



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/119788/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Marsden, Zoe, Lovell, Karina, Blore, David et al. (2017) A randomized controlled trial comparing EMDR and CBT for obsessive–compulsive disorder. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*. ISSN: 1099-0879

<https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.2120>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Author's Manuscript

Note: This is a pre-print peer reviewed article, accepted for publication on 01.07.17. Please do not copy or cite without authors permission.

Citation: Marsden, Z., Lovell, K., Blore, D., Ali, S., & Delgadillo, J. (in press). A randomised controlled trial comparing EMDR and CBT for Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*.

A randomised controlled trial comparing EMDR and CBT for Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder

Zoe Marsden¹, Karina Lovell², David Blore³, Shehzad Ali⁴,
and Jaime Delgadillo^{5*}

1. *Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Trust, Leeds, United Kingdom*
2. *School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Work and Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom*
3. *David Blore Associates Ltd., York, United Kingdom*
4. *Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, United Kingdom*
5. *Clinical Psychology Unit, Department of Psychology, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom*

* Corresponding author. E-mail address: jaime.delgadillo@nhs.net (J. Delgadillo).

Abstract

Background: This study aimed to evaluate eye-movement desensitisation and reprocessing (EMDR) as a treatment for obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), by comparison to cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) based on exposure and response prevention.

Method: This was a pragmatic, feasibility randomised controlled trial in which 55 participants with OCD were randomised to EMDR (n = 29) or CBT (n = 26). The Yale-Brown obsessive compulsive scale (YBOCS) was completed at baseline, after treatment and at 6 months follow-up. Treatment completion and response rates were compared using chi square tests. Effect size was examined using Cohen's *d* and multilevel modelling.

Results: Overall, 61.8% completed treatment and 30.2% attained reliable and clinically significant improvement in OCD symptoms, with no significant differences between groups ($p > .05$). There were no significant differences between groups in YBOCS severity post-treatment ($d = -0.24$, $p = .38$) or at 6 months follow-up ($d = -0.03$, $p = .90$).

Conclusions: EMDR and CBT had comparable completion rates and clinical outcomes.

Key Practitioner Message

- Fifty five patients with OCD were randomised to receive either EMDR or CBT
- Both treatments had comparable completion rates and clinical outcomes
- No significant differences were found after treatment or at 6 months follow-up

Key words: EMDR; CBT; obsessive-compulsive disorder; randomized controlled trial

INTRODUCTION

Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD) is a condition characterised by intrusive thoughts (obsessions) that are accompanied by intense urges (compulsions) to neutralise the associated distress by performing mental or physical rituals (Abramowitz, Taylor, & McKay, 2009). Cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) based on exposure and response prevention (ERP) is recommended by clinical guidelines as a first line psychological treatment for this condition (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence [NICE], 2005). Meta-analytic reviews of clinical trials indicate that CBT is significantly more effective than waitlist or placebo control conditions and equally as effective as pharmacological treatment (i.e., Abramowitz, 1997, 1998; van Balkom et al., 1994; Olatunji, Davis, Powers, & Smits, 2013). In spite of the evidence favouring CBT, there are also a number of recognised drawbacks. Some studies suggest that patients find it difficult to tolerate exposure exercises and tend to drop out of treatment (Abramowitz, Taylor, & McKay, 2005). For example, Foa et al. (2005) reported that 28% of patients dropped out shortly after commencing exposure and response prevention. Even after completing CBT, more than 30% of patients are reported to access ongoing treatment (Rowa et al., 2007). Furthermore, OCD is considered to be one of the most treatment resistant non-psychotic mental health problems (Ponniah, Magiati, & Hollon, 2013), since relatively few patients (approximately 25%) end treatment completely symptom-free (Fisher & Wells, 2005). These drawbacks raise a question about how to meet the needs of those for whom CBT is less effective.

Recent studies have considered whether eye-movement desensitisation and reprocessing (EMDR) could be a helpful alternative treatment for OCD. EMDR is an empirically supported treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder (Bisson et al., 2007; Davidson, & Parker, 2001; Van Etten, & Taylor, 1998). A number of uncontrolled case series have reported the successful application of

EMDR to alleviate symptoms of OCD (Bekkers, 1999; Bohm & Voderholzer, 2010; Keenan, et al., 2014; Marr, 2012). Furthermore, Nazari et al. (2011) conducted a controlled trial in which 90 OCD patients were randomised to either EMDR or pharmacotherapy (citalopram). This trial reported comparable baseline severity of OCD symptoms using the Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale (YBOCS), but significantly lower symptoms in the EMDR group (mean YBOCS = 13.6) by comparison to the pharmacotherapy group (mean YBOCS = 19.06) after 12 weeks of treatment.

Furthermore, there are theoretical reasons why EMDR could be considered as a plausible treatment option for OCD. There is evidence that in some cases OCD may originate in the wake of stressful life events (de Silva & Marks, 1999), and that stressful life events increase the risk of OCD relapse (Steketee, 1993). For example, there is a high incidence of OCD in combat exposed soldiers by comparison to controls (Jordan et al., 1991), and the risk of developing OCD is ten times greater in people with post-traumatic stress disorder by comparison to people without trauma-related problems (Helzer et al., 1987). The *adaptive information processing* (AIP) model of EMDR proposes that psychological symptoms often result from unprocessed traumatic material (Shapiro & Forrest, 2004), or stressful life events. Based on the notion that EMDR works to resolve disturbing memories of traumatic events, it could be that other types of anxiety disorders that develop following a distressing event may also be responsive to EMDR. OCD, whilst different in presentation to PTSD, shares some similarities such as repeated intrusive thoughts and images that evoke intense anxiety and avoidance. Several case studies have also indicated qualitative/metaphorical associations between the content of obsessive intrusions (e.g., 'being or feeling dirty') and the context of traumatic events (e.g., sexual assault) implicated in the onset of obsessional thoughts (de Silva & Marks, 1999). It seems plausible that processing the cognitive, somatic and affective aspects of traumatic

events could afford some alleviation of symptoms that may have arisen from such events.

Overall, these emerging studies and hypotheses suggest that EMDR could be a helpful treatment option for OCD, although there are also several caveats. Small case series are not representative of OCD cases in general healthcare settings and could be prone to selection biases. These case series also lack rigorous designs (i.e., single case experimental design with multiple baselines) and appropriate statistics to account for regression to the mean. The only experimental study to date by Nazari et al. (2011) offers more convincing support for the application of EMDR; however, the lack of post-treatment follow-up raises questions about the sustainability of treatment effects. Furthermore, it is not known if EMDR may be as effective or acceptable as commonly available CBT interventions.

With this backdrop of emerging studies, we conducted a controlled trial that enabled us to compare the application of EMDR with CBT for OCD.

METHOD

Design

This was a pragmatic randomised controlled trial conducted in a primary care, outpatient, public healthcare system (UK National Health Service). The primary objective was to assess the feasibility (based on attendance and completion rates) of delivering EMDR for OCD in routine care. A secondary objective was to undertake a preliminary comparison of clinical effects between EMDR and CBT, which could inform future trials assessing efficacy and mechanisms of action.

The study was approved by an NHS research ethics committee (Ref: 13/YH/0338) and registered in an international database prior to recruitment (ISRCTN16396325).

Setting

Trial participants were recruited and treated in a primary care mental health service in Leeds, a large and socioeconomically diverse city in the north of England. The service offered access to evidence-based psychological interventions recommended by national guidelines (NICE, 2011) and delivered by qualified practitioners working under clinical supervision. Patients with OCD were referred to the service by general practitioners, or self-referred, and were routinely offered 16 to 20 sessions of cognitive behavioural therapy (NICE, 2005).

Interventions

Eye-Movement Desensitisation and Reprocessing (EMDR)

EMDR is a therapy where a structured approach is used to address the past, present and future aspects of traumatic events. Based on Shapiro's (2001) AIP model, EMDR conceptualises psychiatric disorders as a manifestation of unresolved traumatic events. EMDR therapy uses a eight-phase procedure that begins with history taking and case formulation (phase 1), preparation (phase 2) to ensure the client has the resources to manage the processing of the distressing information to an adaptive resolution. In phase 3 the visual, cognitive (negative and desired positive cognition), affective, and sensory components of the targeted memory are identified, and ratings for levels of distress and level of belief in the positive cognition are taken. In phase 4, the client recalls the targeted memory, while simultaneously engaging in sets of eye movements (or alternating bilateral audio and/or tactile stimulation). This continues until the distress level is rated at 0. A memory is considered to be processed when it no longer elicits any affective or somatic distress. In phase 5 the transition to a convincingly valid positive cognition is strengthened using further bilateral stimulation (for example, going from a negative

cognition of 'I am powerless' to 'I am in control'). The installation and strengthening of the positive cognition is a crucial component of EMDR by focusing on the client's positive self-assessment which is pivotal for positive therapeutic effect (Shapiro 2001). Phase 6 is considered completed when a client can bring the memory and positive cognition to mind without any body tension. Phase 7 involves a careful closure of the session including use of resources, and phase 8 is the re-evaluation which takes place at the start of every subsequent session.

Marr (2012) hypothesised that EMDR could provide a treatment option for OCD whereby processing the fears and ritualised behaviours of OCD would decrease symptoms in the present before turning to work on the underlying events linked to the onset of symptoms. This study applied an EMDR protocol described by Marr (2012), where the treatment plan is in the following order: processing current triggers (OCD obsessions and compulsions which are viewed as separate recent traumatic events); installing a future template (imagining successful future action); and then processing any past related disturbing events.

Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT)

CBT followed the ERP model (Foa, Yadin, & Lichner, 2012); for simplicity, we apply the acronym CBT to refer to exposure and response prevention in the rest of this manuscript. This treatment requires patients to become exposed to stimuli (i.e., situations, thoughts, sensations) that evoke obsessive thoughts and/or distressing feelings without performing the rituals that aim to reduce that distress (response prevention). Exposure can be in the form of actual (*in-vivo*) contact with anxiety-provoking stimuli or in imagination (imaginal exposure). These procedures are systematically repeated and typically organised along a hierarchical sequence of exposure tasks which escalate in difficulty. With repeated practice, the distress associated with stimuli that trigger obsessions decreases, and

the associated urges to ritualise also decrease (Foa et al., 2012). The treatment proceeded in five phases: (1) assessment and psychoeducation about OCD; (2) development of a case formulation and orientation to the treatment procedures; (3) collaborative development of an exposure hierarchy; (4) repeated ERP in-session and in-between sessions as homework practice; (5) development of a relapse prevention plan to overcome future setbacks.

Standardisation and quality control

Both treatments were standardised to 16-session protocols and were delivered by therapists (n = 12; 6 EMDR and 6 CBT) that were qualified in each of the treatment modalities (years of experience: EMDR = 2 to 7; CBT = 3 to 15). The majority of therapists had experience of working with OCD cases prior to the trial, except for 3 EMDR therapists. Participating therapists had access to training sessions delivered by expert trainers in each of the treatment models; once prior to starting and once during the trial. Therapists also had access to group supervision and case discussion meetings for their respective treatments, approximately every 6 weeks. Their case notes were audited to ensure fidelity to the treatments and written feedback was provided by the study co-ordinator. No further fidelity checks or procedures were applied.

Measures and data sources

Primary outcome measure

The Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive scale (YBOCS; Goodman et al 1989) is a 10-item measure of OCD symptom severity; each item is rated from 0 (no symptoms) to 4 (extreme symptoms) yielding a total score between 0 – 40 with excellent interrater reliability ($ICC = .98$) and internal consistency ($\alpha = .89$). We applied the self-rated YBOCS developed by Baer et al. (1993), where a cut-off ≥ 16 is commonly

applied to identify moderate to severe OCD symptoms (Baer et al., 1993; Steketee, Frost, & Bogart, 1996). Cronbach's alpha for the baseline YBOCS in this sample was $\alpha = .89$.

Other measures

The Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI) was developed for use by lay interviewers as a short but accurate psychiatric diagnostic interview based on DSM-IV criteria (Sheehan, 1998). The OCD module of the MINI can be delivered in person or over the telephone, with an average completion time of 15 minutes. The Obsessive Compulsive Inventory (OCI) is a 42-item questionnaire where respondents self-rate their distress levels (0 – 4 Likert scale) on each item across 7 domains: washing, checking, doubting, ordering, obsessing, hoarding and mental neutralising (Foa et al., 1998). The total OCI score ranges between 0 – 168 and has been found to correlate with the YBOCS (Foa et al., 1998). The PHQ-9 is a nine-item measure of depression symptoms (Kroenke, Spitzer, & Williams, 2001); items are rated using a 4-point Likert scale (0 – 3) yielding a total severity score between 0 – 27. The GAD-7 is a seven-item measure of anxiety symptoms (Spitzer, Kroenke, Williams, & Löwe, 2006); it is rated in the same way as the PHQ-9 yielding a total severity score between 0 – 21. The Work and Social Adjustment Scale (WSAS) is a measure of functioning across five domains: work, home management, social leisure activities, private leisure activities, and family and relationships. Each item is rated between 0 (no impairment) and 8 (very severe impairment), with a total severity score between 0 – 40.

De-identified demographic and clinical data were also collected for all consenting participants including age, gender, ethnicity, employment status, number of treatment sessions attended, and completion of agreed number of sessions (versus unilateral dropout).

Recruitment, randomisation and data collection

As a feasibility trial, a formal sample size calculation was not estimated, but we aimed to recruit a minimum of 50 participants. All patients presenting to the service had telephone screening contacts with trained mental health practitioners as part of routine care. Those identified as presenting OCD symptoms at screening were referred to a telephone diagnostic interview with a researcher. All clinicians in the service were briefed about the recruitment process to ensure compliance. In addition, a researcher regularly reviewed waitlist records of primary diagnoses to identify any potential OCD cases that may have not been referred by screeners.

Patients who met MINI diagnostic criteria for OCD were invited to take part in the trial via telephone contacts, supplemented by a standard information sheet and consent form. Patients were excluded if (a) they did not meet criteria for OCD; or (b) OCD was not their primary reason for seeking treatment; or (c) they were using benzodiazepines; or (d) they were otherwise unsuitable for treatment in primary care (due to a history of psychotic or bipolar disorders, current suicidal risk, or current substance dependence).

Consenting participants were randomly assigned to either EMDR or CBT, using a computer-generated randomization schedule, by a research facilitator that was independent of the research and clinical teams. After randomization, participants were allocated to a trial therapist who prompted them to self-complete the YBOCS measure once per month (sessions 1, 4, 8, 12, 16). Secondary measures (PHQ-9, GAD-7, WSAS) were completed on a weekly basis, except for OCI which was only completed at the first and last treatment sessions. An independent researcher contacted all participants to gather (self-reported, paper-based) YBOCS measures at 6 months follow-up, regardless of completion (or dropout) status.

Statistical analyses

The analysis plan proceeded in three steps aiming (1) to assess the integrity of randomization by assessing the balance of characteristics in the randomised groups; (2) to assess the feasibility of delivering EMDR by comparing attendance and completion rates with CBT; (3) to compare clinical outcomes between groups based on *intention-to-treat* analysis. Cases with missing data (n = 9; 16.4%) were dealt with using multiple imputation based on an expectation maximization method (Schafer & Olsden, 1998).

In step 1, we compared baseline characteristics between cases allocated to EMDR and CBT, using categorical (chi-square), parametric (*t*-tests) and non-parametric (Mann-Whitney U) tests according to the distribution of each variable.

In step 2, we compared the percentage of cases completing treatment (versus dropouts) and those that provided 6-month follow-up data between groups using chi-square analysis. We also compared the mean number of treatment sessions between groups using a Mann-Whitney U test, given the skewed distribution of data.

In step 3, we used longitudinal multilevel modelling to examine the change (growth trend) in OCD symptoms over time, using a 2-level model with repeated YBOCS measures (level 1) nested within cases (level 2). Following conventional model building guidelines (Singer & Willett, 2003), we started by examining an unconditional (no predictors) model to determine the level of variance explained at each level. We then added covariates to the model, considered different covariance structures, assessed polynomial functions (i.e, quadratic, cubic) of covariates and assessed impact on model fit. *Goodness of fit* was assessed using $-2 \log$ likelihood tests. After initial model checking, the primary analysis applied a 2-level linear growth model with unstructured covariance matrix. Covariates included baseline YBOCS severity, a group variable (CBT = reference category coded '0'; EMDR coded '1'), and a group*time interaction term which was defined as the main hypothesis test (changes in YBOCS over time across groups). Random effects included intercepts and time slopes.

This model was initially implemented up to the time when the treatment ended, and then extended to 6-months follow-up data. As a sensitivity analysis, the same approach was applied using a 3-level model with therapists as the third-level random effects.

Raw means and standard deviations were used to calculate effect sizes (Cohen's d) at post-treatment and 6 months follow-up, adjusting for unequal sample sizes.

Finally, we undertook some secondary and exploratory analyses. The numbers of cases attaining reliable and clinically significant improvement (RCSI) were compared between groups using chi-square analyses. A pre-post treatment reduction of 5 or more points plus a final score of YBOCS ≤ 13 has been taken to indicate RCSI in prior outcome studies (Diefenbach et al., 2015). Post-treatment scores in secondary outcome measures (OCI, PHQ-9, GAD-7, WSAS) were compared using Mann-Whitney U tests, given their skewed distribution.

We also assessed the rate of change in self-reported anxiety levels (GAD-7) up to session 16, by fitting non-linear growth trends in weekly time-series data for each treatment group. A cubic polynomial term was chosen based on the theoretical assumption that in-vivo exposure could increase anxiety before eventually leading to symptomatic improvements, thus potentially following an s-shaped (cubic) trend.

RESULTS

Random allocation and sample characteristics

The CONSORT diagram in Figure 1 summarises the flow of participants through different stages of the trial. A total of 154 patients were contacted as part of the recruitment process, of whom 55 eligible and consenting participants were randomized and treated (EMDR = 29; CBT = 26). Table 1 presents sample characteristics for

trial participants; 61.8% were females, 41.8% were unemployed, 90.4% were of white British background, with a mean age of 32.04 (SD = 12.67) and mean YBOCS of 25.82 (SD = 6.40). Baseline severity estimates for secondary measures are also listed in Table 1. Statistical comparisons between the EMDR and CBT groups indicated no significant differences in any demographic or clinical characteristics (all $p > .05$). Therefore, randomization was adequate and yielded comparable samples.

[Table 1]

Feasibility analysis

As shown in Table 2, the mean number of treatment sessions was 10.49 (SD = 6.18), with no significant differences between groups; $U(55) = 366.50$, $p = .86$. Overall, 61.8% of participants completed their agreed number of treatment sessions (30.9% dropped out), with no significant differences in completion status between groups; $\chi^2(1) = 0.35$, $p = .55$. Similarly, 83.6% of cases provided 6 months follow-up data, with no significant differences in loss to follow-up between groups; $\chi^2(1) = 2.71$, $p = .10$.

[Table 2]

Comparison of clinical outcomes

The primary multilevel modelling indicated no significant main effects for the group*time interaction term at post-treatment ($B = -1.28$, $SE = 0.88$, $p = .16$) or at 6 months follow-up ($B = -0.11$, $SE = 0.42$, $p = .80$). Main effects for time (post-treatment $B = -2.66$, $SE = 0.63$; 6 months $B = -0.89$, $SE = 0.30$) and baseline YBCOS (post-treatment $B = 0.63$, $SE = 0.09$; 6 months $B = 0.57$, $SE = 0.10$) were statistically significant in

all models (all $p < .001$). Figure 2 shows the gradual change in YBOCS at each of the measurement points; confidence intervals (dashed curves surrounding linear growth trends) clearly overlap for both treatment groups. These results were unchanged in sensitivity analyses controlling for therapist effects; main effects for group*time at post-treatment: $B = -1.28$, $SE = 0.88$, $p = .16$; 6 months: $B = -0.11$, $SE = 0.44$, $p = .80$; level-3 random effects: $Z = 1.31$, $p = .19$.

[Figure 2]

The YBOCS effect sizes were $d = -0.24$ ($p = .38$) post-treatment and $d = -0.03$ at 6 months follow-up ($p = .90$); where the negative sign favours the control group (CBT). Raw means used in effect size calculations are presented in Table 2, along with post-treatment estimates for secondary outcome measures, none of which were significantly different between groups (all $p > .05$). The proportions of cases attaining RCSI criteria were higher in the CBT group, though not statistically significant post-treatment ($p = .14$) or at 6 months follow-up ($p = .57$). Figure 3 shows non-linear growth curves for weekly changes in anxiety symptoms across groups; there was no evidence of differential trends in the rate of change at early or later phases of treatment.

[Figure 3]

DISCUSSION

Main findings

This pragmatic trial is the first experimental demonstration that EMDR is feasible and safe to apply as a treatment for obsessive-compulsive disorder in routine clinical care, by comparison to CBT. Attendance and completion rates were similar across groups,

indicating that EMDR was as well tolerated as CBT. Our analyses indicated that there were no significant differences between treatments in any of the outcome measures post-treatment or at 6 months follow-up. We note, however, that this trial was not powered to detect small outcome differences between treatments (if these exist). Our preliminary effect size calculations yielded a small effect favouring CBT ($d = -0.24$), though this was not statistically significant and virtually disappeared at 6 months follow-up ($d = -0.03$). Furthermore, CBT cases were not more prone to dropout and we found no evidence that CBT cases experienced more intense anxiety at the early sessions of treatment by comparison to EMDR cases. These findings challenge the popular clinical notion that exposure can lead people to feel worse before they get better (Richard & Lauterbach, 2006).

Strengths and limitations

By comparison to earlier case-series, we recruited patients accessing a routine primary care setting and took steps to mitigate selection bias (such as screening waitlist records). We note that a considerable number of patients approached for screening did not consent to this (89 of 154; 58%). Nevertheless, the pre-treatment YBOCS mean (25.8) for the sample included in the trial was within the range of symptom severity reported in prior trials (21.8 to 28.7; reviewed by Fisher & Wells, 2005), so our sample was comparable to previous studies.

An important limitation concerns the sample size, which does not rule out the possibility that there could be small differences between treatments. The post-treatment effect size reported in this study could be used to calculate a sample size for future non-inferiority trial designs. The funding and time constraints of this study did not enable us to undertake more stringent fidelity checks, such as ratings of video recorded sessions to assess adherence and competence of treatment delivery. This is also an important limitation, as we cannot be sure about the extent to which the interventions were

delivered with competence and fidelity to the respective treatment manuals. We note, however, that meta-analytic evidence indicates that there are no significant differences in effect sizes between OCD trials with and without treatment integrity checks (Olatunji et al., 2013). Like most prior OCD trials (Eddy, Dutra, Bradley, & Western, 2004; Rosa-Alcázar, Sánchez-Meca, Gómez-Conesa, & Marín-Martínez, 2008), this study was also limited by a relatively brief follow-up period which did not enable us to assess the maintenance of improvements beyond 6 months after treatment.

Implications for theory and research

Acknowledging the need for further replication in larger samples, the current evidence indicates that EMDR and CBT attain similar outcomes in the treatment of OCD. It is likely that some of the clinical effect in both interventions could be explained by common factors. For example, meta-analyses of several studies demonstrate that psychotherapy outcomes are influenced by the degree to which therapists are empathic (Elliott, Bohart, Watson, & Greenberg, 2011), foster a positive therapeutic alliance (Horvath, Del Re, Flückiger, & Symonds, 2011), enhance patients' expectations (Constantino et al., 2011) and motivation to change (Norcross, Krebs, & Prochaska, 2011). Indeed, practice guidelines for OCD discuss the importance of these common factors to enhance collaboration and therapeutic change (Koran et al., 2007).

Although common factors are important, previous studies comparing CBT with other active treatments or psychological placebo controls (relaxation training, stress and anxiety management) have reported small but statistically significant advantages favouring CBT (Olatunji et al., 2013). This leads us to think that common factors (presumed to be present in active control conditions) may offer a facilitative and therapeutic context within which specific change processes can be employed to enhance OCD symptom improvements.

The technical differences between treatments in this trial are not enlightening in this regard, since EMDR patients improved without being directed towards in-vivo exposure and CBT patients improved without bilateral stimulation or the processing of past memories. On the other hand, it is plausible that EMDR and CBT apply similar change processes, which are more specific than the common facilitative factors described above.

The most apparent shared change mechanism is that of exposure to anxiety-provoking stimuli, which EMDR applies *imaginally* (i.e., in imagination) and CBT applies both imaginally and in-vivo (Foa et al., 2012). Previous studies have shown that treatments that combine in-vivo plus imaginal exposure attain better outcomes than exposure in-vivo alone (Rosa-Alcázar et al., 2008). Hence it is possible that imaginal exposure is a key shared component that enhances therapeutic change. Wolpe described the successful treatment of anxiety through imaginal exposure as early as the 1950's (Wolpe, 1958), leading to the eventual development of *emotional processing theory* which informs –to some extent– the hypothesis of systematic desensitization that is common to EMDR and ERP. From this perspective, one possible explanation for our results is that patients in both groups attained some degree of desensitization to obsessional thoughts, and (repeated and prolonged) imaginal exposure is sufficient to achieve this. In fact, both treatments aim to observe within-session-habituation, as reported by the patient in subjective units of distress.

Even though emotional processing theory is still widely accepted by clinicians, there are some contradictory findings that challenge the basic tenets of habituation. For example, studies have shown that within-session-habituation does not necessarily correlate with longer term anxiety reduction (Baker et al., 2010), fears can often be spontaneously reinstated after extinction (Craske & Mystkowski, 2006), and successful fear reduction can occur in the absence of exposure (Rachman, Craske, Tallman, & Solyom, 1986). An alternative

perspective could be offered by contemporary theories on the mechanisms of fear acquisition and inhibitory learning. Supported by numerous laboratory and clinical studies (see Craske et al., 2014), *inhibitory learning theory* posits that a learned association between conditioned and unconditioned stimuli (CS-US) is not entirely eradicated during extinction (i.e., during exposure procedures). The original CS-US pairing is left intact as a memory, while a new and secondary learning set is formed (CS no-US) that serves to inhibit and effectively compete against the original set. Concerning OCD treatment, it is possible that CBT (ERP results in disconfirmation of feared expectations) and EMDR (installation of a positive cognition competes against feared expectations) facilitate inhibitory learning in slightly different ways, which accounts for distress reduction over time with secondary gains in self-efficacy and functioning. Overall, aside from common facilitative factors, it is plausible that both EMDR and CBT rely extensively on shared change mechanisms such as exposure and reappraisal strategies. While our theoretical interpretations are largely speculative, future studies could aim to investigate possible mechanisms of action which may be common to treatments that involve imaginal exposure and inhibitory learning processes for the treatment of OCD.

In conclusion, both treatments studied in this trial had similar effects in the treatment of OCD, although it is important to remark that some patients dropped out and did not attain symptom improvements. It is possible that some may find one or the other treatment more tolerable, credible or acceptable. Future qualitative studies focusing on acceptability and investigations of mechanisms of change may help us to better understand how to maximise the effectiveness of psychological treatments for OCD.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We gratefully acknowledge the following colleagues who supported the development and conduct of the trial: John Marr, Alexander Teahan, Rebecca Forster, Clare Burdekin, Sally Downie, Kirsteen Johnson, Laura Johnson, Naomi Kirby, Ian McAleer, Janet Thomson, Matthew Garner, Lorraine McLaren, Nicole Connor, Linda Dobrzanska and Bernie Bell.

The ECO Trial (EMDR vs. CBT for OCD) was funded by Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Trust. The funding organisation had no role in the design of the trial or the decision to publish the results.

REFERENCES

- Abramowitz, J. S. (1997). Effectiveness of psychological and pharmacological treatments for obsessive-compulsive disorder: a quantitative review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65*(1), 44–52. DOI: 10.1037/0022-006X.65.1.44
- Abramowitz, J. S. (1998). Does cognitive-behavioral therapy cure obsessive-compulsive disorder? A meta-analytic evaluation of clinical significance. *Behavior Therapy, 29*, 339–355. DOI: 10.1016/S0005-7894(98)80012-9
- Abramowitz, J. S., Taylor, S., & McKay, D. (2005). Potentials and limitations of cognitive therapy for obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy, 34*, 140-147. DOI: 10.1080/16506070510041202
- Abramowitz, J. S., Taylor, S., & McKay, D. (2009). Obsessive-compulsive disorder. *The Lancet, 374*, 491–499. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60240-3
- Baer, L., Brown-Beasley, M. W., Sorce, J., & Henriques, A. I. (1993). Computer-assisted telephone administration of a structured interview for obsessive-compulsive disorder. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 150*, 1737–1738. DOI: 10.1176/ajp.150.11.1737
- Baker, A., Mystkowski, J., Culver, N., Yi, R., Mortazavi, A., & Craske, M. G. (2010). Does habituation matter? Emotional processing theory and exposure therapy for acrophobia. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 48*(11), 1139–1143. DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2010.07.009

Bekkers, A.F.M.I. (1999). Enige ervaringen met EMDR bij dwang. In: Haaijman, W.P., Diepstraten, Ph.H.J., van Schevikhoven, R.E.O. (eds), *Ongewoon en anders. 25 jaar kliniek Overwaal te Lent*.

Bisson, J. I., Ehlers, A., Matthews, R., Pilling, S., Richards, D., & Turner, S. (2007). Psychological treatments for chronic post-traumatic stress disorder: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *190*, 97–104. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.bp.106.021402

Bohm, K., Volderholzer, U, (2010) Use of EMDR in the Treatment of Obsessive Compulsive Disorder: A Case Series. *Verhaltenstherapie*, *20*, 175-181. DOI: 10.1159/000319439

Constantino, M. J., Glass, C. R., Arnkoff, D. B., Ametrano, R. M., & Smith, J. Z. (2011). Expectations. In J. C. Norcross (Ed.), *Psychotherapy relationships that work: Evidence-based responsiveness* (2nd ed., pp. 354 –376). New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Craig, P., Dieppe, P., Macintyre, S., Michie, S., Nazareth, I., & Petticrew, M. (2008). Developing and evaluating complex interventions: The new Medical Research Council guidance. *British Medical Journal*, *337*, a1655. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.a1655

Craske, M. G., Treanor, M., Conway, C. C., Zbozinek, T., & Vervliet, B. (2014). Maximizing exposure therapy: An inhibitory learning approach. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *58*, 10–23. DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2014.04.006

Craske, M. G., & Mystkowski, J. (2006). Exposure therapy and extinction: clinical studies. In M. G. Craske, D. Hermans, & D. Vansteenwegen (Eds.), *Fear and learning: Basic science to clinical application*. Washington, DC: APA Books.

Davidson, P.R., Parker, K.C. (2001). Eye movement desensitization and reprocessing (EMDR): a meta-analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 69*, 305–316. DOI: 10.1037/0022-006X.69.2.305

De Silva, P., Marks, M. (1999). The role of traumatic experiences in the genesis of obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 37*, 941-951. DOI: 10.1016/S0005-7967(98)00185-5

Diefenbach, G.J., Wootton, B.M., Bragdon, L.B., Moshier, S.J., Tolin, D.F. (2015). Treatment Outcome and Predictors of Internet Guided Self-Help for Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. *Behavior Therapy, 46*, 764-774. DOI: 10.1016/j.beth.2015.06.001

Eddy, K. T., Dutra, L., Bradley, R., & Westen, D. (2004). A multidimensional meta-analysis of psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy for obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Clinical Psychology Review, 24*, 1011–1030. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpr.2004.08.004

Elliott, R., Bohart, A. C., Watson, J. C., & Greenberg, L. S. (2011). Empathy. *Psychotherapy, 48*, 43-49. DOI: 10.1037/a0022187

Fisher, P.L., & Wells, A. (2005). How effective are cognitive and behavioral treatments for obsessive-compulsive disorder? A clinical significance analysis. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 43*, 1543–1558. DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2004.11.007

Foa, E.B., Kozak, M.J., Salkovskis, P.M., Coles, M.E., Amir, N. (1998). The validation of a new obsessive-compulsive disorder scale: The Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 10*(3), 206-214. DOI: 10.1037/1040-3590.10.3.206

Foa, E. B., Liebowitz, M. R., Kozak, M. J., Davies, S., Campeas, R., Franklin, M. E., Huppert, J. D., Kjernisted, K., Rowan, V., Schmidt, A.

B., Simpson, H. B., & Tu, X. (2005). Treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder by exposure and ritual prevention, clomipramine, and their combination: a randomized, placebo controlled trial. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *162*, 151–161. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.162.1.151

Foa, E.B., Yadin, E., & Lichner, T.K. (2012). *Exposure and Response (Ritual) Prevention for Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Goodman, W. K., Price L. H., Rasmussen, S. A., Mazure, C., Fleishmann, R. L., Hill, C. L., Heninger, G.R., Charney, D.S. (1989). The Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale. I. Development, use and reliability. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *46*, 1006-1011.

Helzer, J. E., Robins, L. N., & McEvoy, L. (1987). Posttraumatic stress disorder in the general population: Findings of the Epidemiologic Catchment Area Survey. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *317*, 1630-1634. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM198712243172604

Horvath, A., Del Re, A. C., Flückiger, C., & Symonds, D. (2011). Alliance in individual psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*, *48*, 9-16. DOI: 10.1037/a0022186

Jordan, B. K., Schlenger, W. E., Hough, R., Kulka, R. A., Weiss, D., & Fairbank, J. A. (1991). Lifetime and current prevalence of specific psychiatric disorders among Vietnam veterans and controls. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *48*, 207-215. DOI: 10.1001/archpsyc.1991.01810270019002

Keenan, P., Keenan, L., Ingham, C., and Farrell, D. (2014). *Treating obsessive compulsive disorder using eye movement desensitisation and reprocessing (EMDR): A case series design*. In: EMDR research

symposium. Symposium presented at 15th EMDR Europe Association Conference, Edinburgh, Scotland

Koran LM, Hanna GL, Hollander E, Nestadt G, Simpson HB. (2007). Practice guideline for the treatment of patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 164, 5-53.

Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B. W. (2001). The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 16, 606–613. DOI: 10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x

Marr, J. (2012). EMDR treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder: Preliminary research. *Journal of EMDR Practice and Research*, 6, 2-15. DOI: 10.1891/1933-3196.6.1.2

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. (2005). *Obsessive-compulsive disorder: Core interventions in the treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder and body dysmorphic disorder*. London: NICE.

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (2011). *Common Mental Health Disorders: identification and pathways to care*. London: National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health.

Nazari, H., Momeni, N., Jariani, M., Mohammad, JT. (2011). Comparison of eye movement desensitization and reprocessing with citalopram in treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Clinical Practice*, 15, 270-274. DOI: 10.3109/13651501.2011.590210

Norcross, J. C., Krebs, P. M., & Prochaska, J. O. (2011). Stages of change. In J. C. Norcross (Ed.), *Psychotherapy relationships that work:*

Evidence-based responsiveness (2nd ed., pp. 279 –300). New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Olatunji, B. O., Davis, M. L., Powers, M. B., & Smits, J. A. (2013). Cognitive-behavioral therapy for obsessive-compulsive disorder: A meta-analysis of treatment outcome and moderators. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *47*, 33–41. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpsychires.2012.08.020

Ponniah, K., Magiati, I., & Hollon, S. D. (2013). An update on the efficacy of psychological treatments for obsessive-compulsive disorder in adults. *Journal of Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders*, *2*, 207-218. DOI: 10.1016/j.jocrd.2013.02.005

Rachman, S. J., Craske, M. G., Tallman, K., & Solyom, C. (1986). Does escape behaviour strengthen agoraphobic avoidance? A replication. *Behavior Therapy*, *17*, 366–384. DOI: 10.1016/S0005-7894(86)80069-7

Richard, D. C. S., & Lauterbach, D. L. (2006). *Handbook of exposure therapies*. New York: Academic Press

Rosa-Alcázar AI, Sánchez-Meca J, Gómez-Conesa A, Marín-Martínez F. (2008). Psychological treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder: a meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *28*, 1310-25. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpr.2008.07.001

Rowa, K., Antony, M. M., Summerfeldt, L. J., Purdon, C., Young, L. and Swinson, R. P. (2007). Office-based vs. home-based behavioral treatment for obsessive-compulsive disorder: a preliminary study. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, *45*, 1883–1892. DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2007.02.009

- Schafer, J. L., & Olsden, M. K. (1998). Multiple imputation for multivariate missing-data problems: A data analyst's perspective. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 33, 545-571. DOI: 10.1207/s15327906mbr3304_5
- Shapiro, F. (2001). *Eye Movement desensitization and reprocessing: Basic principles, protocols, and procedures*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Shapiro, F., Forrest, M. (2004). *EMDR: The breakthrough therapy for overcoming anxiety, stress and trauma*. New York: Perseus Books Group.
- Sheehan, D., Lecrubier, Y., Sheehan, K., Amorim, P. & Janavs, J. (1998). The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI): the development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV and ICD-10. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 59, 22-33.
- Singer, J., & Willett, J. (2003). *Applied longitudinal data analysis: Modeling change and event occurrence*. New York: Oxford University.
- Spitzer, R., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B. W., & Lowe, B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: The GAD-7. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 166, 1092-1097. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092
- Steketee, G. (1993). Social support and treatment outcome of obsessive compulsive disorder at 9-month follow-up. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 21, 81-95. DOI: 10.1017/S014134730001805X

Steketee, G., Frost, R., & Bogart, K. (1996). The Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale: Interview versus self-report. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 34, 675-684. DOI: 10.1016/0005-7967(96)00036-8

van Balkom, A. J. L. M., van Oppen, P., Vermeulen, A. W. A., van Dyck, R., Nauta, M. C. E., & Vorst, H. C. M. (1994). A meta-analysis on the treatment of obsessive compulsive disorder: a comparison of antidepressants, behavior, and cognitive therapy. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 14, 359-381. DOI: 10.1016/0272-7358(94)90033-7

van Oppen, P., Emmelkamp, P.M.G., van Balkom, A.J.L.M., and van Dyck, R. (1995). The Sensitivity to Change of Measures for Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 9, 241-248. DOI: 10.1016/0887-6185(95)00005-9

Van Etten, M.L., Taylor, S. (1998). Comparative efficacy of treatments for post-traumatic stress disorder: a meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 5, 126-144. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-0879(199809)5:3<126::AID-CPP153>3.0.CO;2-H

Wolpe, J. (1958). *Psychotherapy by reciprocal inhibition*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Figure 1. CONSORT diagram






Figure 2. Linear growth trends and confidence intervals for YBOCS measures



[Figure legend]

Solid lines = YBOCS linear growth trend; dashed curves = 95% confidence intervals; EMDR = eye-movement desensitization and reprocessing; CBT = cognitive behavioural therapy; f/up = follow-up

Figure 3. Non-linear growth trends and confidence intervals for weekly anxiety (GAD-7) measures



[Figure legend]

Solid curves = GAD-7 cubic growth trend; dashed curves = 95% confidence intervals; EMDR = eye-movement desensitization and reprocessing; CBT = cognitive behavioural therapy

Table 1. Sample characteristics and comparisons between groups

	Full sample N = 55 (100%)	EMDR group N = 29 (52.7%)	CBT group N = 26 (47.3%)	test statistic	p
Demographics					
Females	34 (61.8)	17 (58.6)	17 (65.4)	$\chi^2(1)=0.26$.61
Mean age (SD)	32.04 (12.67)	30.90 (9.79)	33.31 (15.37)	U(55)=376.00	.99
Unemployed	23 (41.8)	14 (48.3)	17 (65.4)	$\chi^2(1)=1.05$.31
Ethnicity*					
White British	47 (90.4)	23 (88.5)	24 (92.3)	$\chi^2(1)=0.22$.64
Other	5 (9.6)	3 (11.5)	2 (7.7)		
Baseline severity measures					
YBOCS mean (SD)	25.82 (6.40)	25.07 (6.23)	26.65 (6.61)	$t(53)=0.92$.36
OCI mean (SD)	71.13 (30.19)	73.93 (28.94)	68.12 (31.80)	$t(50)=-0.69$.49
PHQ-9 mean (SD)	12.40 (6.58)	11.86 (6.30)	13.04 (6.98)	$t(50)=0.64$.52
GAD-7 mean (SD)	14.38 (5.06)	13.64 (5.45)	15.25 (4.53)	U(52)=283.50	.33
WSAS mean (SD)	18.51 (10.21)	17.81 (10.19)	19.29 (10.39)	$t(49)=0.51$.61

CBT = cognitive behavioural therapy; EMDR = eye movement desensitization and reprocessing; YBOCS = Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale; OCI = Obsessive Compulsive Inventory; PHQ-9 = measure of depression symptoms; GAD-7 = measure of anxiety symptoms; WSAS = work and social adjustment scale; t = Student's t-test; U = Mann-Whitney U test; χ^2 = Chi-square test; * percentages exclude 3 cases with missing data

Table 2. Comparison of treatment outcomes between groups

	Full sample N = 55 (100%)	EMDR group N = 29 (52.7%)	CBT group N = 26 (47.3%)	test statistic	p
Attendance and follow-up data					
Mean treatment sessions (SD)	10.49 (6.18)	10.17 (6.63)	10.85 (5.73)	U(55)=366.50	.86
Completion status*					
Completed	34 (61.8)	17 (58.6)	17 (65.4)	$\chi^2(1)= 0.35$.55
Dropped out	17 (30.9)	10 (34.5)	7 (26.9)		
Referred onwards	4 (7.3)	2 (6.9)	2 (7.7)		
Assessed @6 months follow-up	46 (83.6)	22 (75.9)	24 (92.3)	$\chi^2(1)= 2.71$.10
Outcomes data					
Post-treatment outcomes					
YBOCS mean (SD)	17.75 (8.69)	18.72 (8.01)	16.65 (9.43)	$t(53)= -0.88$.38
YBOCS RCSI**	16/53 (30.2)	6/28 (21.4)	10/25 (40.0)	$\chi^2(1)= 2.16$.14
OCI mean (SD)	46.78 (35.22)	47.90 (33.24)	45.54 (37.93)	U(55)=403.50	.66
PHQ-9 mean (SD)	7.64 (7.03)	7.55 (6.99)	7.73 (7.20)	U(55)=370.00	.91
GAD-7 mean (SD)	8.96 (6.09)	9.14 (6.18)	8.77 (6.10)	U(55)=390.00	.83
WSAS mean (SD)	10.91 (9.76)	11.17 (9.33)	10.62 (10.40)	U(55)=402.00	.67
6 months follow-up outcomes ♦					
Mean YBOCS score (SD)	18.09 (9.55)	18.24 (8.59)	17.92 (10.69)	$t(53)= -0.12$.90
YBOCS RCSI**	15/53 (28.3)	7/28 (25.0)	8/25 (32.0)	$\chi^2(1)= 0.32$.57

CBT = cognitive behavioural therapy; EMDR = eye movement desensitization and reprocessing; YBOCS = Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale; OCI = Obsessive Compulsive Inventory; PHQ-9 = measure of depression symptoms; GAD-7 = measure of anxiety symptoms; WSAS = work and social adjustment scale; RCSI = reliable and clinically significant improvement; t = Student's t-test; U = Mann-Whitney U test; χ^2 = Chi-square test; * statistical comparisons made between completers vs. dropouts; ** comparisons made between cases that scored above YBOCS cut-off ≥ 16 ; ♦ calculated using imputed 6 months outcomes data