

This is a repository copy of *Threshold Analysis as an Alternative to GRADE for Assessing Confidence in Guideline Recommendations Based on Network Meta-Analyses*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/143486/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Phillippo, David, Dias, Sofia [orcid.org/0000-0002-2172-0221](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2172-0221), Welton, N J et al. (3 more authors) (2019) Threshold Analysis as an Alternative to GRADE for Assessing Confidence in Guideline Recommendations Based on Network Meta-Analyses. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. ISSN 0003-4819

<https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-3542>

---

**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](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

## Supplementary Tables

**Supplementary Table 1:** Thresholds for the social anxiety example for each contrast on the standardised mean difference (SMD) scale, sorted to show contrasts with smallest thresholds first. Only contrasts with SMD less than 2 are shown here; the full set can be obtained by running the R code provided in the supplementary material. NT = no threshold in this direction.

Contrast			Thresholds and new optimal treatments			
			Lower	Upper		
41	vs.	31	-	NT	0.46	36
41	vs.	23	-	NT	0.47	36
36	vs.	1	36	-0.48	15.17	7
36	vs.	16	36	-0.57	5.60	16
36	vs.	24	36	-0.69	6.34	25
41	vs.	2	-	NT	0.83	36
17	vs.	2	17	-0.86	51.18	12
13	vs.	2	13	-0.89	140.10	4
39	vs.	18	39	-0.94	3.96	36
38	vs.	21	38	-0.95	3.92	36
18	vs.	2	39	-0.96	9.32	36
23	vs.	2	23	-1.88	0.98	36
36	vs.	2	36	-1.02	35.15	18
16	vs.	2	36	-1.03	17.80	12
19	vs.	2	19	-1.06	30.23	23
25	vs.	24	25	-1.11	554.79	39
31	vs.	8	31	-13.74	1.15	36
34	vs.	1	34	-1.19	102.31	5
31	vs.	1	31	-15.58	1.20	36
32	vs.	30	32	-1.33	5.90	36
11	vs.	2	11	-1.42	856.47	34
9	vs.	2	9	-1.43	46.88	36
40	vs.	35	40	-1.48	3.17	36
30	vs.	24	30	-8.78	1.49	36
15	vs.	2	15	-1.52	49.81	23
22	vs.	2	22	-1.54	6.18	18
8	vs.	1	8	-1.98	1.55	36
8	vs.	6	8	-13.19	1.57	6
37	vs.	30	37	-1.74	7.20	36
8	vs.	7	8	-17.10	1.75	7
31	vs.	23	36	-1.79	2.11	23
21	vs.	2	21	-1.80	11.17	36
12	vs.	2	12	-1.97	59.88	36

**Supplementary Table 2:** Contrast level thresholds for the headaches example, in headache days per month. NT = no threshold in this direction.

Contrast		Thresholds and new optimal treatments				
			Lower	Upper		
2	vs. 1	2, 3, 6, 7	-0.17	NT	-	
4	vs. 1	3, 4, 6, 7	-0.82	11.89	3, 6, 7, 8	
5	vs. 1	3, 5, 6, 7	-0.68	24.05	2, 3, 6, 7	
6	vs. 1	-	NT	0.14	3, 6, 7, 8	
7	vs. 1	3, 7	-1.05	0.64	3, 6, 7, 8	
8	vs. 1	3, 6, 7, 8	-0.09	NT	-	
6	vs. 3	6, 7	-0.45	0.40	3, 7	
7	vs. 6	3, 7	-0.52	1.12	3, 6	

**Supplementary Table 3:** Study level thresholds for the headaches example, in headache days per month.  
 NT = no threshold in this direction.

Study	Thresholds and new optimal treatments			
		Lower	Upper	
Diener 2009 (1)	-	NT	0.17	2, 3, 6, 7
Diener 2009 (2)	2, 3, 6, 7	-0.17	NT	-
Apostol 2008 (1)	3, 6, 7, 8	-7.15	0.82	3, 4, 6, 7
Apostol 2008 (4)	3, 4, 6, 7	-2.99	5.01	3, 6, 7, 8
Apostol 2008 (4)	3, 4, 6, 7	-2.45	NT	-
Apostol 2008 (4)	3, 4, 6, 7	-2.08	7.99	3, 6, 7, 8
Brandes 2004 (1)	3, 6, 7, 8	-0.65	NT	-
Brandes 2004 (6)	-	NT	1.47	3, 6, 7, 8
Brandes 2004 (6)	-	NT	1.79	3, 6, 7, 8
Brandes 2004 (6)	-	NT	17.46	2, 3, 6, 7
Lewis 2009 (1)	3, 6, 7, 8	-1.50	NT	-
Lewis 2009 (6)	-	NT	2.28	3, 6, 7, 8
Lewis 2009 (6)	-	NT	3.51	3, 6, 7, 8
Lipton 2011 (1)	3, 6, 7, 8	-0.92	NT	-
Lipton 2011 (6)	-	NT	0.75	3, 6, 7, 8
Silberstein 2004 (1)	3, 6, 7, 8	-0.54	NT	-
Silberstein 2004 (6)	-	NT	1.83	3, 6, 7, 8
Silberstein 2004 (6)	-	NT	1.74	3, 6, 7, 8
Silberstein 2004 (6)	-	NT	1.65	3, 6, 7, 8
Winner 2005 (1)	3, 6, 7, 8	-1.49	NT	-
Winner 2005 (6)	-	NT	1.27	3, 6, 7, 8
Diener 2004 (1)	3, 6, 7, 8	-0.19	1.32	3, 7
Diener 2004 (6)	3, 6	-2.48	0.98	3, 7
Diener 2004 (6)	3, 6	-2.78	0.95	3, 7
Diener 2004 (7)	3, 7	-0.35	0.69	3, 6
Holroyd 2010 (1)	6, 7	-14.13	0.09	3, 6, 7, 8
Holroyd 2010 (8)	3, 6, 7, 8	-0.09	14.67	6, 7
Silberstein 2013 (5 vs. 1)	3, 5, 6, 7	-0.69	11.76	2, 3, 6, 7
Dodick 2009 (3 vs. 6)	3, 7	-0.39	0.44	6, 7