# S7 Table. GRADE summary of findings table

:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Quality assessment | № of patients | Effect | Confidence in estimate |
| Type of intervention | **Outcome** | **Studies** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **Sample size** | **NNT**  | **SMD** (lower scores favours psychosocial interventions) |
| NET | PTSD symptoms  | 5 RCTs  | not serious 1 | not serious  | not serious  | serious 2 | asymmetrical funnel plot  | 187  | 6.7  | **-0.78** (-1.18 to -0.38)  | ⨁⨁◯◯LOW |
| Depressive symptoms | 3 RCTs  | serious 3 | serious 4 | not serious  | serious 2 | none  | 116  | 4.3 | **-0.86** (-1.65 to -0.06)  | ⨁◯◯◯VERY LOW  |
| CBT | PTSD symptoms | 4 RCTs | serious 5 | very serious 6 | not serious  | serious 7 | asymmetrical funnel plot | 182  | -  | **-0.97** (-2.2 to 0.26)  | ⨁◯◯◯VERY LOW  |
| Depressive symptoms | 3 RCTs | serious 8 | very serious 9 | not serious  | serious 7 | none  | 152  | -  | **-1.54** (-3.38 to 0.29)  | ⨁◯◯◯VERY LOW  |
| EMDR  | PTSD symptoms  | 0 studies |  |  |  |  |  |  | -  | **-** | -  |
| Depressive symptoms  | 0 studies |  |  |  |  |  |  | -  | **-** | -  |
| TFP  | PTSD symptoms  | 2 CCTs | very serious 10 | very serious 11 | not serious  | serious 2 | none  | 146  | 2.1  | **-1.92** (-3.05 to -0.8)  | ⨁◯◯◯VERY LOW  |
| Depressive symptoms  | 1 CCT | very serious 10 | not serious 12 | not serious  | serious 2 | none  | 82  | 3.3 | **-1.04** (-1.59 to -0.5)  | ⨁◯◯◯VERY LOW  |
| CROP  | PTSD symptoms  | 1 RCT | serious 13 | not serious 12 | not serious  | very serious 14 | none  | 28  | -  | **-0.41** (-1.17 to 0.34)  | ⨁◯◯◯VERY LOW  |
| Depressive symptoms | 1 RCT | serious 13 | not serious 12 | not serious  | serious 15 | none  | 28  | 3.7 | -1.1 (-1.67 to -0.54)  | ⨁⨁◯◯LOW  |

**NET**: Narrative exposure therapy; **CBT**: Cognitive behavioural therapy; **EMDR**: Eye movement desensitization and reprocessing; **TFP**: Trauma focused psychotherapy; **CROP**: Culture-Sensitive Oriented Peer; **CI:** Confidence interval; **SMD:** Standardised mean difference; NNT: number-needed-to-be-treated. FOOTNOTES: 1: participants and clinicians are not blind to group allocation; however, the outcome assessor was blind in 4 out of 5 studies; 2: overall number of patients included in the analysis is low (less than 200); 3: outcome assessment is not masked in 1 out of 3 studies included in the analysis, and dropouts are not similarly distributed across treatment arms in 1 out of 3 studies; 4: I squared = 70%; 5: participants and clinicians are not blind to group allocation in 3 out of 4 studies, and outcome assessor is not blind in 2 out of 4 studies, and data on dropout are not reported in 2 out of 4 studies; 6: I squared = 91%; 7: overall number of patients included in the analysis is low (less than 200) and CI ranges from appreciable benefit with CBT to no difference; 8: participants and clinicians are not blind to group allocation in 2 out of 3 studies, and outcome assessor is not blind in 1 out of 3 studies, and data on dropout are not reported in 2 out of 3 studies; 9: I squared = 93%; 10: study design is not randomised; 11: I squared = 85%; 12: not applicable: only one study included in the analysis; 13: participants and clinicians are not blind to group allocation, and no information is provided on blinding of outcome assessor, and high number of dropouts; 14: overall number of patients included in the analysis is very low (N=28), and CI ranges from benefit with CROP to no effect; 15: overall number of patients included in the analysis is very low (N=28)