Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials of psychological interventions to improve glycaemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes
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Summary

Background Adherence difficulties and psychological problems are associated with poor glycaemic control in diabetes. We undertook a systematic review and meta-analysis of psychological therapies to assess their effectiveness in improving glycaemic control in type 2 diabetes.

Methods We searched MEDLINE, PsychINFO, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials up to January, 2003. Eligible studies were randomised controlled trials that involved people with type 2 diabetes and evaluated a psychological therapy (counselling, cognitive behaviour therapy, or psychological therapy) to improve diabetes control. We extracted the number of participants, their age, duration of diabetes, glycaemic control, type of psychological therapy, its mode of delivery, and type of intervention in the control group. The main outcome was long-term glycaemic control measured by percentage of glycated haemoglobin. Blood glucose concentration, weight, and psychological distress were also measured. Pooled standardised effect sizes were calculated.

Findings 25 trials were eligible for the review. In 12 trials, the mean percentage glycated haemoglobin was lower in people assigned a psychological intervention than in the control group (usual care, education, waiting list, or attention control); the pooled mean difference was −0.32 (95% CI −0.57 to −0.07) equivalent to an absolute difference of −0.76%. There were non-significant differences in blood glucose concentration (eight trials; −0.11 [−0.65 to 0.42]) and weight gain (nine trials; 0.37 [−0.18 to 0.93]). Psychological distress was significantly lower in the intervention groups (five trials; −0.58 [−0.95 to −0.20]).

Interpretation In type 2 diabetes, there are improvements in long-term glycaemic control and psychological distress but not in weight control or blood glucose concentration in people who receive psychological therapies.
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Introduction

People with type 2 diabetes have to adhere to many self-care responsibilities to achieve optimum glycaemic control. The tasks include: modification of lifestyle, such as diet, exercise, and weight; self-monitoring of blood glucose concentrations; foot care; and administration of oral medication and, increasingly, insulin injections. Difficulties in adhering to these tasks can be associated with suboptimum glycaemic control even in the most intensively managed groups. Psychological problems such as depressive disorders and eating disorders are common and are associated with suboptimum glycaemic control and diabetes complications.

Previous systematic reviews of non-pharmacological interventions did not adequately distinguish between educational and psychological interventions, between type 1 and type 2 diabetes, or between randomised and non-randomised trials. The distinction between education and psychological therapy is clinically important because they differ (but are not mutually exclusive) in their theoretical basis, training, clinical skills, and implications for resources. Educational interventions are based on didactic and enhanced learning methods which aim to improve diabetes self-management by increasing knowledge. Psychological therapies use the therapeutic alliance between the patient and the therapist to bring about change in emotional, cognitive, and behavioural functioning, including adherence.

In view of the rising prevalence of type 2 diabetes, a potential limit to pharmacological interventions, and effectiveness of psychological therapies for depression and eating disorders, more sophisticated non-pharmacological approaches are needed. Our aims were to carry out a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials assessing the effectiveness of psychological therapies in improving glycaemic control in adults with type 2 diabetes and in reducing psychological distress and bodyweight.

Methods

Criteria for selecting studies

The protocol was peer reviewed and published in the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. We followed the QUORUM guidelines.

Studies eligible for inclusion were randomised controlled trials of a psychological intervention, published or unpublished, involving adult (18 years and older) patients with a diagnosis of type 2 or non-insulin-dependent diabetes. We classified the type of psychological intervention into psychotherapeutic models most commonly used in health-care settings. These were: supportive or counselling therapy, cognitive behaviour therapy, brief psychodynamic psychotherapy, and interpersonal psychotherapy. Studies that did not explicitly label their intervention were included if they used one or more psychological techniques that could be
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coded into one of these categories. Techniques such as relaxation, activity scheduling, problem solving, goal setting, contract setting, cognitive restructuring, and stress management were classified as cognitive behaviour therapy.\textsuperscript{25,26} Techniques such as motivational interviewing\textsuperscript{27} and non-directive counselling\textsuperscript{20} were classified under the counselling model. Techniques not clearly described were excluded. We defined the mode of delivery as individual, group, or family (including couple) therapy. We defined the control group as usual care, education, waiting list, or attention controls.

Our main outcome measures were long-term glycaemic control based on the percentage of glycated haemoglobin, which included HbA\textsubscript{1c}, HbA\textsubscript{1}, and other measurements of glycated haemoglobin made by different methods, and the blood glucose concentration, which included whole-blood, plasma, and serum glucose concentrations. Our subsidiary outcome measures were bodyweight (body-mass index and weight change in pounds or kilograms) and psychological distress if a continuous measure of anxiety or depression was used.

**Search strategy**
The following electronic libraries were searched according to the Cochrane Collaboration’s optimum search strategy for randomised controlled trials for each database: the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials on the Cochrane Library (issue 4, 2002); MEDLINE (1966 to January, 2003); EMBASE (1980 to January, 2003); and PsychINFO, including PsychLIT (1974 to January, 2003). The following search terms were used for MEDLINE and adapted for each other database: “psychological therapies” and “mood disorders” according to the Cochrane Collaboration Depression, Anxiety, and Neurosis Group search strategy; “diabetes mellitus” and “clinical trials” according to the Cochrane Collaboration Metabolic and Endocrine Disorder Group general diabetes search strategy (for further details, please contact the corresponding author). The proceedings of conferences during 1997 to 2002 on diabetes (American Diabetes Association, Diabetes UK [formerly British Diabetic Association], European Association for the Study of Diabetes, International Diabetes Federation) were searched under psychological, educational, or behavioural headings for reports of any trials using psychological therapies. The reference lists of included studies and reviews were searched for additional studies. Leading authors of each included trial and experts on this subject were contacted for additional data on published or unpublished trials.

**Data extraction**
The abstracts of studies identified by the electronic searches were independently inspected by two of us (KI and KW) and inter-rater reliability for selection into the review was reported by use of Cohen’s $k$.\textsuperscript{28} We included abstracts that described a controlled trial of a psychological intervention in patients with diabetes. At this stage, no distinction was made between type of diabetes. In the case of ambiguity or differences between raters the full original article was retrieved for the next stage.

KI and KW independently extracted data from each full copy of those reports selected for further review. Differences over inclusion of studies were resolved through discussions and consensus. Studies written in a language other than English were translated by native-speaking psychiatrists. Quasi-randomised controlled trials and N-of-1 trials were excluded. We included only the first treatment group of cross-over trials. For studies with several intervention groups, we reported the study only once in any one analysis. If there was more than one intervention group, we took the most psychologically intensive intervention as the experimental one. Intensity was defined by type of therapy (most intense was psychodynamic/interpersonal followed by cognitive behaviour therapy, then counselling), number of sessions, and duration of therapy. We coded in a standard way the following characteristics of the study sample: country of origin; number of participants at baseline and at follow-up; age; baseline glycaemic control; clinical subgroups; type of diabetes treatment; and duration of diabetes. We coded the characteristics of the therapy in the intervention and control groups: type and duration of therapy; mode of delivery; specialist; number of sessions; and length of follow-up.

**Statistical analysis**
Data were entered into SPSS (version 11.0). A descriptive summary of the information extracted from included trials was made. We set a minimum requirement of five studies with adequate data before conducting a meta-analysis for each outcome.

We used the within-group SD of the differences (change scores) from baseline to follow-up for each outcome to calculate the SE of the effect size for each study. If the SD of the change score was missing, we used

---

**Figure 1:** Stages of systematic review of randomised controlled trials of the effectiveness of psychological interventions for improving glycaemic control in type 2 diabetes mellitus

RCT=randomised controlled trial.
the square root of the average of the baseline and follow-up variance in each group. This approach is based on the assumption that the correlation between the baseline and the follow-up outcome values was 0·5. We then standardised the effect sizes by dividing them and their SE by the SD. This standardisation allows different measures of the same outcome to be combined because different methods for measuring glycated haemoglobin, blood glucose, and weight were used. We calculated individual effect sizes for the percentage of glycated haemoglobin, blood glucose concentration, weight, and psychological distress.

The effect sizes were pooled by use of a random-effects model because we expected heterogeneity between studies. Unlike fixed-effects meta-analysis, a random-effects approach explicitly allows for such heterogeneity between studies by permitting the true effects estimated by the studies to differ between studies. These true effects are assumed to have a normal distribution in the population of studies, and the aim of the meta-analysis is to estimate the mean of this distribution. Random-effects models generally produce wider CI and are therefore more conservative than fixed-effects models. We assessed heterogeneity between the trials by the χ² test for heterogeneity. The meta-analysis was carried out using the metan command in STATA (version 8).

For glycated haemoglobin and blood glucose, we converted the estimated pooled standardised effect size into absolute units by multiplying the estimate by the pooled SD of all studies included in the meta-analysis for each outcome. We assessed potential publication bias by a funnel plot and Begg’s adjusted rank correlation test for glycated haemoglobin.

We used a random-effects regression to assess other potential factors that could be independently associated with glycated haemoglobin. Regression models were estimated for number of sessions and duration of therapy, which are deemed proxy measures of intensity of treatment and for duration of follow-up. We tested the robustness of the meta-analysis for long-term glycaemic control in sensitivity analyses by comparing random-effects and fixed-effects pooled standardised effect sizes. We compared the pooled effect size of psychological interventions against all control groups and against those control groups excluding studies constituting another psychological therapy.

**Quality assessment**

The quality of randomised studies was assessed on the presence or absence of descriptions of three main criteria specified by Schulz and Jadad and their colleagues: selection bias (randomisation procedure and allocation concealment); attrition bias (withdrawals, dropouts, and intention-to-treat analysis); and detection bias (masking of outcome assessors but not patients and therapists, because psychotherapy cannot be concealed). Three categories were defined: all quality criteria were met with low risk of bias (A); at least one of the quality criteria was only partly met with moderate risk of bias (B); and at least one criterion was not met with high risk of bias (C).

**Role of the funding source**

The study sponsor had no role in the design or conduct of the study, the writing of this report, or the decision to submit it for publication.

**Results**

The search strategy identified 2427 studies from which 93 full texts were selected for further extraction (figure 1). There was 89·6% agreement as to which abstracts from the electronic databases to select for retrieval of full texts (κ=0·64). Data extraction from the full texts identified 25 randomised controlled trials that met the criteria for the systematic review. Reasons for exclusion from the review and meta-analysis are shown in figure 1.

The studies included in the systematic review are listed in the table. One study was classified as A for quality and seven studies as B for quality. Two studies explicitly stated that analyses were by intention to treat. Most studies used either the cognitive behaviour model or its strategies such as relaxation techniques, problem-solving, contract setting, goal setting, self-monitoring of behaviours, and enlisting social support. Four trials assessed counselling techniques.

There were no trials that used a psychodynamic or interpersonal model of therapy, and four trials compared a more intensive psychological therapy with a control less intensive therapy. Three studies had to be translated into English.

For glycated haemoglobin there were 12 studies in the review with data that could be pooled. Most reported an improvement in the glycated haemoglobin (figure 2). With a random-effects model, the pooled standardised difference in the decrease in glycated haemoglobin between patients assigned a psychological intervention and those in the control group was –0·32 (95% CI –0·57 to –0·07).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Number of patients</th>
<th>Standardised effect size (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0·45 (–0·16 to 1·05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>–0·87 (–1·57 to –0·16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>–0·33 (–0·97 to 0·31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>–0·59 (–1·16 to –0·01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0·40 (–0·44 to 1·25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>–0·43 (–1·34 to 0·48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>–0·68 (–1·33 to –0·03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>–0·45 (–1·10 to 0·19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>–0·82 (–1·35 to –0·29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0·07 (–0·63 to 0·76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>–0·47 (–1·27 to 0·33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>–0·06 (–0·45 to 0·33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All studies 522

**Figure 2: Meta-analysis of standardised change scores in glycated haemoglobin in psychological-intervention group compared with control group**

*Unpublished data used for calculation of effect size.*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year, country, and reference</th>
<th>Number of participants recruited/ at follow-up</th>
<th>Mean age (SD or range), years</th>
<th>Mean (SD) % glycated haemoglobin at baseline</th>
<th>Clinical subgroup (type of treatment)</th>
<th>Mean (SD) or range (duration of diabetes, years)</th>
<th>Clinical and duration of therapy in intervention</th>
<th>Model and duration of therapy in control group</th>
<th>Regimen in intervention group and specialty of therapist</th>
<th>Model and duration of therapy in control group</th>
<th>Regimen in control group and specialty of therapist</th>
<th>Follow-up, months</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983, Canada&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>40/40</td>
<td>53.9 (2.0)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Sub-optimal glycemic control (D,T)</td>
<td>0.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>Group CBT for 6 weeks</td>
<td>Individual education for 6 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985, USA&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>53/50</td>
<td>55.1 (7.3)</td>
<td>9.3 (0.3)</td>
<td>Obese (D,T)</td>
<td>5.9 (NS)</td>
<td>Group CBT for 16 weeks</td>
<td>Group education for 16 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986, USA&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>76/76</td>
<td>8.7 (2.7)</td>
<td>Suboptimal glycemic control (D,T,I)</td>
<td>4.3 (3.7)</td>
<td>Individual CBT and education for 5 weeks</td>
<td>Group education for 6 months</td>
<td>Individual education for 6 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987, USA&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>41/32</td>
<td>61.6 (6.4)</td>
<td>11.3 (3.1)</td>
<td>7-5 (7-0)</td>
<td>Group counselling for 11 weeks</td>
<td>Group education for 6 months</td>
<td>Individual education for 5 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991, USA&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>49/43</td>
<td>52.5 (7.5)</td>
<td>9.9 (2.2)</td>
<td>Obese (D,T,I)</td>
<td>6 CBT sessions by dietician for 10 weeks</td>
<td>Group CBT for 16 weeks</td>
<td>Group education for 16 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992, USA&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>54/34</td>
<td>56.0 (8.1)</td>
<td>11.1 (2.8)</td>
<td>Obese (D,T)</td>
<td>11 intensive group education and 2 individual counselling for 11 weeks</td>
<td>Education for 1 week</td>
<td>16 behavioural modification and couple therapy sessions by multidisciplinary team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993, USA&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>156/135</td>
<td>58.0 (11.3)</td>
<td>Suboptimal glycemic control (D,T,I)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>16 CBT sessions by dietician for 10 weeks</td>
<td>Group education for 16 weeks</td>
<td>Group CBT for 16 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993, USA&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>38/38</td>
<td>10.3 (2.3)</td>
<td>Suboptimal glycemic control (D,T)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Individual CBT for 11 weeks</td>
<td>11 intensive group education by nurse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996, Australia&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>118/60</td>
<td>59.5 (10.2)</td>
<td>General (D,T)</td>
<td>0-4 (0-1)</td>
<td>Individual CBT for 11 weeks</td>
<td>16 intensive group education and 2 individual counselling for 11 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997, Australia&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22/22</td>
<td>61.0 (10.2)</td>
<td>General (D,T,I)</td>
<td>11-0 (9-0)</td>
<td>Group CBT for 8 weeks</td>
<td>6 relaxation training sessions by psychologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997, Australia&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19/19</td>
<td>60.0 (47-74)</td>
<td>Suboptimal glycemic control, stress/ anxiety (D,T,I)</td>
<td>6-4 (1.5–23.0)</td>
<td>Group CBT for 6 weeks</td>
<td>6 stress management training sessions by psychologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997, Australia&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20/20</td>
<td>58.9 (7.7)</td>
<td>Suboptimal glycemic control (D,T)</td>
<td>Individual CBT for 4 weeks</td>
<td>8 relaxation therapy sessions by psychologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year, country, and reference</th>
<th>Number of participants recruited/ at follow-up</th>
<th>Mean age (SD or range), years</th>
<th>Mean (SD) % glycated haemoglobin at baseline</th>
<th>Clinical subgroup (type of treatment)</th>
<th>Mean (SD or range) duration of diabetes, years</th>
<th>Model and duration of therapy in intervention group</th>
<th>Regimen in intervention group and specialty of therapist</th>
<th>Model and duration of therapy in control group</th>
<th>Regimen in control group and specialty of therapist</th>
<th>Follow-up, months</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997, USA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22/16</td>
<td>62.4 (7-0)</td>
<td>10-3 (2-2)</td>
<td>Women, obese (D,T)</td>
<td>6-7 (5-4)</td>
<td>Group CBT and individual counselling for 4 months</td>
<td>16 group behaviour modification by nutritionist, exercise physiologist, and psychologist and 3 individual motivational interviewing sessions by psychologist</td>
<td>16 group CBT for 4 months</td>
<td>16 group behaviour modification sessions by nutritionist, exercise physiologist, and psychologist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998, USA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>51/42</td>
<td>54.8 (10-1)</td>
<td>10-3 (3-4)</td>
<td>Depression (D,T,I)</td>
<td>8-8 (9-5)</td>
<td>Group CBT and education for 10 weeks</td>
<td>30 CBT sessions by psychologist and 20 education sessions by diabetes educator</td>
<td>20 education sessions by diabetes educator</td>
<td></td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999, USA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>38/38</td>
<td>63.5 (NS)</td>
<td>12-3 (2-6)</td>
<td>General (D,T,I)</td>
<td>11-5 (NS)</td>
<td>Group CBT and education for 6 months</td>
<td>6 behaviour modification sessions and education by diabetes educators</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>Usual office visits by family physicians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001, China&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>59/59</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>9-9 (2-1)</td>
<td>Depression (treatments not specified)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Group counselling for 3 months Individual CBT for 8 weeks</td>
<td>24 supportive psychotherapy sessions by psychiatrist Internet-based physical activity intervention by occupational therapist</td>
<td>Individual education (duration not specified)</td>
<td>Conventional diabetes care; specialty not specified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001, USA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>78/68</td>
<td>52.3 (NS)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Sedentary (D,T,I)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Individual CBT for 8 weeks</td>
<td>6 months by family physician</td>
<td>Individual education</td>
<td>2 months education; specialty not specified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002, Australia&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>34/32</td>
<td>55.0 (10-5)</td>
<td>7-5 (1-5)</td>
<td>Binge-eating (D,T,I)</td>
<td>3-2 (5-7)</td>
<td>Group CBT for 10 weeks Individual CBT for 10 weeks</td>
<td>Group CBT for 10 weeks</td>
<td>Group education</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>10 non-prescriptive therapy sessions by psychologist</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002, USA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>108/72</td>
<td>57.4 (10-9)</td>
<td>7-8 (1-8)</td>
<td>General (D,T)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Group CBT for 2 months</td>
<td>5 education and stress management training sessions; specialty not specified</td>
<td>5 education sessions; specialty not specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002, Japan&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>36/26</td>
<td>62.2 (8-2)</td>
<td>8-2 (1-7)</td>
<td>General (treatments not specified)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Group CBT for 4 months</td>
<td>16 Qi-gong relaxation training sessions by Chinese Qi-gong doctor</td>
<td>Waiting list</td>
<td>Conventional diabetes care; specialty not specified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In press, UK&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>100/94</td>
<td>59.5 (NS)</td>
<td>8-4 (1-6)</td>
<td>Suboptimum glycaemic control (D,T,I)</td>
<td>8 (NS)</td>
<td>Individual CBT for 7 weeks</td>
<td>4 motivational interviewing sessions and goal setting by psychologist</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>Usual diabetes care; specialty not specified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS=not stated, data missing; D=diet; T=tablets; I=insulin; CBT=cognitive behavioural therapy. *Change in HbA1c was recorded from end of treatment to end of follow-up.

Psychological interventions in type 2 diabetes: characteristics of randomised controlled trials of psychological interventions in people with type 2 diabetes included in the systematic review
to –0.07). The treatment effect in absolute units was a decrease of 0.76% (–1.34 to –0.18) in glycated haemoglobin. The chi-squared test for heterogeneity was significant (p=0.04). The pooled estimate with a fixed-effects model was similar (–0.32 [–0.49 to –0.14]).

We repeated the meta-analysis excluding the two studies13,14 in which the control was a less intensive psychological therapy. We found a larger estimate of the pooled effect size (–0.44 [–0.67 to –0.22]) with a random-effects model, which approximated to a decrease of 1.06% (–1.61 to –0.51) in glycated haemoglobin. The test for heterogeneity was not significant (p=0.21). There was no evidence for publication bias in the funnel plot (not shown), in the Begg adjusted rank correlation test (p=0.54), or the Egger test (p=0.94). In the random-effects regression analyses, number of sessions (regression coefficient –0.02, p=0.34), duration of the psychological intervention (regression coefficient –0.01, p=0.25), and duration of follow-up (regression coefficient –0.01, p=0.49) were not associated with glycated haemoglobin percentage.

Eight studies in the review had outcome data on blood glucose. There was no evidence that psychological therapies improved current blood glucose concentrations (figure 3). With a random-effects model, the pooled standardised difference in the decrease in blood glucose concentration between patients assigned a psychological therapy and
the reporting of potential biases. Most had small sample control or blood glucose concentration.

psychological distress but did not appear to affect weight psychological therapy was associated with a reduction in the effect on psychological distress was –0·58 (–0·95 to –0·20) between patients assigned a psychological therapy and those in the control group. There was no evidence of heterogeneity (p=0·11).

and those in the control group was –0·11 (–0·65 to 0·42), which approximated to a difference of 0·20 mmol/L (–1·34 to 0·91) in absolute units. The χ² test for heterogeneity was significant (p<0·005), but the fixed-effects pooled standardised change score in the blood glucose concentration did not differ much from the random-effects estimate (−0·12 [–0·34 to 0·10]).

Nine studies in the review had outcome data on weight change. With a random-effects model, psychological therapies were associated with a non-significant increase in weight; the pooled standardised effect size was 0·37 (–0·18 to 0·93; figure 4). One early study appeared to be an outlier; when it was omitted, the overall effect of psychological therapies on weight was negligible (0 [–0·20 to 0·20]).

Four studies in the review addressed specific psychological problems such as depression, binge eating, and stress. Figure 5 lists the five studies that had data on psychological status; psychological therapies were effective in reducing psychological distress. With a random-effects model, the pooled standardised difference in the effect on psychological distress was –0·58 (–0·95 to –0·20) between patients assigned a psychological therapy and those in the control group. There was no evidence of heterogeneity (p=0·11).

**Discussion**

We identified 25 randomised controlled trials comparing psychological interventions for improving control of diabetes with a control group of usual care, education, waiting list, or attention control. In a meta-analysis of 12 of these trials, psychological therapies resulted in significantly better glycaemic control approximating to an absolute difference of 0·76% in glycated haemoglobin. When studies that used a less intensive psychological therapy as a comparison were excluded, the pooled effect size was larger, representing a difference of 1·00% in glycated haemoglobin. These effects are large enough to reduce the risk of development and progression of diabetic microvascular complications. We also found that psychological therapy was associated with a reduction in psychological distress but did not appear to affect weight control or blood glucose concentration.

Most of the studies were of moderate to poor quality in the reporting of potential biases. Most had small sample sizes. These factors could explain the borderline heterogeneity observed in the pooled estimate of improvement in glycated haemoglobin. Could we have over-interpreted interventions as psychological interventions when reports were not explicit about the type of therapy? We believe not, for at least three reasons. First, cognitive behaviour therapy is an umbrella for a wide range of psychological techniques designed to bring about change in thinking patterns and behaviours. Second, psychological therapies and education are not mutually exclusive and could coexist as separate interventions as they did in one study we identified. Third, our focused search strategy was based on psychotherapy, not education, and studies with ambiguous descriptions of the intervention were excluded. Although this approach overcame some heterogeneity caused by combination of psychotherapy with education in previous reviews, there is a small possibility we may have missed studies with interventions that were labelled as education but were psychotherapy.

Most of the psychological interventions used variants of cognitive behaviour therapy. Earlier studies used behavioural modification techniques such as contract setting and reward systems, which are used widely in weight reduction programmes. More recent studies applied a wider range of cognitive behaviour techniques. Motivational interviewing was the second most common therapy tested but there were not enough studies to compare with other psychological therapies. It was originally developed as a counselling style for people with unhealthy lifestyles and its potential in type 2 diabetes seems a natural extension.

The lack of an association between duration or number of sessions and improvement in glycaemic control conflicts with evidence that more intensive psychological treatments are more effective in depression. One explanation is that the interventions were perhaps too similar for a difference to be detectable. Most were brief or time-limited therapy conventionally defined as a duration of around 6 months. The short duration of follow-up in most studies may explain the lack of association with glycaemic control.

The lack of effectiveness of psychological therapies on blood glucose concentrations could be due to the small number of studies, but another possibility is that the mean
blood glucose masked wider fluctuations in the concentration as patients' overall control began to improve. The lack of reduction in weight was surprising. Perhaps weight loss would be slow because psychological therapies encourage long-term lifestyle changes.

Only a few studies targeted specific subgroups with manifest psychological problems such as depression, binge-eating disorders, or stress. The finding that psychological therapies reduced distress is potentially clinically important given that the prevalence of depression in diabetes is around 10–15%. These measures were self-reported; since masking of the intervention from patients in psychotherapy studies is impossible, there is a risk of reporting bias overestimating psychological functioning.

Most of the studies originated in the USA, where health insurance influences resources. This factor partly explains the excess of group therapies. Although peer support and social learning are valuable tools in group therapy, a group setting may not be appropriate for discussion of personal psychological problems such as binge-eating and sexual dysfunction.

The first study we included was published in 1983. Despite 20 years of changes in practice in diabetes and mental health, there were surprisingly few innovations. One study used the internet to develop a programme based on cognitive behaviour therapy. No studies used psychodynamic or interpersonal therapy techniques. These are more specialised techniques but the high degree of psychological distress in diabetes clinics suggests that patients may be more willing than physicians assume to discuss their diabetes in the context of their life experiences.

This review shows that adjutant psychological treatments can be effective in improving certain features of diabetes control but the type of therapy that is most effective and the subgroups of patients most likely to benefit are not clear.
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