Author(s): CMM/MN/AT Date: 2015-02-27

Question: Should in vivo exposure-based therapy for children with high levels of needle fear vs no treatment be used for reducing vaccine injection fear in children 7 - 17 years?¹

Settings: university and unclear setting
Bibliography: Flatt 2010, Leutgeb 2012, Muris 1998 (1), Ollendick 2009, Ost 2001 (1,2)

Quality assessment						No of patients		Effect				
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	In vivo exposure- based therapy for children with high levels of needle fear	No treatment	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
				•			F 0-15 and full version tter indicated by lower		Assessme	l ent Manikin duri	ng lab-b	ased fear
4	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency ³	very serious ⁴	serious ⁵	none	150	85	-	SMD 1.71 lower (2.72 to 0.7 lower)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Children	Revised 80-2	40, Multic	limensional Anx	iety Scale for	Children 0-1		-37, State Trait Anxiety kiety Sensitivity Index 1	18-54); Bett	er indicat	ted by lower val	ues)	
1	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	very serious ⁴	serious ⁸	none	158	88	-	SMD 0.03 lower (0.29 lower to 0.23 higher) ⁶	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTAN1
Complia	nce ⁹ (measure	ed with: v	alidated tool (Be	havioural Avo	oidance Test)	; Better indicated	d by higher values)					
	randomised trials		no serious	very serious ⁴	serious ⁵	none	152	79	-	SMD 1.55 higher (0.44 to	⊕000 VERY	IMPORTANT
4	liidis		inconsistency ³							2.65 higher) ⁹	LOW	
t Child Sat			with: rating scale	e 0-8; Better i	ndicated by h	nigher values)						

Parent Satisfaction ¹² (measured with: rating scale 0-8; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised	serious ²	no serious	very	serious ⁵	none	85	70	_12	not pooled ¹²	⊕000	IMPORTANT
	trials		inconsistency	serious ¹¹							VERY	
											LOW	
Pain, Distress, Fainting, Procedure Outcomes, Parent Fear, Memory, Preference (assessed with: no data were identified for these important outcomes)												
0	No evidence					none	-	-	-	-		IMPORTANT
	available											
								0%		ı		

¹ All included studies investigated the effectiveness of massed exposure treatment.

² Therapists and participants not blinded; outcome assessor not blinded

³ Differences in the comparison groups may explain heterogeneity; all included studies used a wait-list control group except for Muris (1998), which used a computer-based exposure control group

⁴ Phobias included: Spider, Various (including blood injection injury phobia n=20)

⁵ Sample size was below the recommended optimum information size (OIS) of 400 for an effect size of 0.2

⁶ In 1 included study (Ollendick 2009), data were combined for participants in 2 countries

⁷ Therapists and participants not blinded; outcome assessor not blinded; In 1 study (Flatt 2010), there was the potential for attrition bias and incomplete data due to unclear summary statistics

⁸ Confidence intervals cross the line of nonsignificance and the sample size was below the recommended optimum information size (OIS) of 400 for an effect size of 0.2

⁹ In 1 included study (Ost 2001), pre-treatment differences were observed in the Behavioural Avoidance Test for analysis 1

¹⁰ Children reported higher satisfaction with exposure-based treatment than educational support treatment (SMD= 0.66, 95% CI: 0.33, 0.98)

¹¹ Phobias included: Various (not blood injection injury phobia)

¹² Parents reported higher satisfaction with exposure-based treatment than educational support treatment (SMD = 0.87, 95% CI: 0.54, 1.20)