e.g., personality disorders (PD), chronic mental disorders (e.g., chronic depression),[7]. They show high comorbidity with other mental and physical health conditions [8] and are associated with considerable functional impairments [9]. Regardless of a categorical diagnosis of PD, lower levels of personality organization are typically found in more severe mental disorders [10]. Previous data on dose-effect relations has indicated that patients with such disorders need longer treatments,[11,12]. Nevertheless, most evidence for psychotherapy is based upon short-term treatments and short-term outcomes, the latter usually assessed at treatment termination,[13]. Only a few trials report one-year follow-up, and longer-term follow-ups of two and more years are scarce,[2,14]. To our best knowledge, long-term remission rates of bona fide short-term psychotherapies are often unsatisfactory,[14], and up to half of the study, patients have been found to seek auxiliary psychotherapy during follow-up,[15]. Naturalistic trials further indicate that many patients require and receive long-term treatments up to several years,[16].

A basic claim of long-term psychoanalytic psychotherapies (LTPP), comprising psychoanalysis and long-term psychoanalytic/psychodynamic psychotherapy, has been to improve structural capacities related to the personality organization,[17–19] in addition to symptoms. Structural integration (i.e. personality functioning) comprises different domains of

1 psychological functioning e.g., identity, affect differentiation and tolerance, and self-other
2 regulation which relate to core developmental tasks of attachment/relatedness and
3 individuation/self-definition,[e.g., 20–22]. Conceptualized by the term personality functioning,
4 the alternative model of personality disorders has introduced a similar,[23,24] model to the
5 DSM-5,[25,26]. Here, impairment in personality functioning is described along the
6 dimensions of self (identity perception, self-regulation) and interpersonal (empathy, intimacy)
7 functioning as shared characteristic of all personality disorders. In the psychoanalytic
8 literature, improvements in these domains have been described as structural change,[17–19]
9 and have been related to treatments with higher frequency promoting greater capacity for
10 self-analysis,[27]. In line with the traditionally transdiagnostic scope of psychoanalysis, LTPP
11 studies have focused on global or disorder-specific symptom improvement, and social and
12 personality functioning with long-term outcomes up to 10 years,[e.g., 15]. However, the
13 number of available trials on LTPP with long-term follow-up is comparably small, as they
14 pose special methodological challenges of recruitment, study design, duration, and funding.
15 For ethical reasons, placebo or waiting-list control conditions are not feasible over extended
16 periods, and it would be difficult to conceptualize plausible interventions with similar
17 frequency and duration of intervention. Studies that included long-term follow-ups have
18 shown that LTPP indeed led to lasting changes at the level of symptoms and other domains
19 of functioning,[15,28–32]. In the long run, several studies indicated LTPP to be more
20 effective than treatment as usual (TAU),[29] or short-term treatments,[15,33].

21 Huber et al.,[30] found psychoanalytic treatment to be more effective than CBT at long-term
22 follow-up, while others reported a comparable reduction of symptoms in psychoanalytic
23 therapy and CBT at the three-year assessment,[34], but stronger evidence of personality
24 change in psychoanalytic treatment groups,[32]. Other studies have focused on the
25 comparison of psychodynamic psychotherapy with more intensive and longer psychoanalytic
26 treatment and found the latter to be more effective at one-, [35] or three-year follow-up,[36].
27 Yet, in a meta-analysis on psychodynamic psychotherapy. Town et al.,[37] found that therapy
28 effects were maintained and continued to improve following termination of psychodynamic
29 therapies of different frequencies and lengths. To our knowledge, only four conventional
30 meta-analyses have focused on the effectiveness of LTPP specifically. Focusing on RCTs,
31 Leichsenring & Rabung,[6,7,38] found LTPP to be more effective than STPT with medium to
32 large effect sizes in terms of symptom reduction and social and personality functioning.
33 Using different inclusion criteria, the meta-analysis of Smit et al.,[39] questioned the
34 effectiveness of LTPP, as they found it more effective only in comparison to control
35 conditions that were no specialized forms of therapy. Exploratory analyses indicated that a
36 greater difference in treatment intensity between LTPP and the control group was related to
37 effect size. The seemingly conflicting findings between Leichsenring and Rabung's,[6,7] and

1 Smit et al's.,[39] meta-analyses have been discussed elsewhere,[e.g., 38,40]. More recently,
2 Woll and Schönbrodt aimed to replicate and update Leichsenring et al.'s,[38] meta-analysis,
3 but only found small additional gains for LTPP in comparison to other forms of
4 psychotherapy, regarding symptoms and social functioning. No significant differences were
5 found with respect to personality functioning. Restricting their meta-analysis to
6 psychoanalysis proper, defined as the patient lying on the couch with at least two sessions,
7 one research group found large within-group effect sizes regarding symptomatic
8 improvement and personality characteristics. Yet, most of the trials they examined were
9 naturalistic and did not have control groups,[41].

10 Beyond efficacy studies, psychotherapy research, in general, has identified
11 numerous patient, psychotherapist, and relational prognostic factors (predictors) for
12 psychotherapy outcome, e.g., racial or social minority status, high symptom load, or
13 high self-criticism,[42]. However, less is known about prescriptive variables
14 (moderators) associated with different outcomes depending on the type of treatment,
15 e.g., maladaptive defenses or rigid relationship patterns for psychodynamic
16 treatments,[1,43,44]. Identifying prescriptive variables that reliably predict differential
17 treatment outcomes has become the main target of personalized treatment
18 approaches,[42,45]. To our knowledge, no meta-analysis has examined prognostic or
19 prescriptive variables in LTPP.

20 Given the evidence outlined above, we presume that LTPP facilitates changes in
21 intrapsychic, structural processes underlying mental disorders in addition to
22 improving symptoms. Yet, it remains unclear whether this is due to the effects of
23 psychoanalytic technique or its treatment frequency and duration,[12,39]. Changes in
24 structural functioning have been posited as a mechanism of change in
25 psychotherapy, and LTPP specifically, with a stronger focus on insight and self-
26 understanding,[46]. Several studies found greater changes e.g. in personality or
27 reflective functioning associated with greater,[34,47] and sustained,[48,49] symptom
28 reduction. However, the studies mostly focused on between-person effects and did
29 not apply lagged analysis over multiple time points to investigate if changes in
30 structural capacities were associated with a decrease in symptoms at subsequent
31 assessment.

32 Due to the limitations of the individual trials, empirical evidence on the role of
33 treatment intensity for the efficacy of LTPP and the identification of prescriptive
34 variables has been limited. Small samples and unequal group sizes as well as
35 decreasing case numbers throughout therapy and follow-up have led to

1
2
3 1 methodological problems in data analysis of individual trials, including a lack of
4 statistical power. Hence, small differences between different treatment approaches
5 2 cannot be identified and testing for sub-groups with differential outcome is
6 3 prohibited,[50]. Additional problems include the utilization of different designs (RCT
7 4 vs. quasi-experimental), varying definitions of LTPP (e.g., ranging from 42 to over
8 5 300 sessions), varying frequency of measurements, definition and timing of follow-
9 6 ups, and the comparability of measures of relevant variables (e.g., sociodemographic
10 7 and clinical characteristics) and different outcome measures.
11 8
12 9

13 10 The current study aims to conduct a systematic review and individual participant data
14 11 (IPD) meta-analysis concerning the efficacy of LTPP treatments of different
15 12 intensities and associated prognostic and prescriptive factors in common mental
16 13 disorders. IPD meta-analysis is a technique to examine treatment effects by
17 14 combining participant-level data of multiple trials collected from the original data and
18 15 is currently considered the gold standard in evidence synthesis,[51,52]. A one-stage
19 16 approach is favored, especially when the original trials have small samples,[53]. It
20 17 has increased statistical power to detect differences between treatment conditions
21 18 and to examine prognostic and prescriptive variables associated with treatment
22 19 efficacy,[45]. Compared to conventional meta-analyses that rely on the aggregated
23 20 level data extracted from published reports, with IDP the same statistical methods
24 21 can be applied across all studies involved. This allows for the application of newer
25 22 statistical modeling techniques and similar handling of missing data, thus increasing
26 23 comparability,[54]. The use of the original data may further circumvent bias related to
27 24 the publication of positive results or the removal of patients before analysis in
28 25 published trials,[55].

29 26 In summary, the current project aims to:

- 30 27 1) Compare treatment effectiveness of LTPP of low vs. high intensity (based on
31 28 average weekly sessions)
 - 32 29 a. At treatment termination
 - 33 30 b. At long-term follow-up (stability of outcome)
 - 34 31 c. Compare their joint efficacy to shorter therapies and TAU as included
35 32 as control groups in the trials
- 36 33 2) Identify individual characteristics that reliably predict or moderate differential
37 34 treatment outcomes of low- and high-intensity LTPP

- 1 3) Examine the reciprocal relationship of symptoms and personality functioning
- 2 over time

3 METHODS AND ANALYSIS

4 The study is an IPD meta-analysis, registered on the International prospective
5 register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO; CRD42022304982)
6 before conducting the main search and soliciting any data. Amendments will be
7 documented here. Eligible studies will be identified through systematic literature
8 research. Study results will be reported following the Preferred Reporting Items for
9 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis for Individual Participant Data (PRISMA-IPD;
10 Stewart et al. 2015). Project planning and preliminary literature research have started
11 in June 2022, and we expect the completion of the project within three years.

12 Selection of studies

13 The aim of the study is the examination of the efficacy of LTPP with different intensity
14 in adult outpatient populations with common mental disorders. Low-intensity
15 treatments are defined as treatments with on average one weekly session, and high-
16 intensity treatments are treatments with two or more weekly sessions. We will include
17 randomized and quasi-experimental clinical trials on LTPP. We will include trials that
18 directly compared high- vs. low-intensity LTPP, and trials that compared high- and/or
19 low-intensity LTPP to shorter treatments or treatments as usual /TAU). In our main
20 analysis, we will compare high- vs. low-intensity LTPP as defined above. A sensitivity
21 analysis will be conducted to contrast one weekly session with three or more (instead
22 of up to two). In a second analysis, we will compare high- and-low intensity LTPP
23 (combined) to shorter treatments and TAU (combined). We will conduct a sensitivity
24 analysis excluding TAU. Due to randomization difficulties for LTPP, especially
25 psychoanalysis, we include quasi-experimental cohort studies along with prospective
26 randomized controlled trials (RCT). Eligible studies must contain LTPP. LTPP is
27 defined according to Leichsenring & Rabung 2011 criteria for LTPP by 1) Studies of
28 psychodynamic therapy; 2) Working with transference and resistance and 3) Duration
29 of at least 50 sessions or at least one year. Moreover, we will include psychoanalysis
30 proper, meaning up to five sessions per week in a supine position. Control conditions
31 are psychodynamic treatments of shorter duration (fewer than 50 sessions), other
32 treatments (e.g., CBT) from various psychotherapeutic backgrounds, or TAU.
33 Treatment must be individual therapy for common mental disorders (e.g., depression,

1 anxiety, or personality disorders) in adults. The exact inclusion and exclusion criteria
2 can be found in Table 1. We will apply a three-step selection process. During the first
3 step, two independent raters (one post-doc and one doctoral candidate) will apply the
4 outlined selection criteria to the titles and abstracts of the references retrieved from
5 the systematic literature research. In case of disagreement, consensus will be
6 reached through discussion. If a study is considered as potentially fulfilling inclusion
7 criteria, we will request full texts. Next, full texts will be rated according to the
8 selection criteria by two independent raters. Disagreements will be resolved through
9 discussion or the involvement of a third rater. Finally, selected studies will be rated by
10 experts (full professors with analytic training) to confirm that the treatment
11 investigated is LTPP.
12

1 **Table 1. Selection criteria**

Inclusion	Prospective RCT or quasi-experimental cohort study
	Baseline assessment and Post/Follow-Up assessment that exceeds at least one year
	Outpatient individual treatment
	Participants (≥ 18 -65 Jahre)
	One treatment is LTPP (psychodynamic or -analytic long-term psychotherapy, psychoanalysis)
	Long-term is defined as ≥ 1 year or ≥ 50 sessions
	Standardized outcome measure of symptoms (global or specific) with at least one empirical proof of reliability
	Data on frequency of sessions are available
	Treatment is carried out by licensed psychotherapists
Exclusion	Focus on psychotic disorders
	Focus on organic disorders
	Single-case studies
	Serial case studies
	Qualitative studies
	Information on session frequency and therapy duration is not available
Outcomes	Primary:
	Standardized symptom assessment (global symptom level or disorder-specific)
	Secondary:
	Reliable change, no change and deterioration, calculated based on the primary outcome measure; Serious Adverse Events, Standardized assessments of personality/personality functioning, functional capacities, or relationship pathology

2

3

1 **Search Strategy**

2 To identify as many relevant studies as possible, different search strategies will be
3 used. Firstly, we will conduct a systematic literature review using the following
4 databases: PubMed, PsycINFO (via EBSCO), Web of Science (via Elsevier), and the
5 Cochrane's Central Register of Controlled Trials (via Wiley). We define five
6 categories of search strings (1) treatment, (2) long-term (3) study, (4) effectiveness
7 and (5) common mental disorders, with synonyms that will be searched as index and
8 free text terms. The Boolean combination of search strings is depicted in Table 2. We
9 will not apply language or date restrictions for the searches, however, the included
10 studies must be published in English, French, or German for our team to conduct risk
11 of bias (RoB) assessments. Secondly, we will search the controlled-trial register to
12 identify ongoing and unpublished studies
13 [https://www.isrctn.com/search?q=&filters=conditionCategory%3AMental+and+Behavioural+D](https://www.isrctn.com/search?q=&filters=conditionCategory%3AMental+and+Behavioural+Disorders)
14 [isorders](https://www.isrctn.com/search?q=&filters=conditionCategory%3AMental+and+Behavioural+Disorders) and the Open Door Review of Clinical, Conceptual, Process and Outcome
15 Studies in Psychoanalysis, 3rd edition
16 https://www.ipa.world/en/Psychoanalytic_Theory/Research/open_door.aspx;
17 accessed 11/21/21. Thirdly, we will hand-search published meta-analyses,[39–41]
18 and the citations of the included trials to identify other possibly eligible trials. We will
19 contact experts in the field through a listserv of related societies (e.g., Society for
20 Psychotherapy Research, Psychoanalytic Research Society, International
21 Psychoanalytic Society) to ask for yet unpublished trials or studies we have missed.

1 **Table 2. Systematic literature search**

Data banks	PubMed PsycInfo Web of Science Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials
Category:	Search terms:
Treatment	emotion focused OR mentalization OR mentalization OR self-psychology OR transference-focused OR insight-oriented OR interpretativ* OR psychodynamic* OR psychoanalys* OR psychoanalytic* OR "psychotherapy, psychodynamic" OR "psychoanalytic therapy"
	AND
Long-term	"follow-up studies" OR follow OR long-term OR longer-term OR open-ended
	AND
study	study OR studies OR trial*
	AND
Effectiveness	treatment outcome OR outcome OR effect* OR efficacy OR result* OR change*
	AND
Common mental disorder	mental disorder*OR psychiatric illness*OR psychiatric disease*OR mental illness*OR psychiatric disorder* OR behavior disorder*OR behaviour disorder* OR psychiatric diagnos* OR anxiet*OR mood disorder* OR affective disorder* OR

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2

	personality disorder*OR borderline personalit* OR depress*OR post-traumatic stress disorder* OR post-traumatic neuros* OR PTSD
--	---

For peer review only

Enseignement Supérieur (ABES) .
Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

1 Data collection and management

2 Named corresponding authors will be contacted via e-mail. They will be provided with
3 all necessary information (including a link to the project's PROSPERO registration
4 and the protocol) and asked whether they would be willing to participate/collaborate.
5 Contact information will be retrieved from the relevant publications or if unavailable or
6 outdated through online searches. Authors will be offered co-authorship on the
7 published paper in return for sharing the studies' de-identified individual participant
8 data. Following Driessen et al.,[56], authors who do not respond will be contacted
9 three times by mail. If we do not get a response, we will try to establish contact by
10 phone, next send up to three letters by post. This procedure will be repeated first with
11 the corresponding author, then the PI, and then sequentially with all other authors of
12 the study. If we still do not get a response, we will contact colleagues or other
13 persons who may help to establish contact. If we do not succeed in contacting the
14 authors with the above-outlined efforts, or if authors respond that the individual
15 participant data cannot be shared or has been deleted, study data is considered
16 unavailable. If authors choose to share their data, data-sharing agreements between
17 all parties will need to be drawn up. The procedures are country-dependent and will
18 need to be taken into consideration. Once data-sharing agreements in line with
19 GDPR ethical standards are arranged, authors will be asked to transfer de-identified
20 individual-level data sets encrypted using a save cloud service, procedures will be
21 provided by the University Medical Center Mainz. Authors will be asked to send item-
22 based data sets if available and to provide a description of how the data was coded
23 (codebook). Datasets will contain de-identified participant-level data comprising
24 sociodemographic data, prognostic and prescriptive variables assessed at baseline,
25 outcome variables assessed at baseline, during and after treatment, therapy duration
26 and session frequency, additional treatment, and case status (ITT/ATP). Study-level
27 data, e.g., requirements of therapists' professional experience (e.g., years of licensed
28 practice), supervision, treatment integrity, and adherence, and interrater reliability for
29 diagnostic assessment of primary outcome measures will be retrieved from the
30 publication or requested, if unavailable. Example code for analyses, detailed RoB
31 ratings, list of studies excluded at full-text stage including reasons for exclusion will
32 be shared via the Open Science Framework (OSF).

Measures

The primary outcome is treatment effectiveness of low- vs. high-intensity LTPP as assessed by a global measure of symptomology, most commonly the Symptom Checklist-90 (SCL-90),^[57] or disorder-specific measures at treatment termination and follow-up. Secondary outcomes are: (1) Reliable change, no change and deterioration, calculated based on the primary outcome measure. (2) Serious Adverse Events are defined according to the definition of the International Conference on Harmonization of pharmaceuticals for the human use – Good Clinical Practice (ICH-GCP) as a medical occurrence resulting in death, being life-threatening, requiring any form of hospitalization or resulting in persistent or significant disability of the patient, ^[58]. As original trials may not have applied this definition, we will also evaluate their definition of adverse events. (3) Changes in functional capacities, personality, personality functioning, or relationship pathology, most commonly the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP),^[59] at treatment termination and long-term follow-up. Additional subgroup analyses will be performed for specific mental disorders (major depression, anxiety, personality disorders). For the primary outcome, we will also assess reliable change criteria ^[60] including no change, and deterioration, to account for the fact that psychotherapy has not always been found to be beneficial. Moreover, we will assess the occurrence of adverse events (0 = no adverse event, 1 = adverse event) during trial participation. If enough data is available this will be added as a secondary outcome. To identify potential prognostic and prescriptive factors for treatment response we include patient-specific characteristics at baseline: Sociodemographic data (e.g., gender, education, employment, income, migration background, clinical characteristics, (diagnosis given by the trial, previous treatments including psychopharmacological treatments) and continuous measures of symptom severity, personality and personality functioning, relationships, functional capacities, and life events (e.g., social occupational functioning, comorbid disorders, childhood adversity). Patient characteristics will be included when they are consistently reported among trials and can be standardized in a coherent way (e.g., by collapsing categories). We will include a variable referring to the original trial design (predetermined length vs. Open ended treatment) and a variable indicating whether cases were treated according to protocol (ATP vs. Drop-out).

1 Data Integrity and preparation

2 Received data sets will be thoroughly examined to identify out-of-range items or
3 invalid scoring and will be compared with the original publication (sample size,
4 missing data, gender, age, mean pre-treatment scores in the primary outcome as
5 defined by the study, and mean post-treatment scores in the primary outcome as
6 defined by the study). In case of deviations, we will contact the authors to resolve the
7 issue (e.g., cases dropped from the analysis, imputation method used for computing
8 mean scores of the questionnaires received). Next, all variables relevant for the IPD
9 meta-analysis will be extracted from each study including prognostic and prescriptive
10 variables, treatment information received, the diagnoses given within the original trial,
11 and primary and secondary outcomes at baseline, intermediate, and follow-up
12 assessment. The resulting variables will be copied into a new data set and study-
13 level criteria (study type, treatment integrity, RoB assessment) and a participant ID
14 containing numeric ID and an abbreviation of the study will be added. A copy of this
15 file containing a study's raw data relevant to IPD will be standardized to the variable
16 names and coding used in the IPD database. A variable will be created indicating the
17 participants' group membership (high intensity LTPP, low intensity LTPP, Shorter
18 Treatment/TAU). For the planned sensitivity analyses, we will create a second
19 grouping variable (one weekly session vs. three or more and separating shorter
20 treatment from TAU). All studies will be integrated into the database structured by the
21 created ID. RoB will be evaluated in line with the Cochrane assessments tools for
22 quasi-experimental trials,[61] and RCTs, [62], respectively. The results of the RoB
23 ratings will be presented in tables listing each original study. They will be used for an
24 overall appraisal for the quality of evidence of the IPD-MA, which is carried out
25 following Tierney et al. [63]. As the type of measures applied by individual studies will
26 likely vary, individual scores will be standardized (using z-transformation or a
27 common metric approach,[64]) for continuous measures. Centering will be applied
28 within individual trials. Data screening, data extraction and risk of bias assessment
29 will be performed independently by two researchers (one postdoctoral researcher
30 and one doctoral candidate).

32 Missing Data

33 We intend to conduct an intention-to-treat analysis. Missing data will be assessed in
34 each study received, including the amount of missing data per participant and

1 variable and possible reasons for missingness. We will compare subsamples of
2 participants without missing data to those with missing data per study and summarize
3 distributions per variable. Missing Data will be handled using multilevel multiple
4 imputation, an approach that handles sporadically (missing data on variables for
5 some but not all participants) and systematically (variables that have not been
6 assessed by a specific study) missing values and can adequately preserve between-
7 study heterogeneity. As we expect some of the included studies to have a small
8 sample size and the overall number of studies to be rather low, we will use a full
9 conditional specification approach (FCS; also Multiple imputation by chained
10 equations; MICE),[65–68]. We will follow White’s et al.,[69] rule of thumb and impute
11 one data set per percent of participants with one or more missing variables. We will
12 include all variables and interactions relevant to our analysis model and variables
13 potentially predictive for missing data. Specifically, we will use the R-packages mice
14 and its extension micemd,[66].

Data Analysis

To address research questions 1(RQ1) and 2(RQ2), we will carry out a one-stage IPD meta-analysis. To analyze effectiveness, we will statistically predict symptom severity (global if available, otherwise specific) and remission (binary) controlling for baseline severity. To predict symptom severity over time we will use a generalized linear mixed model framework (GLMM), as participants are clustered in trials and treatment groups. Following Riley et al.'s [70] recommendations for IPD-meta-analysis, we will use restricted maximum likelihood estimation (REML) and obtain 95% confidence intervals for treatment effects using the Kenward-Roger approach. We will specify a random treatment effect to account for heterogeneity in study populations (intercept) and treatment effects (slope). To account for clustering within trials, we will fit a random intercept for each trial. Separate models will be estimated to compare LTPP of low vs. high intensity, and to compare joint LTPP against control groups as provided by the trials. The estimation procedure will be repeated using our secondary outcome measures based on the trials providing these additional measures. Reliable response, no change and deterioration will be analyzed for symptom outcome only using multilevel logistic regression. Response type will be calculated based on the reliable change index [60] of the symptom assessment within a given trial. We intend to perform subgroup analysis by repeating analysis steps in subgroups with different mental disorders (a) Depressive Disorders, (b) Anxiety disorders, (c) Personality Disorders. The primary diagnosis given in the original trial will define group membership. Next, we will analyze prognostic factors by adding available participant- and study-level variables as predictors to the specified models. If possible, continuous variables will be kept on a continuous scale to avoid loss of power. We will analyze prescriptive variables by adding interaction terms between the predictor and treatment groups. The third research question will be addressed by a two-stage individual participant data meta-analysis approach. We will first, estimate multi-group random intercept cross-lagged panel models (RI-CLPM,[71,72]) to examine the respective lagged and cross-lagged effects of personality functioning and symptoms on between-person (BP) and within-person (WP) level per study. We will consider every study providing data on personality functioning and symptoms for baseline, treatment termination and follow-up. We will use within-person (WP) centering,[73,74] of scores prior to analyses to derive standardized coefficients for lagged and cross-lagged effects. Next, findings will be meta-analyzed using random effects meta-analytic structural equation modelling (MASEM), a technique to meta-analyze path or structural equation models. Analyses will be carried out in R-lavaan [75] and R-metaSEM [76]. Sensitivity analyses for all research questions will be carried out based on complete cases. If enough studies have used the same instrument, we will rerun analysis for RQ1 and RQ2 based on these studies without standardizing the variables.

1 Patient and Public Involvement
2 No Patient and Public Involvement.

4 ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

5 Given that all studies obtained ethical approval from the relevant ethics boards,
6 further ethical approval is not necessary but requirements for data-sharing need to be
7 met. A data-sharing agreement based according to principles of the General Data
8 Protection Rules (GDPR) of the European Union will be signed between the
9 University Medical Center Mainz and all parties involved (shared responsibility). All
10 parties sharing their data are responsible to ensure that data sharing is in line with
11 their institutional, local, and international requirements, which they confirm by signing
12 the agreement on shared responsibility. All data transferred will be de-identified. The
13 results of the study will be presented at international conferences for clinician
14 scientists and practitioners. Scientific reports of the study results will be submitted for
15 publication in international, preferably open-access journals.

16 DISCUSSION

17 This study protocol describes a systematic review with meta-analysis of individual
18 participant data to determine the effectiveness of low vs. high intensity LTPP at the
19 end of treatment and long-term follow-up. Additionally, we aim to identify associated
20 prognostic and prescriptive variables and the interaction of different outcome
21 domains over time.

22 Clinical and scientific relevance

23 The evidence base of effectiveness for psychotherapy in general but also for
24 psychodynamic treatments has been predominantly based on short-term therapies
25 and short-term outcomes,[13]. Previous research found a potential benefit of LTPP
26 over short-term treatments for complex mental disorders,[6,7,38,40]. Yet, little is
27 known about the role of treatment intensity in LTPP, including psychoanalysis, and
28 psychoanalytic/ psychodynamic long-term psychotherapy. Given unsatisfactory
29 response rates, e.g., about 41 % for (short-term) psychotherapy,[77], but high
30 additional costs of extensive treatment, the effectiveness of LTPP at long-term follow-
31 up represents a health outcome of public interest. Individual studies lack sufficient
32 power to reliably examine prognostic and prescriptive variables, however, identifying

1 factors associated with benefits from (specific) treatments is an important step
2 towards optimized treatment planning,[45]. The project serves to close this gap, by
3 consolidating the evidence base for LTPP for the major common mental disorders
4 (e.g., depression, anxiety, and personality disorders). As LTPP treatments strive to
5 achieve structural and personality changes, outcomes will go beyond symptom
6 change and cover relevant outcome domains, such as personality, interpersonal and
7 social-occupational functioning. This is consistent with the recommendations for
8 updating the criteria of evidence-based therapies,[78]. The stability of therapeutic
9 gains during long-term follow-up is of particular interest, as psychoanalytic theory
10 posits that change does not necessarily cease at the end of treatment. Rather,
11 insights gained during therapy are understood to promote further development during
12 follow-up, when autonomy and greater capacity for self-analysis evolve,[79]. Hence,
13 changing underlying structural capacities should enable patients to gain further
14 benefits in the follow-up phase,[37,48,49].

15 **Limitations**

16 Limitations of data aggregation and analyses include different designs regarding the
17 assessment of process and follow-up. Moreover, definitions of LTPP differ between
18 studies regarding the frequency of sessions and setting. We cannot conduct a
19 conventional meta-analysis to compare our results with trials not providing original
20 data as some original studies will have analyzed low-and-high intensity LTPP
21 together. If enough trials provide separate analyses, we will conduct a conventional
22 meta-analysis based on these trials. The study includes RCTs and quasi-
23 experimental cohort studies, lowering the quality of evidence according to gold-
24 standards. Yet, the inclusion of quasi-experimental trials in diverse settings, where
25 patients self-select their treatment, enhances the external validity of the results as
26 treatment length and techniques in practice are individually adapted. An important
27 limitation of IPD meta-analysis is that some trials may not be integrated due to non-
28 response, problems with data-sharing, or the deletion of the original data. Thus, even
29 if IPD meta-analyses are considered the gold standard in evidence synthesis, bias
30 cannot be precluded, and information obtained by IPD should be used in addition to
31 conventional meta-analyses and reviews. Identifying, collecting, and aggregating
32 relevant data will require a certain time, and newly published trials cannot easily be
33 incorporated. Even though IPD meta-analysis will likely have enough power to
34 examine prognostic and prescriptive treatment variables, the choice of variables

1 examined depends on the variables included in the original trials. Moreover, results
2 may be restricted to individuals who choose to participate in treatment trials. Akin to
3 previous work including high frequent LTPP, we excluded trials on
4 schizophrenia,[41]. We have specified secondary outcomes, however, our analyses
5 will not be controlled for type I and type II errors. To our knowledge, studies
6 conducted in the field have not incorporated explicit measures on harmful effects,
7 such as negative experiences during psychotherapy. Our analyses will therefore fall
8 short of an equal focus on efficacy and harmful effects of LTPP. We try to
9 counterbalance this with modeling no reliable change, deterioration, and adverse
10 events.
11

12 Authors Contributions

13 MEB, MLB and EB conceived the original idea. LK wrote the first draft of the
14 manuscript reviewed and edited by MEB, MLB and EB. LK and PS developed the
15 analysis plan. HLS, JB, DH, GK, TJ, HRS, FR, SS, FL and ME revised the
16 manuscript for important intellectual content. All authors have reviewed the final
17 version of the manuscript, agree with its submission and are responsible for all
18 aspects of the work.
19

20 Acknowledgements

21 We would like to thank Lorena Cascant Ortolano for helping with the development
22 and critical review of the search strings and Anouk Olivia Bonay for support in
23 coordinating and preliminary literature research. Moreover, we are grateful to all
24 patients, therapists and former staff involved in carrying out the original trials.
25

26 Funding

27 This work was supported by the DGPT (German Society for Psychoanalysis,
28 Psychotherapy, Psychosomatics and Psychodynamic Psychology). No grant number
29 is associated with this project.
30

1 Disclaimer

2 The funder had no role in the development of this study protocol, nor was there
3 editorial direction or censorship from the sponsor in this manuscript.
4

5 Competing interests

6 Manfred E. Beutel, Falk Leichsenring, Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber, Henriette
7 Löffler-Stastka, are state-licensed psychoanalysts, involved in the training of
8 psychodynamic therapists/psychoanalysts. Josef Brockmann, Dorothea Huber,
9 Guenther Klug, Thorsten Jakobsen, Hemma Rössler-Schülelein, Felicitas Rost and
10 Simone Salzer are state-licensed psychoanalysts/psychodynamic psychotherapists.
11 Mareike Ernst and Lina Krakau are training as a psychodynamic/ psychoanalytic
12 psychotherapists.

13
14 They have conceived and/or performed trials that will serve as a data source for the
15 proposed study (*Frankfurt-Hamburg Study*, Josef Brockmann; *Göttingen Study*, Falk
16 Leichsenring, *Heidelberg-Berlin Study*, Thorsten Jakobsen; *Munich Psychotherapy*
17 *Study*, Dorothea Huber, Guenther Klug, *LAC Study*, Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber,
18 Manfred E. Beutel, Mareike Ernst; *Tavistock Adult Depression Study*, Felicitas Rost;
19 *Viennese Psychoanalytic Process and Outcome Study*, Henriette Löffler-Stastka,
20 Hemma Rössler-Schülelein)

21
22 Elmar Brähler and Peter Schmidt declare no competing interests.
23
24
25
26

27 References

- 28 1 Barber JP, Muran JC, McCarthy KS, *et al.* Research on dynamic therapies. In:
29 Barkham M, Lutz W, Castonguay LG, eds. *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior*
30 *Change*. Hoboken, NJ: : Wiley 2021. 387–419.
- 31 2 Cuijpers P, Quero S, Noma H, *et al.* Psychotherapies for depression: a network
32 meta-analysis covering efficacy, acceptability and long-term outcomes of all main treatment
33 types. *World Psychiatry* 2021;**20**:283–93. doi:10.1002/wps.20860

- 1
2
3 1 3 Steinert C, Munder T, Rabung S, *et al.* Psychodynamic Therapy: As Efficacious as
4 2 Other Empirically Supported Treatments? A Meta-Analysis Testing Equivalence of
5 3 Outcomes. *Am J Psychiatry* 2017;**174**:943–53. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2017.17010057
6 4 4 Bruce SE, Yonkers KA, Otto MW, *et al.* Influence of Psychiatric Comorbidity on
7 5 Recovery and Recurrence in Generalized Anxiety Disorder, Social Phobia, and Panic
8 6 Disorder: A 12-Year Prospective Study. *Am J Psychiatry* 2005;**162**:1179–87.
9 7 doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.162.6.1179
10 8 5 Maj M, Stein DJ, Parker G, *et al.* The clinical characterization of the adult patient with
11 9 depression aimed at personalization of management. *World Psychiatry* 2020;**19**:269–93.
12 10 doi:10.1002/wps.20771
13 11 6 Leichsenring F, Rabung S. Long-term psychodynamic psychotherapy in complex
14 12 mental disorders: update of a meta-analysis. *Br J Psychiatry* 2011;**199**:15–22.
15 13 doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.110.082776
16 14 7 Leichsenring F. Effectiveness of Long-term Psychodynamic Psychotherapy: A Meta-
17 15 analysis. *JAMA* 2008;**300**:1551. doi:10.1001/jama.300.13.1551
18 16 8 Saxena S, Maj M. Physical health of people with severe mental disorders: leave no one
19 17 behind. *World Psychiatry* 2017;**16**:1–2. doi:10.1002/wps.20403
20 18 9 Jacobi F, Grafiadeli R, Volkmann H, *et al.* Krankheitslast der Borderline-
21 19 Persönlichkeitsstörung: Krankheitskosten, somatische Komorbidität und Mortalität.
22 20 *Nervenarzt* 2021;**92**:660–9. doi:10.1007/s00115-021-01139-4
23 21 10 Luyten P, Fonagy P. Integrating and differentiating personality and psychopathology:
24 22 A psychodynamic perspective. *J Pers* 2022;**90**:75–88. doi:10.1111/jopy.12656
25 23 11 Kopta SM, Howard KI, Lowry JL, *et al.* Patterns of symptomatic recovery in
26 24 psychotherapy. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 1994;**62**:1009–16. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.62.5.1009
27 25 12 Zimmermann J, Löffler-Stastka H, Huber D, *et al.* Is It All about the Higher Dose?
28 26 Why Psychoanalytic Therapy Is an Effective Treatment for Major Depression: Is It All about
29 27 the Higher Dose? *Clin Psychol Psychother* 2015;**22**:469–87. doi:10.1002/cpp.1917
30 28 13 Leichsenring F, Steinert C, Rabung S, *et al.* The efficacy of psychotherapies and
31 29 pharmacotherapies for mental disorders in adults: an umbrella review and meta-analytic
32 30 evaluation of recent meta-analyses. *World Psychiatry* 2022;**21**:133–45.
33 31 doi:10.1002/wps.20941
34 32 14 Steinert C, Hofmann M, Kruse J, *et al.* Relapse rates after psychotherapy for
35 33 depression – stable long-term effects? A meta-analysis. *J Affect Disord* 2014;**168**:107–18.
36 34 doi:10.1016/j.jad.2014.06.043
37 35 15 Knekt P, Virtala E, Härkänen T, *et al.* The outcome of short- and long-term
38 36 psychotherapy 10 years after start of treatment. *Psychol Med* 2016;**46**:1175–88.
39 37 doi:10.1017/S0033291715002718
40 38 16 Leuzinger-Bohleber M, Stuhr U, Rüger B, *et al.* How to study the ‘quality of
41 39 psychoanalytic treatments’ and their long-term effects on patients’ well-being: A
42 40 representative, multi-perspective follow-up study. *Int J Psychoanal* 2003;**84**:263–90.
43 41 doi:10.1516/C387-0AFM-4P34-M4BT
44 42 17 Kernberg OF. *Object relations theory and clinical psychoanalysis*. Northvale, NJ: :
45 43 Jason Aronson 1984.
46 44 18 Kernberg OF. Psychic structure and structural change: An ego psychology-object
47 45 relations theory viewpoint. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* 1988;**36**:315–37.
48 46 19 Wallerstein RS. Assessment of structural change in psychoanalytic therapy and
49 47 research. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* 1988;**36**:241–61.
50 48 20 Blatt SJ. Levels of Object Representation in Anaclitic and Introjective Depression.
51 49 *Psychoanal Study Child* 1974;**29**:107–57. doi:10.1080/00797308.1974.11822616
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 21 Blatt SJ. A Fundamental Polarity in Psychoanalysis: Implications for Personality
4 2 Development, Psychopathology, and the Therapeutic Process. *Psychoanal Inq* 2007;**26**:494–
5 3 520. doi:10.1080/07351690701310581
6 4 22 Ehrental JC, Benecke C. Tailored Treatment Planning for Individuals With
7 5 Personality Disorders. In: *Case Formulation for Personality Disorders*. Elsevier 2019. 291–
8 6 314. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-813521-1.00015-1
9 7 23 Zimmermann J, Brakemeier E-L, Benecke C. Alternatives DSM-5-Modell zur
10 8 Klassifikation von Persönlichkeitsstörungen: Bezüge zu psychodynamischer und
11 9 verhaltenstherapeutischer Diagnostik [The DSM-5 alternative model for the classification of
12 10 personality disorders: references to psychodynamic and behavioral diagnostics].
13 11 *Psychotherapeut* 2015;**60**:269–79. doi:10.1007/s00278-015-0033-8
14 12 24 Zimmermann J, Ehrental JC, Cierpka M, *et al.* Assessing the Level of Structural
15 13 Integration Using Operationalized Psychodynamic Diagnosis (OPD): Implications for *DSM-*
16 14 *5*. *J Pers Assess* 2012;**94**:522–32. doi:10.1080/00223891.2012.700664
17 15 25 Bach B, Kerber A, Aluja A, *et al.* International Assessment of DSM-5 and ICD-11
18 16 Personality Disorder Traits: Toward a Common Nosology in DSM-5.1. *Psychopathology*
19 17 2020;**53**:179–88. doi:10.1159/000507589
20 18 26 Bender DS, Morey LC, Skodol AE. Toward a Model for Assessing Level of
21 19 Personality Functioning in *DSM-5*, Part I: A Review of Theory and Methods. *J Pers Assess*
22 20 2011;**93**:332–46. doi:10.1080/00223891.2011.583808
23 21 27 Falkenström F, Grant J, Broberg J, *et al.* Self-Analysis and Post-Termination
24 22 Improvement After Psychoanalysis and Long-Term Psychotherapy. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc*
25 23 2007;**55**:629–74. doi:10.1177/00030651070550020401
26 24 28 Brockmann J, Schlüter T, Eckert J. Langzeitwirkungen psychoanalytischer und
27 25 verhaltenstherapeutischer Langzeitpsychotherapien: Eine vergleichende Studie aus der Praxis
28 26 niedergelassener Psychotherapeuten [Long-term effects of long-term psychoanalytic and
29 27 long-term behavior therapy. A comparative study from the general practices of
30 28 psychotherapists]. *Psychotherapeut* 2006;**51**:15–25. doi:10.1007/s00278-005-0454-x
31 29 29 Fonagy P, Rost F, Carlyle J, *et al.* Pragmatic randomized controlled trial of long-term
32 30 psychoanalytic psychotherapy for treatment-resistant depression: the Tavistock Adult
33 31 Depression Study (TADS). *World Psychiatry* 2015;**14**:312–21. doi:10.1002/wps.20267
34 32 30 Huber D, Zimmermann J, Henrich G, *et al.* Comparison of cognitive-behaviour
35 33 therapy with psychoanalytic and psychodynamic therapy for depressed patients – A three-year
36 34 follow-up study. *Z Für Psychosom Med Psychother* 2012;**58**:299–316.
37 35 doi:10.13109/zptm.2012.58.3.299
38 36 31 Leichsenring F, Biskup J, Kreische R, *et al.* The Göttingen study of psychoanalytic
39 37 therapy: First results. *Int J Psychoanal* 2005;**86**:433–55. doi:10.1516/XX6F-AU0W-KWM3-
40 38 G6LU
41 39 32 Leuzinger-Bohleber M, Kaufhold J, Kallenbach L, *et al.* How to measure sustained
42 40 psychic transformations in long-term treatments of chronically depressed patients:
43 41 Symptomatic and structural changes in the LAC Depression Study of the outcome of
44 42 cognitive-behavioural and psychoanalytic long-term treatments. *Int J Psychoanal*
45 43 2019;**100**:99–127. doi:10.1080/00207578.2018.1533377
46 44 33 Knekt P, Lindfors O, Laaksonen MA, *et al.* Quasi-experimental study on the
47 45 effectiveness of psychoanalysis, long-term and short-term psychotherapy on psychiatric
48 46 symptoms, work ability and functional capacity during a 5-year follow-up. *J Affect Disord*
49 47 2011;**132**:37–47. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2011.01.014
50 48 34 Leuzinger-Bohleber M, Hautzinger M, Fiedler G, *et al.* Outcome of Psychoanalytic
51 49 and Cognitive-Behavioural Long-Term Therapy with Chronically Depressed Patients: A
52 50 Controlled Trial with Preferential and Randomized Allocation. *Can J Psychiatry* 2019;**64**:47–
53 51 58. doi:10.1177/0706743718780340

- 1 35 Jakobsen T, Rudolf G, Brockmann J, *et al.* Ergebnisse analytischer
2 Langzeitpsychotherapien bei spezifischen psychischen Störungen: Verbesserungen in der
3 Symptomatik und in interpersonellen Beziehungen [Results of psychoanalytic long-term
4 therapy in specific diagnostic groups: improvement in symptoms and interpersonal
5 relationships]. *Z Für Psychosom Med Psychother* 2007;**53**:87–110.
6 doi:10.13109/zptm.2007.53.2.87
- 7 36 Huber D, Henrich G, Clarkin J, *et al.* Psychoanalytic Versus Psychodynamic Therapy
8 for Depression: A Three-Year Follow-Up Study. *Psychiatry Interpers Biol Process*
9 2013;**76**:132–49. doi:10.1521/psyc.2013.76.2.132
- 10 37 Town JM, Diener MJ, Abbass A, *et al.* A meta-analysis of psychodynamic
11 psychotherapy outcomes: Evaluating the effects of research-specific procedures.
12 *Psychotherapy* 2012;**49**:276–90. doi:10.1037/a0029564
- 13 38 Leichsenring F, Abbass A, Luyten P, *et al.* The Emerging Evidence for Long-Term
14 Psychodynamic Therapy. *Psychodyn Psychiatry* 2013;**41**:361–84.
15 doi:10.1521/pdps.2013.41.3.361
- 16 39 Smit Y, Huibers MJH, Ioannidis JPA, *et al.* The effectiveness of long-term
17 psychoanalytic psychotherapy—A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin Psychol*
18 *Rev* 2012;**32**:81–92. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2011.11.003
- 19 40 Woll CFJ, Schönbrodt FD. A Series of Meta-Analytic Tests of the Efficacy of Long-
20 Term Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy. *Eur Psychol* 2020;**25**:51–72. doi:10.1027/1016-
21 9040/a000385
- 22 41 de Maat S, de Jonghe F, de Kraker R, *et al.* The Current State of the Empirical
23 Evidence for Psychoanalysis: A Meta-analytic Approach. *Harv Rev Psychiatry* 2013;**21**:107–
24 37. doi:10.1097/HRP.0b013e318294f5fd
- 25 42 Constantino MJ, Boswell JF, Coyne AE. Patient, therapist, and relational factors. In:
26 Barkham M, Lutz W, Castonguay LG, eds. *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior*
27 *Change*. Hoboken, NJ: : Wiley 2021. 225–62.
- 28 43 Löffler-Stastka H, Rössler-Schüle H, Skale E. Prädiktoren des Therapieabbruchs in
29 psychoanalytischen Behandlungen von Patienten mit Persönlichkeitsstörungen [Predictors of
30 therapy discontinuation in psychoanalytic treatment of patients with personality disorders]. *Z*
31 *Für Psychosom Med Psychother* 2008;**54**:63–76. doi:10.13109/zptm.2008.54.1.63
- 32 44 Löffler-Stastka H, Blueml V, Boes C. Exploration of personality factors and their
33 predictive impact on therapy utilization: The externalizing mode of functioning. *Psychother*
34 *Res* 2010;**20**:295–308. doi:10.1080/10503300903436710
- 35 45 Cuijpers P, Ciharova M, Quero S, *et al.* The Contribution of “Individual Participant
36 Data” Meta-Analyses of Psychotherapies for Depression to the Development of Personalized
37 Treatments: A Systematic Review. *J Pers Med* 2022;**12**:93. doi:10.3390/jpm12010093
- 38 46 Crits-Christoph P, Connolly Gibbons MB. Psychotherapy Process-Outcome Research:
39 Advances in Understanding Causal Connections. In: Barkham M, Lutz W, Castonguay LG,
40 eds. *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change*. Hoboken, NJ: : Wiley 2021. 263–97.
- 41 47 De Meulemeester C, Vansteelandt K, Luyten P, *et al.* Mentalizing as a mechanism of
42 change in the treatment of patients with borderline personality disorder: A parallel process
43 growth modeling approach. *Personal Disord Theory Res Treat* 2018;**9**:22–9.
44 doi:10.1037/per0000256
- 45 48 Grande T, Dilg R, Jakobsen T, *et al.* Structural change as a predictor of long-term
46 follow-up outcome. *Psychother Res* 2009;**19**:344–57. doi:10.1080/10503300902914147
- 47 49 Huber D, Zimmermann J, Klug G. Change in personality functioning during
48 psychotherapy for depression predicts long-term outcome. *Psychoanal Psychol* 2017;**34**:434–
49 45. doi:10.1037/pap0000129

- 1
2
3 1 50 Brookes ST, Whitely E, Egger M, *et al.* Subgroup analyses in randomized trials: risks
4 2 of subgroup-specific analyses; *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004;**57**:229–36.
5 3 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2003.08.009
6 4 51 Thomas CL, Cassady JC, Heller ML. The influence of emotional intelligence,
7 5 cognitive test anxiety, and coping strategies on undergraduate academic performance. *Learn*
8 6 *Individ Differ* 2017;**55**:40–8. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2017.03.001
9 7 52 Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Clarke M, *et al.* Individual participant data. In: Higgins JPT,
10 8 Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al.*, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*
11 9 *Interventions*. Wiley 2019. 643–58. doi:10.1002/9781119536604.ch26
12 10 53 Burke RM, Killerby ME, Newton S, *et al.* Symptom Profiles of a Convenience Sample
13 11 of Patients with COVID-19 — United States, January–April 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly*
14 12 *Rep* 2020;**69**:904–8. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6928a2
15 13 54 Riley RD, Lambert PC, Abo-Zaid G. Meta-analysis of individual participant data:
16 14 rationale, conduct, and reporting. *BMJ* 2010;**340**:c221–c221. doi:10.1136/bmj.c221
17 15 55 Stewart LA, Parmar MKB. Meta-analysis of the literature or of individual patient data:
18 16 is there a difference? *The Lancet* 1993;**341**:418–22. doi:10.1016/0140-6736(93)93004-K
19 17 56 Driessen E, Abbass AA, Barber JP, *et al.* Which patients benefit specifically from
20 18 short-term psychodynamic psychotherapy (STPP) for depression? Study protocol of a
21 19 systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data. *BMJ Open*
22 20 2018;**8**:e018900. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018900
23 21 57 Derogatis LR, Unger R. Symptom Checklist-90-Revised. In: Weiner IB, Craighead
24 22 WE, eds. *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: : John Wiley & Sons,
25 23 Inc. 2010. corpsy0970. doi:10.1002/9780470479216.corpsy0970
26 24 58 International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for
27 25 Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use. ICH harmonised guideline: integrated
28 26 addendum to ICH E6(R1): guideline for good clinical practice (ICH- GCP). 2016
29 27 59 Horowitz LM, Alden LE, Wiggins JS, *et al.* *Inventory of interpersonal problems*
30 28 *manual*. Menlo Park. CA: : Mind Garden Inc 2003.
31 29 60 Jacobson NS, Truax P. Clinical significance: A statistical approach to defining
32 30 meaningful change in psychotherapy research. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 1991;**59**:12–9.
33 31 doi:10.1037/0022-006X.59.1.12
34 32 61 Sterne JAC, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, *et al.* ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias
35 33 in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ* 2016;:i4919. doi:10.1136/bmj.i4919
36 34 62 Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, *et al.* RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias
37 35 in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;:l4898. doi:10.1136/bmj.l4898
38 36 63 Tierney JF, Vale C, Riley R, *et al.* Individual Participant Data (IPD) Meta-analyses of
39 37 Randomised Controlled Trials: Guidance on Their Use. *PLOS Med* 2015;**12**:e1001855.
40 38 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001855
41 39 64 Wahl I, Löwe B, Bjorner JB, *et al.* Standardization of depression measurement: a
42 40 common metric was developed for 11 self-report depression measures. *J Clin Epidemiol*
43 41 2014;**67**:73–86. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.04.019
44 42 65 Audigier V, White IR, Jolani S, *et al.* Multiple Imputation for Multilevel Data with
45 43 Continuous and Binary Variables. *Stat Sci* 2018;**33**. doi:10.1214/18-STS646
46 44 66 Buuren S van, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. **mice** : Multivariate Imputation by Chained
47 45 Equations in R. *J Stat Softw* 2011;**45**. doi:10.18637/jss.v045.i03
48 46 67 Jolani S, Debray TPA, Koffijberg H, *et al.* Imputation of systematically missing
49 47 predictors in an individual participant data meta-analysis: a generalized approach using
50 48 MICE: S. JOLANI *ET AL* . *Stat Med* 2015;**34**:1841–63. doi:10.1002/sim.6451
51 49 68 Kunkel D, Kaizar EE. A comparison of existing methods for multiple imputation in
52 50 individual participant data meta-analysis: D. KUNKEL AND E. E KAIZAR. *Stat Med*
53 51 2017;**36**:3507–32. doi:10.1002/sim.7388

- 1
2
3 1 69 White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues
4 2 and guidance for practice. *Stat Med* 2011;**30**:377–99. doi:10.1002/sim.4067
5 3 70 Riley RD, Tierney JF, Stewart LA, editors. *Individual participant data meta-analysis:*
6 4 *a handbook for healthcare research*. Hoboken, NJ: : Wiley 2021.
7 5 71 Hamaker EL, Kuiper RM, Grasman RPPP. A critique of the cross-lagged panel model.
8 6 *Psychol Methods* 2015;**20**:102–16. doi:10.1037/a0038889
9 7 72 Mulder JD, Hamaker EL. Three Extensions of the Random Intercept Cross-Lagged
10 8 Panel Model. *Struct Equ Model Multidiscip J* 2021;**28**:638–48.
11 9 doi:10.1080/10705511.2020.1784738
12 10 73 Schuurman NK, Ferrer E, de Boer-Sonnenschein M, *et al*. How to compare cross-
13 11 lagged associations in a multilevel autoregressive model. *Psychol Methods* 2016;**21**:206–21.
14 12 doi:10.1037/met0000062
15 13 74 Wang L, Zhang Q, Maxwell SE, *et al*. On Standardizing Within-Person Effects:
16 14 Potential Problems of Global Standardization. *Multivar Behav Res* 2019;**54**:382–403.
17 15 doi:10.1080/00273171.2018.1532280
18 16 75 Rosseel Y. lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *J Stat Softw*
19 17 2012;**48**. doi:10.18637/jss.v048.i02
20 18 76 Cheung MW-L. metaSEM: an R package for meta-analysis using structural equation
21 19 modeling. *Front Psychol* 2015;**5**. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01521
22 20 77 Cuijpers P, Karyotaki E, Ciharova M, *et al*. The effects of psychotherapies for
23 21 depression on response, remission, reliable change, and deterioration: A meta-analysis. *Acta*
24 22 *Psychiatr Scand* 2021;**144**:288–99. doi:10.1111/acps.13335
25 23 78 Tolin DF, McKay D, Forman EM, *et al*. Empirically supported treatment:
26 24 Recommendations for a new model. *Clin Psychol Sci Pract* 2015;**22**:317–38.
27 25 doi:10.1037/h0101729
28 26 79 Thomä H, Kächele H, Bilger A, *et al*. *Psychoanalytic therapy. Vol. 1: Principles /*
29 27 *Helmut Thomä, Horst Kächele ; with the collaboration of Andreas Bilger [und 11 weiteren] ;*
30 28 *translated by Michael Wilson and David Roseveare ; bibliographic support by Regine Lederer*
31 29 *(University Library Ulm) and Lisa Malmheden*. Revised second edition. Gießen: :
32 30 Psychosozial-Verlag 2020.
33 31
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 32
42 33
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

PRISMA-IPD Checklist of items to include when reporting a systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data (IPD)

PRISMA-IPD Section/topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page
Title			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data.	1
Abstract			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including as applicable:	2
		Background: state research question and main objectives, with information on participants, interventions, comparators and outcomes.	
		Methods: report eligibility criteria; data sources including dates of last bibliographic search or elicitation; reporting that IPD were sought; methods of assessing risk of bias.	
		Results: provide number and type of studies and participants identified and number (%) obtained; summary effect estimates for main outcomes (benefits and harms) with confidence intervals and measures of statistical heterogeneity. Describe the direction and size of summary effects in terms meaningful to those who would put findings into practice.	
		Discussion: state main strengths and limitations of the evidence, general interpretation of the results, and any important implications.	
Other: report primary funding source, registration number and registry name for the systematic review and IPD meta-analysis.			
Introduction			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	3-6
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions being addressed with reference, as applicable, to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes and study design (PICOS). Include any hypotheses that relate to particular types of participant-level subgroups.	6-7
Methods			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a protocol exists and where it can be accessed. If available, provide registration information including registration number and registry name. Provide publication details, if applicable.	2
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify inclusion and exclusion criteria including those relating to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, study design and characteristics (e.g. years when conducted, required minimum follow-up). Note whether these were applied at the study or individual level i.e. whether eligible participants were included (and ineligible participants excluded) from a study that included a wider population than specified by the review inclusion criteria. The rationale for criteria should be stated.	7-8
Identifying studies -	7	Describe all methods of identifying published and unpublished studies including, as applicable: which bibliographic databases were searched with dates of coverage; details of any hand searching including of conference proceedings; use of study registers	10

information sources		and agency or company databases; contact with the original research team and experts in the field; open adverts and surveys. Give the date of last search or elicitation.	
Identifying studies - search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	11-12
Study selection processes	9	State the process for determining which studies were eligible for inclusion.	nA
Data collection processes	10	Describe how IPD were requested, collected and managed, including any processes for querying and confirming data with investigators. If IPD were not sought from any eligible study, the reason for this should be stated (for each such study). If applicable, describe how any studies for which IPD were not available were dealt with. This should include whether, how and what aggregate data were sought or extracted from study reports and publications (such as extracting data independently in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming these data with investigators.	13
Data items	11	Describe how the information and variables to be collected were chosen. List and define all study level and participant level data that were sought, including baseline and follow-up information. If applicable, describe methods for standardising or translating variables within the IPD datasets to ensure common scales or measurements across studies.	14-15
IPD integrity	A1	Describe what aspects of IPD were subject to data checking (such as sequence generation, data consistency and completeness, baseline imbalance) and how this was done.	14-15
Risk of bias assessment in individual studies.	12	Describe methods used to assess risk of bias in the individual studies and whether this was applied separately for each outcome. If applicable, describe how findings of IPD checking were used to inform the assessment. Report if and how risk of bias assessment was used in any data synthesis.	15
Specification of outcomes and effect measures	13	State all treatment comparisons of interests. State all outcomes addressed and define them in detail. State whether they were pre-specified for the review and, if applicable, whether they were primary/main or secondary/additional outcomes. Give the principal measures of effect (such as risk ratio, hazard ratio, difference in means) used for each outcome.	14;17
Synthesis methods	14	Describe the meta-analysis methods used to synthesise IPD. Specify any statistical methods and models used. Issues should include (but are not restricted to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of a one-stage or two-stage approach. • How effect estimates were generated separately within each study and combined across studies (where applicable). • Specification of one-stage models (where applicable) including how clustering of patients within studies was accounted for. • Use of fixed or random effects models and any other model assumptions, such as proportional hazards. • How (summary) survival curves were generated (where applicable). • Methods for quantifying statistical heterogeneity (such as I^2 and τ^2). • How studies providing IPD and not providing IPD were analysed together (where applicable). • How missing data within the IPD were dealt with (where applicable). 	17

Exploration of variation in effects	A2	If applicable, describe any methods used to explore variation in effects by study or participant level characteristics (such as estimation of interactions between effect and covariates). State all participant-level characteristics that were analysed as potential effect modifiers, and whether these were pre-specified.	17
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias relating to the accumulated body of evidence, including any pertaining to not obtaining IPD for particular studies, outcomes or other variables.	15
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of any additional analyses, including sensitivity analyses. State which of these were pre-specified.	27
Results			
Study selection and IPD obtained	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the systematic review with reasons for exclusions at each stage. Indicate the number of studies and participants for which IPD were sought and for which they were obtained. For those studies where IPD were not available, give the numbers of studies and participants for which a complete data set was available. Report reasons for non-availability of IPD. Include a flow diagram.	nA
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present information on key study and participant characteristics (such as description of interventions, numbers of participants, demographic data, unavailability of outcomes, funding source, and if applicable duration of follow-up). Provide (main) citations for each study. Where applicable, also report similar study characteristics for any studies not providing IPD.	nA
IPD integrity	A3	Report any important issues identified in checking IPD or state that there were none.	nA
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias assessments. If applicable, describe whether data checking led to the up-weighting or down-weighting of these assessments. Consider how any potential bias impacts on the robustness of meta-analysis conclusions.	nA
Results of individual studies	20	For each comparison and for each main outcome (benefit or harm), for each individual study report the number of eligible participants for which data were obtained and show simple summary data for each intervention group (including, where applicable, the number of events), effect estimates and confidence intervals. These may be tabulated or included on a forest plot.	nA
Results of syntheses	21	Present summary effects for each meta-analysis undertaken, including confidence intervals and measures of statistical heterogeneity. State whether the analysis was pre-specified, and report the numbers of studies and participants and, where applicable, the number of events on which it is based.	nA
		When exploring variation in effects due to patient or study characteristics, present summary interaction estimates for each characteristic examined, including confidence intervals and measures of statistical heterogeneity. State whether the analysis was pre-specified. State whether any interaction is consistent across trials.	
		Provide a description of the direction and size of effect in terms meaningful to those who would put findings into practice.	

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2022-029332 on 19 July 2023. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on June 13, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l'Enseignement Supérieur (ABES). All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias relating to the accumulated body of evidence, including any pertaining to the availability and representativeness of available studies, outcomes or other variables.	nA
Additional analyses	23	Give results of any additional analyses (e.g. sensitivity analyses). If applicable, this should also include any analyses that incorporate aggregate data for studies that do not have IPD. If applicable, summarise the main meta-analysis results following the inclusion or exclusion of studies for which IPD were not available.	nA
Discussion			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarise the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome.	nA
Strengths and limitations	25	Discuss any important strengths and limitations of the evidence including the benefits of access to IPD and any limitations arising from IPD that were not available.	19-20
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the findings in the context of other evidence.	nA
Implications	A4	Consider relevance to key groups (such as policy makers, service providers and service users). Consider implications for future research.	18-19
Funding			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding and other support (such as supply of IPD), and the role in the systematic review of those providing such support.	21

A1 – A3 denote new items that are additional to standard PRISMA items. A4 has been created as a result of re-arranging content of the standard PRISMA statement to suit the way that systematic review IPD meta-analyses are reported.

© Reproduced with permission of the PRISMA IPD Group, which encourages sharing and reuse for non-commercial purposes

bmjopen-2022-069332 on 19 July 2023. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on June 13, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l'Enseignement Supérieur (ABES) . All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission. This article is protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46