effective than both CBT alone SMD -0.78 (95% CI: -1.55 to -0.01) and psychodynamic therapy SMD -1.14 (95% CI: -2.20 to -0.08), but not more effective than fluoxetine alone SMD -0.22 (95% CI: -0.86 to 0.42). Fluoxetine, fluoxetine plus CBT and interpersonal therapy were all significantly more effective than psychological placebo.

Fluoxetine was associated with fewer dropouts than sertraline, imipramine, and desipramine.

The non-significant findings for other antidepressant monotherapies may in part simply reflect that there were more fluoxetine trials compared with trials for other antidepressants.

The authors highlight a number of limitations. Most of the included studies were of low or very low quality, and there was some evidence of publication bias. A further difficulty is the high placebo response rate in children.

Psychological placebo usually involves a non-directional and neutral discussion so satisfactory blinding may not be possible.

The authors conclude: 'The findings suggest that fluoxetine (alone or in combination with CBT) might be considered the best option to treat acute symptoms in children and adolescents with major depression.'

The NICE guideline currently recommends a psychological intervention for initial management of moderate to severe depression in children and adolescents,[1] and this may now need to be reviewed.

NICE recommends that antidepressant treatment should not be initiated in primary care.[1] Children and adolescents with moderate to severe depression should be referred to child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS).

DR PHILLIP BLAND

Zhou X, Teng T, Zhang Y et al. Comparative efficacy and acceptability of antidepressants, psychotherapies, and their combination for acute treatment of children and adolescents with depressive disorder: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2020; 7:581-601

REFERENCE

1 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. NG134. Depression in children and young people: identification and management. NICE. London. 2019

See also Special report: Optimising the management of depression in children, p21

Addiction

Patient safety incidents in opioid substitution therapy analysed

Errors in prescribing, supervised or non-supervised dispensing, and monitoring and communication, were responsible for patient safety incidents in opioid substitution treatment, a study from England and Wales has shown.

Data on patient safety incidents involving patients receiving either methadone or buprenorphine treatment in community services between 2005 and 2015 were extracted from the National Reporting and Learning System. This is a national database of patient safety incident reports maintained by the NHS in England and Wales.

Eligible reports were manually reviewed to check that they fitted study criteria, and the resulting study population comprised 2,284 safety incident reports.

Methadone was the most commonly reported drug (n = 1,862; 82%) followed by buprenorphine (n = 394; 17%) and buprenorphine and naloxone in combination (28; 1%).

Most incident reports from opioid substitution treatment came from failure in one of four processes of care delivery: non-supervised dispensing (n = 1,544) examples included dispensing incorrect doses and dispensing to the wrong patient; supervised dispensing (n = 318) e.g. incorrect dose, wrong patient and failure to supervise consumption; monitoring and communication (n = 248) e.g. failing to stop dispensing when appropriate; and prescribing opioid substitution treatment (n = 151) e.g. incomplete or inaccurate prescriptions and prescriptions for the wrong dose.

For incidents associated with harm, prescribing opioid substitution had the highest proportion (14 of 151; 9%), followed by monitoring and communication-related incidents (22 of 284; 8%), and failures with supervised dispensing (24 of 318; 8%). Non-supervised dispensing had the lowest proportion resulting in harm (57 of 1,544; 4%).

Overall, 94% (n = 2,155) of incidents resulted in no harm, while 6% (n = 129) caused low or moderate harm to the patient. There were no incidents resulting in severe harm or death.

Contributory factors (categorised as staff; organisational; patient; medication storage and packaging; or information technology) were identified in 75% of incidents with 40% involving more than one factor.

Opioid substitution therapy is an effective harm reduction strategy in the management of opioid dependence and reduces illicit drug use and associated morbidity. Substitution therapy is widespread and evaluating the safety of treatment programmes is vital.

Based on their findings the authors conclude that priority areas to promote safe opioid substitution include prescriber education, implementing and strengthening electronic prescribing systems, strengthening dispensing and monitoring systems and developing specific procedural and educational interventions for pharmacy staff.

DR JEZ THOMPSON

Gibson R, McLeod N, Donaldson LJ et al. A mixed-methods analysis of patient safety incidents involving opioid substitution treatment with methadone or buprenorphine in community-based care in England and Wales. *Addiction* Epub ahead of print 9 March 2020 doi:10.1111/add.15039

We welcome your feedback

If you would like to comment on any of the clinical reviews write to: **editor@thepractitioner.co.uk**