

Table E-56. Study quality for trials comparing antidepressant with placebo

| Study | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 | Q9 | Overall |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
| Suvanto-Luukkonen 2005 | Unc | Yes | Yes | Unc | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Unc | Poor |
| Evans 2005 | Yes | Unc | Unc | Unc | Yes | Unc | Yes | Yes | Unc | Poor |
| Kerwin 2007 | Unc | Yes | Unc | Unc | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Unc | Poor |
| Kalay 2007 | Yes | No | Unc | Unc | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Unc | Poor |
| Speroff 2008 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Good |
| Soares 2008 | Yes | Yes | Unc | Unc | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Unc | Poor |
| Archer 2009 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Fair |
| Archer 2009 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Good |
| Kornstein 2010 | Yes | Yes | Unc | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Poor |
| Soares 2010 | Yes | Yes | Unc | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Good |
| Freeman 2011 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Good |
| Bouchard 2012 | Unc | Yes | Unc | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Poor |
| Pinkerton 2012 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Good |
| Simon (Study 2) 2013 | Yes | Yes | Unc | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Fair |
| Pinkerton 2013 | Yes | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Good |
| Simon (Study 1) 2013 | Yes | Yes | Unc | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Fair |

(a): data came from a conference abstract; (c): data came from posted results on the clinical trial registry; CEE: conjugated equine estrogen; (d): duplicate patient population with other included article; (m): trial contains data from multiple publications; MPA: medroxyprogesterone acetate; (SIP); data came from a package insert; Unc: uncertain

Q1: Was initial assembly of comparable groups: adequate randomization including equal distribution of potential confounders?

Q2: Were the researchers and subjects blinded to the study group assignment?

Q3: Was there adequate concealment of the study group assignments?

Q4: Was there maintenance of comparable groups (includes attrition, crossovers, adherence and contamination)?

Q5: Was there important differential loss to follow-up or overall high loss to follow-up?

Q6: Were measurements equal, reliable and valid (includes masking of outcome assessment)?

Q7: Were definitions of interventions clear?

Q8: Were all important outcomes considered and defined?

Q9: At analysis, was there adjustment for potential confounders (cohort studies) and intention-to-treat analysis (RCTs)?

Q10: Overall Quality Assessment