




ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Drug and Alcohol Dependence

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/drugalcdp

Review

Continuing care for patients with alcohol use disorders: A systematic review[☆]Evelien Lenaerts^{a,*}, Catharina Mathei^a, Frieda Matthys^b, Dieter Zeeuws^b, Leo Pas^a, Peter Anderson^{c,d}, Bert Aertgeerts^a^a Academic Center for General Practice, Department of Public health and Primary Care, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Kapucijnenvoer 33, blok j, bus 7001, 3000 Leuven, Belgium^b University Hospital (UZ Brussel), Psychiatric Department, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (V.U.B.), Laarbeeklaan 101, 1090 Brussels, Belgium^c Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX, United Kingdom^d Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences, Maastricht University, P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD, Maastricht, The Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 21 August 2013

Received in revised form 9 October 2013

Accepted 31 October 2013

Available online 14 November 2013

Keywords:

Alcohol use disorders treatment

Substance use disorders treatment

Continuing care

Aftercare

Integrated care

ABSTRACT

Background: A chronic care perspective should be adopted in the treatment of patients with alcohol use disorders (AUDs). Initial treatment in a more intense psychiatric care setting should be followed by continuing care. This systematic review aims to identify effective continuing care interventions for patients with AUDs.**Methods:** Electronic databases were searched up to February 2013 (MEDLINE, EMBASE, CENTRAL, CINAHL and PsycINFO) to identify RCTs studying continuing care interventions for patients with AUDs. Study selection and quality appraisal was done independently by two reviewers. Drinking and treatment engagement outcomes were considered. Relative risks and mean differences were calculated with 95% confidence intervals. A statistical pooling of results was planned.**Results:** 20 trials out of 15,235 identified studies met the inclusion criteria. Only six were evaluated as methodologically strong enough and included for further analysis. Interventions ranged from telephone calls and nurse follow-up to various forms of individual or couples counseling. Four trials suggested that supplementing usual continuing care with an active intervention empowering the patient, could be beneficial to drinking outcomes. Effect sizes were limited and not consistent across all outcomes. Because of heterogeneity in the interventions and outcome measures, a meta-analysis could not be performed.**Conclusion:** For the treatment of a disease with such devastating consequences, it is remarkable how few high quality studies are available. Adding an active intervention to usual continuing care seems to improve treatment outcomes. We propose an integrated care program with different elements from the selected studies and discuss implications for further research.

© 2013 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

Contents

1. Introduction	10
2. Methods	10
2.1. Search strategy	10
2.2. Selection of studies	11
2.3. Quality appraisal	11
2.4. Data extraction and analysis	11
3. Results	11
3.1. Search results	11
3.2. Quality assessment	11
3.3. Description of included studies	11

[☆] Supplementary material can be found by accessing the online version of this paper. See Appendix A for more details.

* Corresponding author at: Academic Center for General Practice, Department of Public health and Primary Care, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Kapucijnenvoer 33, blok j, bus 7001, 3000 Leuven, Belgium. Tel.: +32 0 16 376 621; fax: +32 0 16 337 480.

E-mail addresses: evelien.lenaerts@med.kuleuven.be, lenaerts.evelien@gmail.com (E. Lenaerts).

3.3.1.	Participants	11
3.3.2.	Interventions	15
3.3.3.	Outcomes	16
3.3.4.	Effects of interventions	16
4.	Discussion	17
4.1.	Limited evidence available	17
4.2.	A tendency of efficacy	18
4.3.	Integrated continuing care	19
4.4.	Implications for research	19
4.5.	Weaknesses and strengths of the review	19
5.	Conclusion	20
	Role of funding source	20
	Contributors	20
	Conflict of interest	20
	Acknowledgements	20
	Appendix A. Supplementary data	20
	References	20

1. Introduction

Alcohol use disorders (AUDs) are a widespread problem worldwide (Rehm et al., 2012). They are often viewed as social or behavioral problems requiring regulations and law enforcement, rather than chronic medical disorders requiring ongoing care management (McLellan et al., 2000; Smith, 2012). However, increasing evidence suggests that AUDs are also a chronic health problem, presenting many similarities with other chronic diseases in heritability, course, risk of relapse, and response to treatment (McLellan et al., 2000). Yet, in contrast to other chronic diseases, the condition is extremely undertreated, with less than 10% of Europeans living with AUDs receiving therapy (Rehm et al., 2012). In addition, even when treated, relapse rates are up to 75% in the year after treatment (Friedmann, 2013).

Although alcohol belongs to the group of ‘socially accepted drugs,’ the burden of alcohol use at a global level is greater than the effects of illicit drug use (Giesbrecht et al., 2010). Firstly, alcohol is a threat to the *individual patient*. The mortality caused by alcohol consumption in the European Union is one in seven deaths in men and one in 13 deaths in women (Rehm et al., 2012). Alcohol is a contributory cause of more than 200 illnesses (Rehm et al., 2012) and 4% of the global burden of disease is attributable to alcohol (Room et al., 2005). Secondly, exposure to heavy drinkers often has negative impacts on *others* (family, workplace, and social network) leading to a reduced personal wellbeing and poorer health (Giesbrecht et al., 2010; Rehm et al., 2012). Finally, AUDs have important *socio-economic implications* (increase in crime rates, road trauma, absenteeism, unemployment and increased health care costs; Giesbrecht et al., 2010; Rehm et al., 2012).

Given this important health and socio-economic impact of AUDs, supplementing preventative strategies with adequate treatment is recommended (Rehm et al., 2012). Yet, current care for patients with AUDs is inadequate (Anderson et al., 2009; McLellan et al., 2000; Rehm et al., 2012). It is often based upon practices with little or no evidence of effectiveness (Lash et al., 2011; Miller et al., 2006). In addition, it relies heavily on an acute treatment model, providing detoxification programs, sometimes followed by specialty treatment rehabilitation programs, but without proactive efforts to ensure continuity of care thereafter (McLellan et al., 2000). Finally, there is no integration of care. Medical treatment, mental health care and substance abuse programs are often provided separately, and different healthcare settings (residential, semi-residential and ambulant care) generally function independently (Weisner, 2001).

AUD care should, instead, be organized from a chronic care perspective (NICE, 2011; Lash et al., 2011; McKay, 2009; McLellan et al.,

2000). Initial treatment in a more intense psychiatric care setting (inpatient or intensive outpatient) should be followed by a phase of *continuing care*, in order to sustain the achieved positive effects (McKay, 2009). This continuing care phase, also called ‘*aftercare*’ in literature, is the specific focus of this review. An integrated care program (ICP), based on Wagner’s Chronic Care Model, could be used to reorganize the phase of continuing care for patients with AUDs (Bodenheimer et al., 2002a). Wagner’s model relies on the concept of continuous, integrated care and encourages the interaction of informed, activated patients with prepared, proactive practice teams. ICPs do not yet exist in addiction care, but evidence indicates that they improve health outcomes in many other chronic diseases like diabetes, COPD and depression (Ouwens et al., 2005; Bodenheimer et al., 2002b). Although the exact definition and content of these ICPs vary, five common key principles have been described: patient centeredness, multi-professional teamwork, continuity of care, evidence-based practice and continuous quality improvement (Ouwens et al., 2005). In the continuing care phase for patients with AUDs, a *full ICP* has never been developed. However, multiple *isolated continuing care interventions* have been described in a wide variety of formats and modalities (Lash et al., 2011; McKay, 2009). They show different degrees of effectiveness and are not widely implemented (Lash et al., 2011). These could be part of an ICP for this population.

A systematic analysis of research on these continuing care interventions for people with only AUDs is lacking. It could, however, offer insight into how to effectively organize continuing care for patients with AUDs after they have completed the phase of more intense psychiatric care. This systematic review aims to identify effective continuing care interventions for patients with AUDs, sustaining the principles of integrated care as mentioned above.

2. Methods

To conduct our systematic review, we followed the principles of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins and Green, 2011). The reporting is based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidance for systematic reviews (Moher et al., 2009).

2.1. Search strategy

A sensitive search was conducted in five electronic databases (MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, CINAHL and PsycINFO), to identify studies published up to February, 2013. Trials registers (Current Controlled Trials, including <http://clinicaltrials.gov/>) were searched to identify ongoing trials. We hand-searched the reference lists of the included articles and of topic-related systematic reviews to identify possible additional studies of interest. Both free text words and subject indexing terms were combined as search terms. Search terms were selected through discussion, taking into account the inclusion criteria, an exploratory search of the relevant literature and after browsing the MEDLINE

Thesaurus of subject indexing terms. Supplementary material provides an illustration of the full electronic search strategies for the distinct databases.¹ No language or time restrictions were used.

2.2. Selection of studies

The selection of papers was conducted independently by two reviewers. The first author (EL) conducted the first review process, but given the large number of records identified through database searching, the second review process was divided among five reviewers (BA, FM, DZ, LP and NDM). Disagreements with the first reviewer (EL) were resolved by discussion. Reference Manager 12 was used to eliminate duplicate reports. The studies were selected in two phases. First, title and abstract were screened and potentially relevant documents retrieved. Studies with a missing abstract were not retained. Then, full texts were screened for eligibility, against the inclusion and exclusion criteria described below. Only randomized controlled trials (RCTs) were eligible for inclusion. We included adult patients with an AUD as their main problem, receiving treatment in an outpatient, continuing care setting. Continuing care was defined as the phase after completing an inpatient or intensive outpatient alcohol rehabilitation program of at least seven days, not just detoxification. Interventions taking place during the initial rehabilitation program, with the specific aim of increasing continuing care attendance, were also included. The interventions had to focus primarily on the treatment of AUDs. Data on drinking related outcomes or treatment engagement had to be available, with a follow-up duration of at least 12 weeks after the beginning of the continuing care phase. Studies were excluded if patients were under the age of 18 years, were inmates or parolees or suffered from a comorbid psychotic illness or other co-occurring substance use disorder (except for nicotine). Trials focusing primarily on testing a pharmacological approach were also not eligible.

2.3. Quality appraisal

Two reviewers independently assessed the methodological quality of each individual study (EL, BA). Discrepancies were resolved through discussion. Risk of bias was assessed both on a study-level and an outcome level, based upon the Cochrane Collaboration's risk of bias assessment tool (Higgins et al., 2011). Seven bias domains were assessed as having a high, low or unclear risk of bias: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other possible bias. Results of the quality assessment were reported using Review Manager 5.1 Software. We estimated that studies of poor methodological quality with regard to the randomization procedure and reporting of outcome data would add little value to the existing knowledge on the topic. Therefore, only trials with a low risk of bias on these two criteria were selected for further analysis. We would like to point out that in the population targeted, missing data are inevitable. It is however the amount, nature and handling of missing data which determines the associated risk of bias. Publication bias would be assessed using funnel plots, if sufficient studies were available to do conduct a meaningful analysis.

2.4. Data extraction and analysis

Data were extracted by one researcher and independently checked by a second reviewer (CM), using pre-designed data extraction forms (Microsoft Excel). In the case of important missing data, we made attempts to contact the authors of the original trials. We only received additional data from the authors of Project Match (Allen et al., 1997). The results of each study were reported individually. We considered two separate outcome categories: drinking outcomes (i.e., percent days abstinent, percent patients abstinent, heavy drinking outcomes, number of drinks, time to first drinking day) and treatment engagement outcomes (i.e., patients in retention in continuing care, number of sessions attended). Wherever possible, we used Review Manager to calculate relative risks (RR) for dichotomous outcomes and mean differences (MD) for continuous variables reported with 95% confidence intervals. Heterogeneity was to be expected, therefore, the random effects model was chosen. For the calculations on treatment attendance, the exact number of scheduled sessions was not always reported. These data were derived from protocol information on treatment frequency and duration. For project Match, analysis was based on both published and unpublished data. To calculate the percentage of patients abstinent, patients with missing data were considered to be non-abstinent.

We planned to perform a statistical pooling of results, provided that clinical heterogeneity between studies was limited with regard to study populations, setting, interventions and outcome measures.

3. Results

3.1. Search results

The search strategy in the five databases identified 15,235 studies, of which 159 were eligible for inclusion, based on title and abstract (Fig. 1). 20 trials actually met the inclusion criteria (Ahles et al., 1983; Allen et al., 1997; Bennett et al., 2005; Burtscheidt et al., 2001, 2002; Connors et al., 1992; Cooper and Wilson, 1988; Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985; Galanter, 1984; Galanter et al., 1987; Gilbert, 1988; Intagliata, 1976; Ito et al., 1988; Kadden et al., 1989, 1992; Keane et al., 1984; Maisto et al., 1995; McKay et al., 2004; Mundt et al., 2006; O'Farrell et al., 1985, 1992, 1993, 1998; Ossip-Klein et al., 1984; Pelc et al., 2005; Powell et al., 1985; Project MATCH Research Group, 1998). The main reasons for exclusion were a different setting (i.e., no continuing care, $n=49$), a different population (i.e., mixed substance use disorders, $n=43$) or another design (i.e., no RCT, $n=31$). Only four trials were published within the last ten years (Bennett et al., 2005; McKay et al., 2004; Mundt et al., 2006; Pelc et al., 2005).

3.2. Quality assessment

The methodology of the 20 included studies was in general poorly described and to a large extent also poorly conducted (Figs. 2 and 3).

Only six trials had a lower risk of bias on their randomization procedure and the reporting of findings (Allen et al., 1997; Bennett et al., 2005; Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985; McKay et al., 2004; O'Farrell et al., 1985, 1992; Pelc et al., 2005; Project MATCH Research Group, 1998). With the exception of three trials (Bennett et al., 2005; Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985; Pelc et al., 2005), allocation concealment was not mentioned. Due to the type of interventions, blinding of participants, personnel and outcome assessors was in general not possible, which could have engendered a certain degree of performance and detection bias. Although outcome data were often incomplete, significant attrition bias was mostly avoided by clarifying the reasons for missing data, reporting an equal distribution of missing data between intervention groups or processing the available data in an intention-to-treat analysis. There was no clear distinction between the older studies and the more recent ones as regards the methodological quality.

Insufficient studies were available to assess publication bias by funnel plotting.

3.3. Description of included studies

Tables 1–3 give an overview of the characteristics of the six included studies. Note that the results of two of these trials were outlined in multiple articles (Allen et al., 1997; O'Farrell et al., 1985, 1992; Project MATCH Research Group, 1998). Overall, 1479 patients were studied, with similar characteristics among the study population in the individual trials. The interventions and outcome measures, however, showed pronounced heterogeneity.

3.3.1. Participants. Most trials included a limited number of participants (Table 1). Only Project MATCH based its results on a large population of 774 patients in the aftercare arm. In our protocol, we decided to include participants with AUDs, without specification of the type or severity of the disorder. The four most recent included trials studied patients with alcohol dependence, based on DSM-IIIIR of DSM IV criteria (Allen et al., 1997; Bennett et al., 2005; McKay et al., 2004; Pelc et al., 2005). The two older studies used different scales (O'Farrell et al., 1985; Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985). The other characteristics of the populations were fairly homogeneous. Participants were mostly male (63–100%), with an average

¹ Supplementary material can be found by accessing the online version of this paper. See Appendix A for more details.

Table 1
Characteristics of included studies: participants.

Study (country)	Description of drinking problem	N	Men (%)	Age: mean years (SD)	Education	Employment (%)	Family status: % married/in a relation	Prior intensive treatment (duration)
Fitzgerald 1985 (Fitzgerald & Mulford, 1985) (US)	Iowa alcoholic stages index score (0–4): 85% score ≥ 3	354	72	88% <49 y	1–11 y: 30%	58	30	Inpatient (3–4 weeks)
O'Farrell 1985, 1992 (O'Farrell et al., 1985, 1992) (US)	MAST: mean 38.38, SD 7.74	36	100	42.38 (9.33)	12–15 y: 65% 16+ y: 5% mean: 12.47 y (SD: 2.32)	–	100	For most participants: first inpatient (7–28 days) then outpatient (<2 months)
Project MATCH 1997, 1998 (1998; Allen et al., 1997) (US)	2% Aab and 98% AD (DSM-III-R)	774	80	41.9 (11.1)	mean: 13.1 y (SD: 2.1)	48	34	In- or outpatient (≥ 7 days)
McKay 2004 (McKay et al., 2004) (US)	AD (DSM-IV)	91	83*	41.9 (I)*	mean: 12.4 y*	–	17.4*	Outpatient (3–4 weeks)
Bennet 2005 (Bennett et al., 2005) (UK)	AD (DSM-IV)	124	63	44.3 (10.6) 41.8 (10.6)	–	15	29	Outpatient (6 weeks)
Pelc 2005 (Pelc et al., 2005) (B)	AD (DSM-IV)	100	78	43.5 (8.8) 43.1 (7.2)	32% primary 44% secondary 24% university	–	18	Inpatient (3 weeks)

US, United States of America; UK, United Kingdom; B, Belgium; N, sample size randomized; SD, standard deviation; MAST, Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test; AD, alcohol dependence; Aab, alcohol abuse; DSM, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders; –, no data available; *, data on the whole sample (alcohol and cocaine dependence); y, year.

Table 2
Characteristics of included studies: interventions.

Study	Continuing care interventions (number of patients)	Treatment duration, frequency	Format	Approach based on
Fitzgerald 1985 (Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985)	TEL (+UC) (123)	1 y, 1 call/2 w	Individual (calls)	Showing concern, source of help
	UC (165)	1y, 2 sessions*	Group*	Encouraging patients to follow at least two group sessions
O'Farrell 1985, 1992 (O'Farrell et al., 1985, 1992)	BMT (+UC) (10)	10 w, 1 session/w	Group	Behavioral techniques to promote sobriety and improve relationships
	IT (+UC) (12)	10 w, 1 session/w	Group	Other techniques to promote sobriety and improve relationships
	UC (12)	1 M 1 session/w, then 1/M	Individual	Supportive counseling, encouraging AA, Antabuse and abstinence
Project MATCH 1997, 1998 (1998; Allen et al., 1997)	CBT (266)	12 w, 1 session/w	Individual	Social learning theory, teaching coping skills
	MET (261) TSF (247)	12 w, 4 sessions 12 w, 1 session/w	Individual Individual	Motivational psychology Promoting AA, working through the 12 steps
McKay 2004 (McKay et al., 2004)	TEL (27)	12 w, 1 call/w + 4 sessions	Individual (calls) + group	Calls to discuss behavior and progress
	RP (34)	12 w, 2 sessions/w	Individual + group	+4 Support group sessions
	STND (30)	12 w, 2 sessions/w	Group	Cognitive-behavioral therapy to improve coping addictions counseling + 12-step recovery
Bennet 2005 (Bennett et al., 2005)	EWSRPT (+UC) (62)	15 w, 1 session/w	Individual	Gorski's approach on relapse prevention (Gorski & Woll 1995)
	UC (62)	3 sessions/w	Group	Social and recreational activities + 3 support groups/w
Pelc 2005 (Pelc et al., 2005)	NURSE (+UC) (50)	26 w, ≥ 1 call/w, variable home visits hospital visits: at 4, 6 w, then every 4 w. GP whenever necessary	Individual	Close monitoring, coordination of f.u. at the hospital or the GP
	UC (50)		Individual	Fixed f.u. at the hospital, free f.u. with the GP, Acamprostate

y: year, w: week, M: month, UC: usual continuing care, TEL: telephone calls, BMT: behavioral marital therapy, IT: interactional couples therapy, CBT: Cognitive behavioral coping skills therapy, MET: motivational enhancement therapy, TSF: twelve step facilitation, RP: relapse prevention, STND: standard continuing care, EWSRPT: early warning signs relapse prevention training, NURSE: community nurse follow up, * only for patients from center B, no formal continuing care in center A, AA: alcoholics anonymous, f u: follow up, GP: general practitioner

Table 3
Characteristics of included studies: drinking outcomes and findings.

Study	Continuing care interventions (number of patients)	Follow-up	Outcome measures	Findings	Authors conclusions
Fitzgerald 1985 (Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985)	TEL (+UC) (123) UC (165)	t0-M12	% Patients abstinent since t0 Number of days abstinent since t0: mean (SD) Days prior to first drink since t0: mean (SD) % Patients no drinking 5+ drinks in 2 hours since t0 Treatment attendance: mean number of personal contacts	TEL: (A) 17 6, (B) 28 9 UC: (A) 17.5, (B) 38.5 RR ^o (TEL/UC): 0.88 [0.57, 1.36] TEL: (A) 275 101, (B) 295 94 UC: (A) 287 93, (B) 296 103 MD ^o (TEL/UC): -8.98 [-32.36, 14.41] TEL: (A) 142 131, (B) 186 141 UC: (A) 157 129, (B) 211 145 MD ^o (TEL/UC): -17.41 [-48.94, 14.13] TEL: (A) 32 5, (B) 47 2 UC: (A) 32.5, (B) 52.6 RR ^o (TEL/UC): 0.95 [0.70, 1.29] TEL: (A) 9, (B) 15 UC: no data	TEL = UC
O'Farrell 1985, 1992 (O'Farrell et al., 1985, 1992)	BMT (+UC) (10) IT (+UC) (12) UC (12)	t0-12/14w M1–M24 post-continuing care [#]	% Days abstinent: mean SD Treatment attendance: mean number of sessions attended % Days abstinent: mean (SD) % Days heavy drinking ¹ : mean (SD)	BMT: 99 40 1 37 IT: 82 66 32 33 UC: 90 57 15 01 MD (BMT/UC): 8.83 [0.30, 17.36] BMT: 8.50 IT: 8.25 UC: no data BMT: 79.07 (30.44) IT: 83.23 (27.83) UC: 66.41 (39.98) MD (BMT/UC): 12.66 [-16.80, 42.12] BMT: 10.42 (23.77) IT: 6.15 (13.31) UC: 15.80 (28.06) MD (BMT/UC): -5.38 [-27.04, 16.28]	IT = BMT = UC
Project MATCH 1997, 1998 (1998; Allen et al., 1997)	CBT (266) MET (261) TSF (247)	t0-M3, M4–6, M7–9, M10–12, M13–15	% Patients abstinent since t0 % Days abstinent Drinks per drinking day Time to first drink Treatment attendance: % sessions attended	CBT: 23,68 MET: 20,69 TSF: 23,89 Graph (M15: 90%, no significant difference between intervention groups) Graph (M15: ±2.5, no significant difference between intervention groups) Survival curve (whole sample) 66 (whole sample)	CBT = MET = TSF
McKay 2004 (McKay et al., 2004)	TEL (27) RP (34) STND (30)	M1–3, M4–6, M7–9, M10–12	% Days of heavy drinking ² % Patients abstinent from heavy drinking ² Treatment attendance: number of sessions received	Graph (M1–3: ±5%) (M10–12: TEL: 8, STND: 18%) TEL > STND: z = 2.02, p = .04 TEL > RP: z = 2.07, p = .04 No data for the 'alcohol only' sample	TEL > STND, TEL > RP

Table 3 (Continued)

Study	Continuing care interventions (number of patients)	Follow-up	Outcome measures	Findings	Authors conclusions
Bennet 2005 (Bennett et al., 2005)	EWSRPT (+UC) (62) UC (62)	t0 M12	% Patients abstinent	EWSRPT: 31 UC: 17 RR: 1.80 [0.91, 3.56]	EWSRPT > UC
			% Patients in category of % days drinking	EWSRPT: 18%: 1–4% days, 27%: 5–19% days, 22%: >19% days UC: 16%: 1–4% days, 24%: 5–19% days, 40%: >19% days	
			Drinks per drinking day: mean (SD)	EWSRPT: 21.4 (16.4) UC: 23.1 (13.3) MD: -1.70 [-8.40, 5.00]	
			% Patients abstinent from heavy drinking ³	EWSRPT: 45 UC: 26 RR: 1.73 [1.01, 2.95]	
			% Patients in category of % days of heavy drinking ³	EWSRPT: 15%: 1–4% days, 27%: 5–19% days, 18%: >19% days UC: 14%: 1–4% days, 36%: 5–19% days, 28%: >19% days	
			Treatment attendance: median number of continuing care sessions attended (1 y)	EWSRPT: 16 UC: 6	
Pelc 2005 (Pelc et al., 2005)	NURSE (+UC) (50) UC (50)	t0-M6	% Days abstinent since t0: mean (SD)	NURSE: 55 (37) UC: 39 (34) MD: 16.00 [2.07, 29.93]	NURSE > UC
			% Patients abstinent since t0	NURSE: 32 UC: 16 RR: 2.00 [0.94, 4.25]	
			Time to first drink	NURSE: 81 days UC: 67 days	
			Treatment attendance: % retention in the study	NURSE: 46 UC: 24 RR: 1.92 [1.08, 3.41]	

RR: relative risk with 95% confidence interval, MD: mean difference with 95% confidence interval, SD: standard deviation, (A): center A, (B): center B (RR and MD for center A and B together, bold characters: significant difference, t0: trial entry, before starting continuing care, w: week, M: month, #: outcomes also available for intermediate intervals: M1–2, M3–6, M7–12, M13–18, M19–24, UC: usual continuing care, TEL: telephone calls, BMT: behavioral marital therapy, IT: interactional couples therapy, CBT: cognitive behavioral coping skills therapy, MET: motivational enhancement therapy, TSF: twelve step facilitation, RP: relapse prevention, STND: standard continuing care, EWSRPT: early warning signs relapse prevention training, NURSE: community nurse follow up, heavy drinking 1: more than 3 ounces/day, heavy drinking 2: ≥ 5 drinks/day, heavy drinking 3: ≥ 9 drinks/day.




Fig. 1. Flow diagram of the study-selection process. RCT, randomized controlled trial; AUD, alcohol use disorders.

age of 40, and had a reasonable degree of education. With the exception of the study by O’Farrell which included only married couples, only a small proportion of the participants were in a relationship (17.5–34%). Patients had previously followed an inpatient (Allen et al., 1997; Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985; O’Farrell et al., 1985; Pelc et al., 2005) or outpatient (Allen et al., 1997; Bennett et al., 2005; McKay et al., 2004) rehabilitation program, ranging from seven days to six weeks. The content of the rehabilitation program was only mentioned in two trials and included evaluation, medical stabilization, counseling and education (Bennett et al., 2005; McKay et al., 2004).

3.3.2. Interventions. Interventions varied in duration (10 weeks to 1 year), frequency of scheduled contacts (three sessions a week to

four sessions in 12 weeks) and type of continuing care (Table 2). The therapists were, however, all experienced and trained in the treatment of AUDs.

3.3.2.1. Telephone calls. Three trials used telephone calls in their experimental group (Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985; McKay et al., 2004; Pelc et al., 2005). However, the concrete implementation of these calls differed substantially. Fitzgerald et al. (1985) used short, counselor-initiated, biweekly calls as a general supportive and monitoring tool, without imposing any treatment. The calls were not supplemented by other forms of therapy, apart from the usual continuing care, which was minimal (center A: no formal discharge program and center B: two group sessions). McKay et al. (2004) used patient-initiated calls, at predetermined times, in order




Fig. 2. Risk of bias graph: review authors’ judgments about each risk of bias item presented as percentages across all included studies.

	Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias): drinking outcomes	Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias): treatment engagement	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Other bias
Ahles 1983 / Ossip 1984	?	?	-	?	+	?	-	?
Bennet 2005	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	?
Burtscheidt 2001, 2002	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	?
Connors 1992	?	?	-	?	?	+	?	?
Cooney '91, Kadden '89/92	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?
Cooper 1988	?	-	-	-	?	+	?	?
Fitzgerald 1985	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	?
Galanter 1984, 1987	?	?	?	+	+	-	?	?
Gilbert 1988	-	-	?	?	+	-	?	?
Intagliata 1976	?	?	?	?	+	+	?	?
Ito 1988	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	?
Keane 1984	?	?	?	?	+	+	?	?
Maisto 1995	?	?	-	?	?	?	?	?
MATCH 1997, 1998	+	?	?	?	?	+	+	?
McKay 2004	+	?	?	?	?	+	+	?
Mundt 2006	?	?	-	?	?	-	-	?
O'Farrell 1985, 1992	+	?	?	?	?	+	+	?
O'Farrell 1993, 1998	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Pelc 2005	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	?
Powell 1985	?	?	-	-	?	+	-	?

Fig. 3. Risk of bias summary: review authors' judgments about each risk of bias item for each included study.

to empower the patient. The weekly calls offered counseling, by discussing behavior, progress and plans for achieving primary goals. The calls were embedded in a broader approach consisting of support group sessions and the use of a workbook by the patient. Pelc et al. (2005) compared a community nurse follow-up with standard continuing care. The nurse made weekly calls to the patient to monitor and support the patient, but also to coordinate the follow-up at the hospital or with the general practitioner. The calls were supplemented by home-visits and the usual continuing care (Acamprosate and physician follow-up).

3.3.2.2. *Psychotherapy.* Different types of psychotherapy were used in the continuing care intervention: *behavioral* therapy (cognitive behavioral therapy; Allen et al., 1997, relapse prevention; Bennett et al., 2005; McKay et al., 2004, behavioral marital therapy; O'Farrell et al., 1985), *motivational* therapy (Allen et al., 1997), *twelve step facilitation* (Allen et al., 1997; McKay et al., 2004), and *interactional couples therapy* (Bennett et al., 2005). Therapists were experienced and trained and treatment was given in group or individual sessions. The frequency of scheduled sessions was mostly one or two per week. Only motivational therapy was delivered in four sessions over a period of 12 weeks (Allen et al., 1997).

3.3.2.3. *Usual continuing care.* Except for Project MATCH, all trials compared one or two experimental therapies with usual continuing care. However, the format of this usual care intervention differed significantly. Usual care included: no formal program (Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985), an encouragement to follow at least two group sessions in one year (Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985), individual supportive counseling sessions organized weekly the first month and monthly thereafter (O'Farrell et al., 1985), twelve step facilitation therapy (McKay et al., 2004), weekly support groups and social activities (Bennett et al., 2005) and a combination of Acamprosate and physician follow-up (Pelc et al., 2005).

3.3.3. *Outcomes.* Follow-up duration ranged from six months after trial entry to two years after the continuing care treatment (around 27 months after trial entry; Table 3). Drinking outcomes were assessed through self-reports, supplemented by corroborating data from significant others in half of the studies (Allen et al., 1997; McKay et al., 2004; O'Farrell et al., 1985). Except for one study (McKay et al., 2004), all trials reported data on alcohol use frequency. However, this outcome was measured at different time points, over different follow-up periods, and different outcome measures were used: mostly the proportion of *days* abstinent or the proportion of *patients* continuously abstinent after discharge, but also the time to the first drink after discharge or the length of the longest dry period after discharge. Drinking severity data were available as the 'number of drinks per drinking day' in two trials or as 'heavy drinking' outcomes. Treatment engagement was reported as an effect measure by two trials (Bennett et al., 2005; Pelc et al., 2005). The other trials provided data on treatment attendance only as a process outcome, measured by the number of attended continuing care sessions.

3.3.4. *Effects of interventions.* A meta-analysis could not be performed because of the mix of comparisons of different treatments with different comparators, and the lack of a common outcome measure. The main findings of the included studies are summarized in Table 3. Five trials compared an active intervention to usual continuing care. Of these, three trials reported statistically significant better results for the experimental group, on some but not all outcomes (Bennett et al., 2005; McKay et al., 2004; Pelc et al., 2005). Only one trial showed a trend in favor of the experimental group (O'Farrell et al., 1992). The last trial described results slightly in favor of the usual care group (Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985). The

Table 4
Main findings from (excluded) studies with poor methodological quality.

Study	Author's conclusions on continuing care effectiveness Therapeutic benefit	No therapeutic benefit
Ahles, 1983 Ossip-Klein, 1984 Burtscheidt, 2001 Burtscheidt, 2002 Connors, 1992	Behavioral contract + calendar > UC Behavioral therapy > UC	
Cooney, 1991 Kadden, 1989 Kadden, 1992 Cooper, 1988		Telephone continuing care = group continuing care = no continuing care Coping skills training = interactional therapy
Galanter, 1984 Galanter 1987 Gilbert, 1988	Letter and telephone > self-management, UC: only in the first month after discharge	Peer-led self-help group = professional-led group
Intagliata, 1976 Ito, 1988 Keane, 1984 Maisto, 1995 Mundt, 2006	Home visits > case management > traditional follow-up: only on attendance rates, not on drinking outcome Telephone calls > No telephone calls	Relapse prevention = Interpersonal process continuing care
O'Farrell, 1993 O'Farrell, 1998	Contract + recording > no intervention BMT + RP > BMT only	Daily IVR reporting (with or without personal follow-up) = no IVR reporting
Powell, 1985	In general: BMT + RP > BMT only: during six months For alcoholics with more severe marital and drinking problems: BMT + RP > BMT only: during 30 months	Medication only = active support = untreated medical monitoring

UC, usual continuing care; IVR, interactive voice response system; BMT, behavioral marital therapy; RP, relapse prevention.

sixth trial, Project Match, did not include a usual care comparison group. Similar results for the three interventions were reported. Below, we highlight some findings on different outcome measures in more detail. For information purposes only, an overview of the conclusions from the excluded, low-quality trials is given in Table 4. As decided at protocol stage, these results will not be further analyzed or discussed.

3.3.4.1. Drinking outcomes. Overall, the percentage of patients continuously abstinent was low, ranging from 17% to 38.5% at 12 months follow-up. Pelc et al. and Bennett et al. showed better outcomes for the experimental condition (community nurse, relapse prevention) compared to usual care, but without reaching statistical significance (Fig. 4). Note that the statistical significance reported by Pelc et al. could not be confirmed in our analysis. Fitzgerald et al. found slightly better values for the usual care group compared to the telephone group. In Project Match, no significant outcome differences between the cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT), twelve step facilitation (TSF) and motivational enhancement therapy (MET) condition were seen (Allen et al., 1997).

The percentage of days abstinent ranged from 39% to 99.4%. As for the previous outcome measure, in Pelc et al. and Bennett et al. the nurse group and relapse prevention group obtained better results than the usual care groups. Effects reached statistical significance. In O'Farrell et al. the behavioral marital therapy group also performed better than the usual care group, but with results reaching statistical significance only after three months, not after two years of follow-up. In Fitzgerald et al., the usual care group again performed slightly better than the telephone group. Once more, Project Match reported similar results for the CBT, TSF and MET condition.

Pelc et al. described a relatively short time to first drink (81 days), in favor of the intervention (nurse) group. A much longer period of abstinence before the first drink was obtained by Fitzgerald et al. (211 days), however in favor of the usual care group.

As regards to drinking severity, the number of drinks per drinking day was around 2.5 in the three conditions in Project Match (Allen et al., 1997). Bennett et al. found a minor difference in favor

of the relapse prevention group compared to usual care (usual care: 23.1, relapse prevention group: 21.4). His calculations were based only on drinking participants, which resulted in a much higher number of drinks than in Project Match. Although different definitions of heavy drinking were used, both McKay et al., Bennett et al. and O'Farrell et al. found results in favor of the experimental intervention (telephone, relapse prevention, behavioral marital therapy).


3.3.4.2. Treatment engagement. As for drinking outcomes, the nurse group in Pelc et al. and relapse prevention group in Bennett et al. obtained better outcomes for treatment attendance than the usual care conditions (Table 3). The other four trials reported treatment attendance only as a process outcome (Fig. 5). The percentage of scheduled sessions which were attended ranged from 35% to 90%. The lowest proportion of attended sessions was seen in the trials with the highest number of scheduled sessions (Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985; McKay et al., 2004).

4. Discussion

4.1. Limited evidence available

Our review shows how few high-quality studies on continuing care for patients with AUDs are available. For a disease with such devastating consequences, both on a personal and a socio-economic level, one would expect otherwise. We observed that there is a much larger number of trials available studying a mixed population of patients with AUDs or other substance use disorders. Broadening our subject selection criteria to this population would have allowed for a much larger sample of studies. Nevertheless, for several reasons we have decided at protocol stage to include only trials studying a population with AUDs, without co-occurring substance use disorders. Firstly, although dependence on alcohol is frequently associated with dependence on illicit drugs (Degenhardt et al., 2001), several studies suggest that this population differs from the population with alcohol dependence only. Both

A. Percent patients abstinent



B. Percent days abstinent




Fig. 4. Forest plot of comparison: active intervention (AI) compared to usual continuing care (UC). (A) Percent patients abstinent: Bennett (AI: early warning signs relapse prevention therapy): 1 year post-trial entry. Fitzgerald (AI: telephone continuing care): results pooled from two centers, 1 year post-trial entry. Pelc (AI: nurse follow-up): 6 months post-trial entry. (B) Percent days abstinent: O'Farrell (AI: behavioral marital therapy) at 12 weeks post-discharge (lower) and at 24 months post-continuing care (upper). Pelc (AI: nurse follow-up): 6 months post-trial entry.

in demographic terms and in the severity of their alcohol dependence both groups seem to differ (Kranzler et al., 1996; Stinson et al., 2005). Also the treatment seeking behavior appears to differ, with a much higher treatment seeking in the comorbid group (21.76%) compared to the alcohol-only group (6.06%; Stinson et al., 2005). Finally, there is specific genetic evidence suggesting that alcohol dependence with comorbid drug dependence represents a more severe form of the disorder, with higher genetic contribution to vulnerability (Dick et al., 2007). In view of these differences, we cannot exclude the possibility that an adapted approach is necessary for both types of populations. Secondly, a substantial part of the population with AUDs has no co-occurring substance use disorder (Branstrom and Andreasson, 2008; Stinson et al., 2005). So it certainly seems relevant to practice to focus on this particular group. Thirdly, to allow for the most reliable comparison of continuing care interventions, we tried to maximize the homogeneity between

the populations of included studies. Therefore we chose to define the studied population quite strictly, excluding other substance use disorders.

As a result of our choice, we unfortunately had to exclude many trials describing a mixed population with alcohol or other substance use disorders. Often, they had a significant proportion of patients suffering from AUDs only. However, separate data for this 'alcohol-only group' were rarely reported. We strongly recommend future researchers to specify results for this sub-group. Only then it will be evident if findings are indeed similar between groups with different substance use diagnoses.

4.2. A tendency of efficacy

Based on the available data, we come to the tentative conclusion that adding an active intervention to usual continuing care




Fig. 5. Attendance at scheduled sessions during the trial (numbers are means, except for Bennett (median) TEL: telephone calls, BMT: behavioral marital therapy, IT: interactional couples therapy, CBT: cognitive behavioral coping skills therapy, TSF: twelve step facilitation, MET: motivational enhancement therapy, RP: relapse prevention, STND: standard continuing care, EWSRPT: early warning signs relapse prevention training.

seems to improve treatment outcomes. The active interventions differ from usual continuing care in many aspects. They bring treatment more proactively to the patient and are usually organized on a more regular basis. Providing coping skills and increasing motivation, they focus strongly on patient empowerment, whereas usual care consists mainly of supportive counseling and promoting alcoholics anonymous attendance. Finally, the active interventions also target the functioning of the patient within his family network and improve coordination between the patient and different healthcare services.

We would like to compare our findings with the existing literature. We notice that our main conclusion agrees with the findings of research on continuing care in a population with mixed alcohol and drug use disorders (McKay, 2005, 2009). Indeed, in two narrative reviews, McKay et al. conclude that ‘extended interventions’ improve long-term outcomes compared to usual treatment (McKay, 2005) and that continuing care can be effective in sustaining the positive achievements from the rehabilitation care phase (McKay, 2009). Based on a limited number of economic studies, evidence even exists that continuing care interventions could maximize the economic value of the initial more intense treatment phase (Popovici et al., 2008). A number of other systematic reviews have separately examined several of the active interventions described in our analysis. However, these reviews did not focus in particular on patients with only AUDs and did not take place in the continuing care phase. Therefore, their conclusions should be interpreted with caution in our specific setting. Still, we note that relapse prevention and behavioral couple therapy, two relatively successful interventions in our analysis, were also found to be effective in meta-analyses (Irvin et al., 1999; Powers et al., 2008). On the contrary, no convincing evidence exists for the effectiveness of twelve step facilitation in reducing alcohol dependence or problems (Ferri et al., 2006). Also in our review, twelve step facilitation did not appear to be the most successful treatment. An approach which was not encountered in our analysis is an online alcohol intervention. This approach could be beneficial for users less likely to access traditional alcohol-related services (White et al., 2010). Finally, two Cochrane reviews on telephone consultations and on internet interventions are currently ongoing (Kazeem et al., 2011; Stallman et al., 2012).

It is clear from our results that effect sizes are limited. This does not necessarily mean that the intervention in itself is inadequate. The control group could have been exposed to treatments not included in the study protocol. Moreover, in this population drop-out rates are often high, limiting exposure to the continuing care intervention. Adding strategies to increase treatment engagement could improve treatment outcomes (Lash et al., 2011). Furthermore, the type and intensity of the previously received rehabilitation treatment could influence the specific needs of the patient in the continuing care phase. Finally, the effectiveness of a specific continuing care intervention could depend on certain patient characteristics. However, Project MATCH (Allen et al., 1997) found little evidence to support this hypothesis, contrary to prior research (Mattson et al., 1994).

4.3. Integrated continuing care

Different principles of integrated care can be recognized in the active interventions analyzed: patient-centeredness, multiprofessional teamwork and continuity of care. Unfortunately, no single active intervention fully meets all the requirements of continuous integrated care. In contrast, an integrated care program (ICP) based on different elements of the continuing care interventions discussed above, may be more appropriate. Finally, we note that all continuing care interventions in this analysis can be categorized as “specialty continuing care.” However, in an integrated care

approach, the primary care physician could also play a part in the delivery of continuing care (Friedmann, 2013). Typically using a patient-centered and longitudinal approach, he is ideally placed to assist the patient in this care phase.

4.4. Implications for research

We intend to propose an integrated care program (ICP), which could be used in the continuing care setting for patients with AUDs. This program should be further investigated in a (cluster) randomized controlled trial before being implemented in daily practice. We believe that an ICP will better respond to the complex demands of this population, compared to a single continuing care intervention. Moreover, such a program should offer the flexibility to adapt the treatment to the individual patient. The program could consist of the following elements: telephone follow-up by a specialized and trained nurse, with calls being initiated at predefined moments by the patients themselves. The nurse takes the initiative only if the patients fail to call. The calls could encompass monitoring of the patients, but also limited counseling and a coordination of care with the psychiatrist, general practitioner (GP), social worker or other care providers. Patients could use a workbook, to register among other things their behavior, difficulties encountered and intermediate goals. This workbook could be discussed during the calls, but also in the counseling sessions with the specialist or the GP. If deemed necessary by the patient or the nurse, calls could be supplemented by home visits. Too many follow-up moments should be avoided, in view of the burden for the patient, the feasibility for the care-giver and the cost-effectiveness of the intervention. Therefore, we would propose weekly calls in the beginning. The duration, intensity and frequency of the calls should however be continuously adapted to the needs of the individual patient. We fully support the concept of the adaptive continuing care proposed by McKay et al. (2009). Given the chronic nature of the disease, we would suggest no restricted follow-up period, but literally ‘continuing’ care. Specific elements could be added to increase retention in the ICP, as described by several investigators (Lash et al., 2007; Ossip-Klein et al., 1984).

More efficacy studies are necessary to provide stronger support for the different elements composing the ICP. The interventions mentioned above should be further investigated, but new technologies could also be integrated in the program. Research in this domain is currently ongoing (McTavish et al., 2012). In order to provide flexible continuing care, tailored to the needs of the individual patient, more research is also needed on matching patient characteristics to treatment. Cost-effectiveness research is needed before implementation of an ICP in daily practice. Finally, interventional trials should be in accordance with the recommendations of the SPIRIT statement (Chan et al., 2013). In order to facilitate meta-analysis, interventions should be compared to a control group receiving usual care. Also, we would strongly recommend the use of more homogeneous outcome measures. Both the type of outcome measure as the length of follow-up should be more standardized. Outcome measures should focus both on drinking frequency (e.g., percent days abstinent) and severity (e.g., drinks per drinking day) as recommended by previous research (Babor et al., 1994). Self-reported data and data from other sources should be combined. More research guidelines and recommendations for future economic evaluation research are outlined comprehensively by Popovici et al. (2008).

4.5. Weaknesses and strengths of the review

This review is based on a limited number of studies, with heterogeneous interventions and outcome measures. This impeded the conduct of a meta-analysis and influences the strength of the

conclusions. Furthermore, the exclusion of trials focusing on a population with co-occurring other substance use disorders limits the applicability of the results to only a part of the population presenting for substance abuse treatment. Finally, relying on previous research (Friedmann, 2013; McKay, 2005, 2009), we defined 'continuing care' as the treatment phase following an inpatient or intensive outpatient alcohol rehabilitation program. However, we should be careful not to divide care of these patients in too rigidly separate phases. The intensity and format of treatment can vary over time, according to the needs of the individual patient and always in dialog with the patient and caregivers involved. Despite these limitations, this review adds value to the existing knowledge on the treatment of patients with AUDs. It is the first systematic analysis of continuing care research for patients with AUDs only. The search was extensive and the most recent guidelines for conduct and reporting of systematic reviews were followed (Higgins and Green, 2011; Moher et al., 2009). We want to emphasize that given the scarcity of evidence, our conclusions must be interpreted cautiously. They cannot simply be adopted in implementation programs. Nevertheless, this analysis provides a solid basis to direct further research.

5. Conclusion

In this systematic review, we observe a trend of better outcomes in favor of continuing care interventions actively involving the patient, compared to 'usual care.' The lack of convincing evidence in continuing care research should not discourage clinicians or researchers. Considering the severe consequences of this disorder, even small improvements in outcomes can be important for the individual patient and for society. We have an ethical obligation toward this population suffering from a disease with devastating consequences. This was emphasized by investigators 30 years ago, is still supported today (Fitzgerald and Mulford, 1985; McKay, 2009; Rehm et al., 2012), and will hopefully inspire future researchers and policy makers.

Role of funding source

Funding for this study was provided by a grant from the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KU Leuven) and funding by Belspo (Belgian Federal Research Programme on Drugs) as part of the ICARUS project. The KU Leuven and Belspo had no further role in the study design, in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data, in the writing of the report, or in the decision to submit the paper for publication.

Contributors

Evelien Lenaerts and Bert Aertgeerts were involved in all stages of the project from design, drafting the protocol, through study selection, data extraction, quality assessment, analysis and synthesis. Catharina Matheï contributed to the design, data extraction, analysis and synthesis. Frieda Matthys provided the concept to focus on continuing care research and participated in the design and the study selection process. Leo Pas and Dieter Zeeuws were involved in the design and the study selection process. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Evelien Lenaerts. All authors contributed to and have approved the final manuscript. Peter Anderson approved the final protocol and the manuscript.

Conflict of interest

All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

We thank the authors of Project MATCH who kindly provided additional data for our analysis. We also thank Mr. Nikolaas De Maeyer, who performed a restricted part of the second review process. Finally, we are grateful for the valuable and constructive comments and suggestions made by the reviewers.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2013.10.030>.

References

- Ahles, T.A., Schlundt, D.G., Prue, D.M., Rychtarik, R.G., 1983. Impact of aftercare arrangements on the maintenance of treatment success in abusive drinkers. *Addict. Behav.* 8, 53–58.
- Allen, J.P., Mattson, M.E., Miller, W.R., Tonigan, J.S., Connors, G.J., Rychtarik, R.G., Randall, C.L., Anton, R.F., Kadden, R.M., Litt, M., Cooney, N.L., Diclemente, C.C., Carbonari, J., Zweben, A., Longabaugh, R.H., Stout, R.L., Donovan, D., Babor, T.F., Del Boca, F.K., Rounsaville, B.J., Carroll, K.M., Wirtz, P.W., Bailey, S., Brady, K., Cisler, R., Hester, R.K., Kivlahan, D.R., Nirenberg, T.D., Pate, L.A., Sturgis, E., 1997. Matching alcoholism treatments to client heterogeneity: project MATCH post-treatment drinking outcomes. *J. Stud. Alcohol* 58, 7–29.
- Anderson, P., Chisholm, D., Fuhr, D.C., 2009. Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of policies and programmes to reduce the harm caused by alcohol. *Lancet* 373, 2234–2246 (27–6–2009).
- Babor, T.F., Longabaugh, R., Zweben, A., Fuller, R.K., Stout, R.L., Anton, R.F., Randall, C.L., 1994. Issues in the definition and measurement of drinking outcomes in alcoholism treatment research. *J. Stud. Alcohol Suppl* 12, 101–111.
- Bennett, G.A., Withers, J., Thomas, P.W., Higgins, D.S., Bailey, J., Parry, L., Davies, E., 2005. A randomised trial of early warning signs relapse prevention training in the treatment of alcohol dependence. *Addict. Behav.* 30, 1111–1124.
- Bodenheimer, T., Wagner, E.H., Grumbach, K., 2002a. Improving primary care for patients with chronic illness. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 288, 1775–1779 (9–10–2002a).
- Bodenheimer, T., Wagner, E.H., Grumbach, K., 2002b. Improving primary care for patients with chronic illness: the chronic care model. Part 2. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 288, 1909–1914 (16–10–2002b).
- Branstrom, R., Andreasson, S., 2008. Regional differences in alcohol consumption, alcohol addiction and drug use among Swedish adults. *Scand. J. Public Health* 36, 493–503.
- Burtscheidt, W., Wolwer, W., Schwarz, R., Strauss, W., Gaebel, W., 2002. Out-patient behaviour therapy in alcoholism: treatment outcome after 2 years. *Acta Psychiatr. Scand.* 106, 227–232.
- Burtscheidt, W., Wolwer, W., Schwarz, R., Strauss, W., Loll, A., Luthcke, H., Redner, C., Gaebel, W., 2001. Out-patient behaviour therapy in alcoholism: relapse rates after 6 months. *Acta Psychiatr. Scand.* 103, 24–29.
- Chan, A.W., Tetzlaff, J.M., Altman, D.G., Dickersin, K., Moher, D., 2013. SPIRIT 2013 new guidance for content of clinical trial protocols. *Lancet* 381, 91–92.
- Connors, G.J., Tarbox, A.R., Faillace, L.A., 1992. Achieving and maintaining gains among problem drinkers: process and outcome results. *Behav. Ther.* 23, 449–474.
- Cooper, L.F., Wilson, E.D., 1988. Some follow-up procedures with alcoholics who have completed an alcohol treatment program in a veterans hospital. *J. Alcohol Drug Educ.* 33, 58–67.
- Degenhardt, L., Hall, W., Lynskey, M., 2001. Alcohol, cannabis and tobacco use among Australians: a comparison of their associations with other drug use and use disorders, affective and anxiety disorders, and psychosis. *Addiction* 96, 1603–1614.
- Dick, D.M., Agrawal, A., Wang, J.C., Hinrichs, A., Bertelsen, S., Bucholz, K.K., Schuckit, M., Kramer, J., Nurnberger Jr., J., Tischfield, J., Edenberg, H.J., Goate, A., Bierut, L.J., 2007. Alcohol dependence with comorbid drug dependence: genetic and phenotypic associations suggest a more severe form of the disorder with stronger genetic contribution to risk. *Addiction* 102, 1131–1139.
- Ferri, M., Amato, L., Davoli, M., 2006. Alcoholics Anonymous and other 12-step programmes for alcohol dependence. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.*, CD005032.
- Fitzgerald, J.L., Mulford, H.A., 1985. An experimental test of telephone aftercare contacts with alcoholics. *J. Stud. Alcohol* 46, 418–424.
- Friedmann, P.D., 2013. Clinical practice: alcohol use in adults. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 368, 365–373 (24–1–2013).
- Galanter, M., 1984. Self-help large-group therapy for alcoholism: a controlled study. *Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res.* 8, 16–23.
- Galanter, M., Castaneda, R., Salamon, I., 1987. Institutional self-help therapy for alcoholism: clinical outcome. *Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res.* 11, 424–429.
- Giesbrecht, N., Cukier, S., Steeves, D., 2010. Collateral damage from alcohol: implications of 'second-hand effects of drinking' for populations and health priorities. *Addiction* 105, 1323–1325.
- Gilbert, F.S., 1988. The effect of type of aftercare follow-up on treatment outcome among alcoholics. *J. Stud. Alcohol* 49, 149–159.

- Higgins, J.P., Altman, D.G., Gotzsche, P.C., Juni, P., Moher, D., Oxman, A.D., Savovic, J., Schulz, K.F., Weeks, L., Sterne, J.A., 2011. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *Br. Med. J.* 343, d5928.
- Higgins, J.P.T., Green, S. (Eds.), 2011. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, Available from www.cochrane-handbook.org
- Intagliata, J., 1976. A telephone follow-up procedure for increasing the effectiveness of a treatment program for alcoholics. *J. Stud. Alcohol* 37, 1330–1335.
- Irvin, J.E., Bowers, C.A., Dunn, M.E., Wang, M.C., 1999. Efficacy of relapse prevention: a meta-analytic review. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 67, 563–570.
- Ito, J.R., Donovan, D.M., Hall, J.J., 1988. Relapse prevention in alcohol aftercare: effects on drinking outcome, change process, and aftercare attendance. *Br. J. Addict.* 83, 171–181.
- Kadden, R.M., Cooney, N.L., Getter, H., Litt, M.D., 1989. Matching alcoholics to coping skills or interactional therapies: posttreatment results. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 57, 698–704.
- Kadden, R.M., Litt, M.D., Cooney, N.L., Busher, D.A., 1992. Relationship between role-play measures of coping skills and alcoholism treatment outcome. *Addict. Behav.* 17, 425–437.
- Kazeem, A., Car, J., Pappas, Y., 2011. Telephone consultations for the management of alcohol-related disorders. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*.
- Keane, T.M., Foy, D.W., Nunn, B., Rychtarik, R.G., 1984. Spouse contracting to increase antabuse compliance in alcoholic veterans. *J. Clin. Psychol.* 40, 340–344.
- Kranzler, H.R., Del Boca, F.K., Rounsaville, B.J., 1996. Comorbid psychiatric diagnosis predicts three-year outcomes in alcoholics: a posttreatment natural history study. *J. Stud. Alcohol* 57, 619–626.
- Lash, S.J., Stephens, R.S., Burden, J.L., Grambow, S.C., DeMarce, J.M., Jones, M.E., Lozano, B.E., Jeffreys, A.S., Fearer, S.A., Horner, R.D., 2007. Contracting, prompting, and reinforcing substance use disorder continuing care: a randomized clinical trial. *Psychol. Addict. Behav.* 21, 387–397.
- Lash, S.J., Timko, C., Curran, G.M., McKay, J.R., Burden, J.L., 2011. Implementation of evidence-based substance use disorder continuing care interventions. *Psychol. Addict. Behav.* 25, 238–251.
- Maisto, S.A., McKay, J.R., O'Farrell, T.J., 1995. Relapse precipitants and behavioral marital therapy. *Addict. Behav.* 20, 383–393.
- Mattson, M.E., Allen, J.P., Longabaugh, R., Nickless, C.J., Connors, G.J., Kadden, R.M., 1994. A chronological review of empirical studies matching alcoholic clients to treatment. *J. Stud. Alcohol Suppl.* 1 (12), 16–29.
- McKay, J.R., 2005. Is there a case for extended interventions for alcohol and drug use disorders? *Addiction* 100, 1594–1610.
- McKay, J.R., 2009. Continuing care research: what we have learned and where we are going. *J. Subst. Abuse Treat.* 36, 131–145.
- McKay, J.R., Lynch, K.G., Shepard, D.S., Ratichek, S., Morrison, R., Koppenhaver, J., Pettinati, H.M., 2004. The effectiveness of telephone-based continuing care in the clinical management of alcohol and cocaine use disorders: 12-month outcomes. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 72, 967–979.
- McLellan, A.T., Lewis, D.C., O'Brien, C.P., Kleber, H.D., 2000. Drug dependence, a chronic medical illness: implications for treatment, insurance, and outcomes evaluation. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 284, 1689–1695 (4-10-2000).
- McTavish, F.M., Chih, M.Y., Shah, D., Gustafson, D.H., 2012. How patients recovering from alcoholism use a smartphone intervention. *J. Dual Diagn.* 8, 294–304.
- Miller, W.R., Sorensen, J.L., Selzer, J.A., Brigham, G.S., 2006. Disseminating evidence-based practices in substance abuse treatment: a review with suggestions. *J. Subst. Abuse Treat.* 31, 25–39.
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D.G., 2009. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 151, 264–269 (18-8-2009, W64).
- Mundt, J.C., Moore, H.K., Bean, P., 2006. An interactive voice response program to reduce drinking relapse: a feasibility study. *J. Subst. Abuse Treat.* 30, 21–29.
- NICE Clinical Guidelines, 2011. No. 115. guidance.nice.org.uk.
- O'Farrell, T.J., Choquette, K.A., Cutter, H.S., 1998. Couples relapse prevention sessions after behavioral marital therapy for male alcoholics: outcomes during the three years after starting treatment. *J. Stud. Alcohol* 59, 357–370.
- O'Farrell, T.J., Choquette, K.A., Cutter, H.S., Brown, E.D., 1993. Behavioral marital therapy with and without additional couples relapse prevention sessions for alcoholics and their wives. *J. Stud. Alcohol* 54, 652–666.
- O'Farrell, T.J., Cutter, H.S., Floyd, F.J., 1985. Evaluating behavioral marital therapy for male alcoholics: effects on marital adjustment and communication from before to after treatment. *Behav. Ther.* 16, 147–167.
- O'Farrell, T.J., Cutter, H.S.G., Choquette, K.A., Floyd, F.J., Bayog, R.D., 1992. Behavioral marital therapy for male alcoholics: marital and drinking adjustment during the two years after treatment. *Behav. Ther.* 23, 529–549.
- Ossip-Klein, D.J., Van Landingham, W.P., Prue, D.M., Rychtarik, R.G., 1984. Increasing attendance at alcohol aftercare using calendar prompts and home based contracting. *Addict. Behav.* 9, 85–89.
- Ouwens, M., Wollersheim, H., Hermens, R., Hulscher, M., Grol, R., 2005. Integrated care programmes for chronically ill patients: a review of systematic reviews. *Int. J. Qual. Health Care* 17, 141–146.
- Pelc, I., Hanak, C., Baert, I., Houtain, C., Leher, P., Landron, F., Verbanck, P., 2005. Effect of community nurse follow-up when treating alcohol dependence with Acamprostate. *Alcohol Alcohol.* 40, 302–307.
- Popovici, I., French, M.T., McKay, J.R., 2008. Economic evaluation of continuing care interventions in the treatment of substance abuse: recommendations for future research. *Eval. Rev.* 32, 547–568.
- Powell, B.J., Penick, E.C., Read, M.R., Ludwig, A.M., 1985. Comparison of three outpatient treatment interventions: a twelve-month follow-up of men alcoholics. *J. Stud. Alcohol* 46, 309–312.
- Project MATCH Research Group, 1998. Matching alcoholism treatments to client heterogeneity: treatment main effects and matching effects on drinking during treatment. *J. Stud. Alcohol* 59, 631–639.
- Powers, M.B., Vedel, E., Emmelkamp, P.M., 2008. Behavioral couples therapy (BCT) for alcohol and drug use disorders: a meta-analysis. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 28, 952–962.
- Rehm, J., Shield, K., Rehm, M.X., Gmel, G., Frick, U., 2012. Alcohol Consumption, Alcohol Dependence and Attributable Burden of Disease in Europe: Potential Gains from Effective Interventions for Alcohol Dependence. Centre for Addiction and Mental Health www.camh.net
- Room, R., Babor, T., Rehm, J., 2005. Alcohol and public health. *Lancet* 365, 519–530 (5-2-2005).
- Smith, D.E., 2012. The process addictions and the new ASAM definition of addiction. *J. Psychoactive Drugs* 44, 1–4.
- Stallman, H.M., Kavanagh, D., White, A.M., 2012. Internet interventions for treatment of alcohol-related problems. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*.
- Stinson, F.S., Grant, B.F., Dawson, D.A., Ruan, W.J., Huang, B., Saha, T., 2005. Comorbidity between DSM-IV alcohol and specific drug use disorders in the United States: results from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 80, 105–116 (1-10-2005).
- Weisner, C., 2001. Integrating primary medical care with addiction treatment: a randomized controlled trial. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 286, 1715–1723 (10-10-2001).
- White, A., Kavanagh, D., Stallman, H., Klein, B., Kay-Lambkin, F., Proudfoot, J., Drennan, J., Connor, J., Baker, A., Hines, E., Young, R., 2010. Online alcohol interventions: a systematic review. *J. Med Internet Res.* 12, e62.