

Antidepressants might work for people with major depression: where do we go from here?



The publication of our updated network meta-analysis¹ about antidepressants for the acute treatment of major depression has generated a wide discussion in newspapers,^{2,3} social media,⁴ and scientific journals.⁵ Based on 522 trials and more than 116 000 patients, this network meta-analysis of 21 drugs and placebo represents the most comprehensive analysis of the evidence base ever undertaken. We take the opportunity of this Comment not to repeat our findings but to reflect on the implications of this research and, most importantly, on what needs to be done next to improve the outcome of patients with major depression.

Antidepressants can be, on average, an efficacious and acceptable treatment for adults with moderate-to-severe major depression in the acute phase of illness.¹ However, our analysis¹ is based on aggregate data from the included studies, so it cannot provide information to clinicians and patients about who will respond to which treatment and how well. Some patients will probably experience greater benefit from antidepressants, whereas others might have no benefit. Differences between antidepressants are small on average, but exceptions exist. The average response to placebo—defined in our analysis as a 50% reduction of depressive symptoms over an 8-week period—is 35%; by contrast, in the same trials, the average response to antidepressants ranges between 42% (reboxetine) and 53% (amitriptyline).

To be methodologically sound, any systematic review should answer a well defined, specific question. In our network meta-analysis,¹ we specifically addressed the issues of efficacy and acceptability of antidepressants for acutely ill patients because a priority for most people who are acutely unwell is to get better. We are also running parallel projects to investigate the profile of specific adverse events for each drug, the dose-response association, the long-term outcomes for each drug, treatment-resistant depression, and the efficacy and acceptability of non-pharmacological interventions for depression: medicines are not the only effective treatment for major depression. All this information is needed to guide the shared decision-making process between patients, carers, and clinicians. Our network meta-analysis might be only part of the full picture, but it provides the

best available evidence to inform clinical practice. Would anybody feel that these data were valueless if the topic were cancer,⁶ hypertension, or stroke?

Overall, we were impressed by the interest and meticulousness of the media coverage (once reading beyond the headlines), but inevitably some coverage in the media and social platforms was inaccurate—in particular, there was an undue focus on the binary and polarising question of clinical significance. People can always manipulate information to fuel controversy and this appears to occur frequently in the stigmatised area of mental health. We firmly believe that the best approach to dealing with stigma and entrenched beliefs is by improving knowledge and understanding about mental disorders. There are some grounds to believe that the large-scale evidence we reported might have helped people to overcome resistance to talking in public about major depression and their personal treatment experience. One of the most remarkable phenomena was the powerful upsurge of the patient's voice via the Twitter hashtags #MedsWorkedForMe and #MedsDidntWorkForMe. "I think seeing people you look up to publicly admitting to their depression and anxiety helps you realise you're not alone and sharing real advice on what works for them—drugs, mental exercises or whatever—is probably one of the most powerful things someone can do", one Twitter user said.⁷

It took us more than 6 years to collect all the published and unpublished data included in the analyses. In the spirit of open science and transparency, we have made the data freely available. We committed to do this when drafting the review protocol, not only because we would like others to check the robustness and accuracy of our findings, but also because we think that open science provides an opportunity to build the interdisciplinary and collaborative networks that make optimum use of resources, including secondary analysis of existing datasets. Open science is a hugely promising way to facilitate reproduction and hence the reliability of science, and to increase the speed of progress.⁸

WHO, the Nordic Trial Alliance, and the US Institute of Medicine recently called for a transformation of the existing scientific culture to one where "data sharing is the expected norm".⁹ Open access to data from clinical

Lancet Psychiatry 2018

Published Online

April 5, 2018

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30133-0)

[S2215-0366\(18\)30133-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30133-0)

For more on open science and the availability of our data see <https://www.elsevier.com/connect/open-science-data-from-largest-meta-analysis-of-antidepressants-available>

trials at the individual patient level is not yet a reality. Such data are indispensable to answer the next, most crucial questions: how much do patients differ in their response and are there predictors of better response in specific patients and with specific drugs? We are confident that once patients' privacy and confidential commercial information are protected, we should be able to do with randomised data what we can already do with observational data from national registries.¹⁰

While new methods of synthesising evidence are developed to support timely decision making,¹¹ new barriers, including national data protection laws or controlled access to trial data, need to be tackled soon and internationally. Some pharmaceutical companies and study authors are already able to share individual patient data: this means that it must be possible to do more generally. If the substantial incentives of open science are not strong enough to motivate action, then it will need to be made mandatory. Funders, regulatory agencies, and scientific journals should support this and could play an active role in facilitating the process. Access to individual patient data makes it possible to carry out individual patient data network meta-analyses.¹² We believe this should be the next step. This approach would be a powerful step towards enabling personalised treatment in psychiatry. Of course, we also need better treatments for depression. Access to all the current data will get us so far, but we also need treatments that, whether pharmacological or non-pharmacological, are more precisely targeted at mechanism and better tolerated.

*Andrea Cipriani, Georgia Salanti, Toshi A Furukawa, Matthias Egger, Stefan Leucht, Henricus G Ruhe, Erick H Turner, Lauren Z Atkinson, Anna Chaimani, Julian P T Higgins, Yusuke Ogawa, Nozomi Takeshima, Yu Hayasaka, Hissei Imai, Kiyomi Shinohara, Aran Tajika, John P A Ioannidis, John R Geddes

Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK (ACi, HGR, LZA, JRG); Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, Warneford Hospital, Oxford OX3 7JX, UK (ACi, JRG); Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland (GS, ME); Department of Health Promotion and Human Behavior, Kyoto University Graduate School of Medicine and School of Public Health, Kyoto, Japan (TAF, YO, NT, YH, HI, KS, AT); Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, TU-Munich, Munich, Germany (SL); Department of Psychiatry, Radboud University Nijmegen, Nijmegen, Netherlands (HGR); Behavioral Health and Neurosciences Division, VA Portland Health Care System, Portland, OR, USA (EHT); Department of Psychiatry and Department of Pharmacology,

Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR, USA (EHT); INSERM, UMR1153 Epidemiology and Statistics, Sorbonne Paris Cité Research Center (CRESS), METHODS Team, Paris & French Cochrane Center, Paris, France (ACH); School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK (JPTH); Department of Medicine, Department of Health Research and Policy, and Department of Biomedical Data Science, Stanford University School of Medicine and Department of Statistics, Stanford University School of Humanities and Sciences, and Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA (JPAI) andrea.cipriani@psych.ox.ac.uk

ACi is supported by the NIHR Oxford cognitive health Clinical Research Facility. JRG is an NIHR Senior Investigator. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the UK National Health Service, the NIHR, or the UK Department of Health. TAF has received lecture fees from Eli Lilly, Janssen, Meiji, Mitsubishi-Tanabe, MSD, and Pfizer and consultancy fees from Takeda Science Foundation. He has received research support from Mochida and Mitsubishi-Tanabe. SL has received honoraria for consulting and advisory boards from Alkermes, Eli Lilly, Janssen, Johnson & Johnson, Lundbeck, MedAvante, Roche, Otsuka, and Teva; lecture honoraria from AstraZeneca, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Eli Lilly, Janssen, Johnson & Johnson, Lundbeck (Institute), Pfizer, Sanofi-Aventis, ICON, AbbVie, AOP Orphan, and Servier; for the preparation of educational material and publications from Lundbeck Institute and Roche; and Eli Lilly has provided medication for a trial with SL as the primary investigator. NT has received lecture fees from Otsuka and Meiji. YH has received lecture fees from Yoshitomi. All other authors declare no competing interests.

- 1 Cipriani A, Furukawa TA, Salanti G, et al. Comparative efficacy and acceptability of 21 antidepressant drugs for the acute treatment of adults with major depressive disorder: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2018; published online Feb 20. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)32802-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32802-7).
- 2 Carroll AE. Do antidepressants work? The most comprehensive study on them has recently been published, showing mostly modest effects. *The New York Times* (New York, NY), March 12, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/12/upshot/do-antidepressants-work.html> (accessed March 28, 2018).
- 3 Boseley S. The drugs do work: antidepressants are effective, study shows. *The Guardian* (London), Feb 21, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2018/feb/21/the-drugs-do-work-antidepressants-are-effective-study-shows> (accessed March 28, 2018).
- 4 Tomlin A. Antidepressants can help adults with major depression. *The Mental Elf*. Feb 22, 2018. <https://www.nationalelfservice.net/treatment/antidepressants-antidepressants-can-help-adults-with-major-depression/> (accessed March 28, 2018).
- 5 McCormack J, Korownyk C. Effectiveness of antidepressants. *BMJ* 2018; **360**: k1073.
- 6 Post RM. Preventing the malignant transformation of bipolar disorder. *JAMA* 2018; published online March 5. DOI:10.1001/jama.2018.0322.
- 7 Colin P (@colinTDF). I think seeing people you look up to publicly admitting to their depression and anxiety helps you realise you're not alone and sharing real advice on what works for them - drugs, mental exercises or whatever - is probably one of the most powerful things someone can do. Feb 22, 2018, 0506 h GMT. Tweet.
- 8 Geddes JR, Mackay C, Lee WH, Cipriani A. Open science in neuropsychiatry: mental health and dementia. *OpenScience EU*. June, 2016. http://www.openscienceeu.com/uploads/1/8/2/9/18296189/june_2016_page_to_view.pdf (accessed March 28, 2018).
- 9 Loder E, Groves T. The BMJ requires data sharing on request for all trials. *BMJ* 2015; **350**: h2373.
- 10 Lähteenvuo M, Tanskanen A, Taipale H, et al. Real-world effectiveness of pharmacologic treatments for the prevention of rehospitalization in a Finnish nationwide cohort of patients with bipolar disorder. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2018; published online Feb 28. DOI:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.4711.
- 11 Nikolakopoulou A, Mavridis D, Furukawa TA, et al. Living network meta-analysis compared with pairwise meta-analysis in comparative effectiveness research: empirical study. *BMJ* 2018; **360**: k585.
- 12 Furukawa TA, Schramm E, Weitz ES, et al. Cognitive-Behavioural Analysis System of Psychotherapy (CBASP), a drug, or their combination: differential therapeutics for persistent depressive disorder: a study protocol of an individual participant data network meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2016; **6**: e011769.