A1.8 Should antagonists with minimal sedation be used for opioid withdrawal?

GRADE evidence profile

Author(s): Davoli M, Amato L
Date: 02/02/2006
Question: Should opioid antagonists with minimal sedation be used for opioid withdrawal?
Patient or population: opioid dependents undergoing managed withdrawal
Settings: Inpatient
Systematic review: Gowing L et al.; *Opioid antagonists with minimal sedation for opioid with*drawal (CLIB 1, 2006)[160].

Quality assessment						Summary of findings					
						No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No. studies	Design	Limitations	Consistency	Directness	Other considerations	Opioid antagonists with minimal sedation	Control	Relative risk (RR) (95% CI)	Absolute risk (AR) (95% CI)		
Completion of treatment[232, 233, 234, 231] (Objective follow-up: 3-6 days[e])											
4[a]	Randomized trials	No limitations[b]	Important inconsistency (-1)[c]	No uncertainty	None	198/231 (85,7%)	118/163 (72,4%)	RR 1.26[d] (0.80 to 2.00)	70/1 000 (40 less to 180 more)	⊕⊕⊕◯ Moderate	7
Severity and duration of withdrawal symptoms[235, 236, 237, 231] (Subjective and objective follow-up)											
4[a]	Randomized trials	Serious limitations (-1)[b, f]	No important inconsistency[g]	No uncertainty	High probability of reporting bias (- 1)[g]	-	-	Unable to compare scales	-	⊕⊕◯◯ Low	5
Side effects[235, 237] (Subjective follow-up: 3-6 days[e])											
2[h]	Observational studies[n]	No limitations[i]	No important inconsistency	No uncertainty	Imprecise or sparse data (-1)[f] High probability of reporting bias (- 1)[f, j]	6/94 (6,4%)	1/80 (1,2%)	RR 3.71[d] (0.65 to 21.32)	50/1 000 more (10 less to 110 more)	⊕◯◯◯ Very low	8
Patients who have relapsed at follow-up[234] (Subjective follow-up: 6 months)											
1[k]	Randomized trials	No limitations[l]	No important inconsistency	Some uncertainty (-1)[m]	Imprecise or sparse data (-1)[m]	15/32 (46,9%)	18/32 (56,2%)	RR 0.83 (0.52 to 1.35)	100/1 000 less (2700 less to 100 more)	⊕⊕◯◯ Low	5

[a] Country of origin of the studies: Italy (2), United Kingdom (1) and USA (1); 3 studies were conducted in an outpatient setting, 1 inpatient
[b] 3/4 the allocation concealment was unclear, and in 1/4 inadequate; 2 double blind, 2 no information on blindness
[c] Statistically significant heterogeneity
[d] Random effect model
[e] Length of treatment
[f] In addition, there are major differences in treatment schedules and the type of additional therapy
[g] Measured on the basis of subjective symptoms using different scales preventing the possibility of pooling data
[h] 2 controlled prospective trial, both conducted in USA and in outpatient setting
[i] Allocation concealment unclear in 1 study and inadequate in the other
[j] The RR is greater than 3
[k] The study was conducted in Italy in outpatient setting
[l] Unclear allocation concealment, no information on blindness
[m] only 1 study, few participants (98) and conducted in outpatient setting
[n] Observational studies