

Supplementary Table 1. Six randomised controlled trials evaluating Feeling Good.

Reference	Duration	Guidance	Setting/subjects	Groups	Findings	Quality	Comments
23 Floyd	4 weeks treatment, follow up at 3 months	Telephoned once a week for less than 10 minutes by member of research team	Various media announcements recruited 46 volunteers out of 111 inquiries. Eligible if >60 yrs HRSD>10, DSM-IV criteria for major depressive disorder, minor depression or dysthymia	Intervention n = 16 Individual psychotherapy n = 16 Delayed treatment n = 14	Main outcome measures HRSD; GDS at 4 weeks. Statistically significant benefit on both outcome measures at 4 weeks in repeated measures ANOVA, comparing intervention and delayed treatment.	Concealment NO Follow up to 4 week assessment 67% (31/46) Power calc NO Primary outcome YES	Unpublished results in press
24 McKendree -Smith	8 weeks Self report assessment completed at 2 and 4 weeks into treatment. Post-test at 8 weeks and follow up at 20 weeks.	Weekly telephone contact of no more than 10 minutes	Volunteers recruited via media announcement. Eligibility criteria included DSM-IV diagnosis of major depression, dysthymia or minor depression and a HRSD score >10. Average years education 15 years	Delayed treatment n = 21 Behavioural bibliotherapy n = 17 (Control <i>Your Depression</i>) Immediate cognitive therapy n = 19	Main outcome measures HRSD, BDI. For HRSD & BDI cognitive bibliotherapy superior to delayed treatment (P<0.05), but no significant difference between cognitive and behavioural bibliotherapy	Concealment NO Follow up at 8 weeks n = 40 (70%) Power calc NO Primary outcome NO	Study uses an 8 week waiting period rather than 4 weeks as in most other studies. <i>Feeling Good</i> out performs <i>Control Your Depression</i> (unlike 14). Patients with higher scores for depression, more likely to drop out. Unpublished PhD thesis
25 Bowman et al	4 weeks	Telephoned once a week for less than 10 minutes by member of research team	Participants recruited via media announcements. Eligible if HRSD> 10 and not receiving other treatments.	Intervention n = 10 Self monitor only with self-examination therapy (SET) n = 10 Wait list n = 10	Two outcome measures: HRSD, BDI. Statistically significant benefit for both interventions on two outcome measures at 4 weeks; using analysis of covariance adjusting for baseline scores.	Concealment NO Follow up at 4 weeks 100% Power calc NO Primary outcome NO	SET is designed to help patients decide 'what matters to them' and think 'less negatively about things that do not matter to them'. No significant difference between SET and intervention group. All subjects completed at least 25% of <i>Feeling Good</i> exercises. Assessments after 4 weeks not relevant as wait list group then received bibliotherapy.

Supplementary Table 1. Randomised controlled trials evaluating Feeling Good.

Reference	Duration	Guidance	Setting/subjects	Groups	Findings	Quality	Comments
26 Jamison and Scogin	4 weeks	Telephoned once a week for less than 10 minutes by member of research team	Various media announcements recruited 171 subjects. Eligible if HRSD > 10, BDI > 10 and met DSM-III-R criteria elicited from HRSD and BDI.	Intervention n = 40 Delayed treatment n = 40	3 main outcome measures HRSD; BDI; SCL-90 Statistically significant benefit for intervention on all 3 measures at 4 weeks using analysis of covariance adjusting for baseline scores. Clinically significant improvement: 59% intervention, 13% control.	Concealment NO Follow up to 4 week assessment 90% (72/80) Power Calc NO Primary outcome NO	Longer follow-up in the study not helpful as the delayed treatment group received bibliotherapy after 4 weeks. 3-year follow up 25 also reported. Sample had about 15 years education on average
14 Scogin <i>et al</i>	4 weeks	Maximum 5 min contact time via telephone per week for all groups.	Recruitment through media of subjects over 60 yrs. Eligible if HRSD > 10 and performed adequately on a cognitive status assessment. Were eligible if on psychotropic medication but not if receiving psychotherapy.	Cognitive bibliotherapy n = 22 Behavioural bibliotherapy n = 23 Delayed treatment n = 22	Outcome measures HRSD, GDS. Statistically significant benefit of the cognitive bibliotherapy on both outcome measures and for behavioural bibliotherapy for HRSD and P = 0.06 for GDS; using repeated measures ANOVA adjusting for baseline scores but including a third assessment after the delayed treatment group received bibliotherapy	Concealment NO Follow up to 4 weeks assessment 93% (62/67) Power calc NO Primary outcome NO	Also performed overall test comparing the two bibliotherapy groups with delayed treatment.
13 Scogin <i>et al</i>	4 weeks	Telephoned once a week for less than 10 minutes by member of research team	Adverts in newspapers for volunteers aged over 60 years. Eligible if HRSD > 10.	Cognitive bibliotherapy n = 10 Delayed cognitive bibliotherapy n = 11 Control bibliotherapy n = 8	Concealment NO Follow up to 4 week assessment 90% (26/29) Power Calc NO Primary Outcome NO	Concealment NO Follow up to 4 week assessment 90% (26/29) Power Calc NO Primary Outcome NO	Control bibliotherapy was Man's search for meaning by Frank published 1959. 41% of participants had college degrees. Assessments after 4 weeks not relevant as delayed wait list group then received bibliotherapy.
Randomised controlled trial evaluating Managing Anxiety and Depression							
11 Holdsworth <i>et al</i>	Follow up at 1 month and 3 months	No contact described in paper. Booklet given in sealed envelope by GP:	General practice (UK). Participants recruited via GP. Inclusion criteria 16-65 years, and if GP considered them as suffering from 'anxiety, depression or mixed anxiety/depression and not suffering from major mental illness'	106 recruited, but data reported on 62 completers Intervention n = 32 Control n = 30	Outcome measures GHQ HAD anxiety and HAD depression subscales at 1 month and 3 months. Statistically significant difference reported at 1 month for HAD anxiety subscale. Used t tests without adjusting for baseline severity.	Concealment POSSIBLY Follow up to third assessment 58% (62/106) Power calc NO Primary outcome stated nine hypotheses tested	Uncertainty about some of the details of methods and the number randomised to each group. Used sealed envelopes but do not say if in random order or how they were blinded as one envelope contained the booklet and the other did not.