

A randomised controlled trial of cognitive behavioural treatment for obsessive compulsive disorder in children and adolescents

Article

Accepted Version

Williams, T. I., Salkovskis, P.M., Forrester, E., Turner, S., White, H. and Allsopp, M. (2010) A randomised controlled trial of cognitive behavioural treatment for obsessive compulsive disorder in children and adolescents. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 19 (5). pp. 449-456. ISSN 1018-8827 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-009-0077-9> Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/18188/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00787-009-0077-9>

Publisher: Springer Verlag

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Editorial Manager(tm) for European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: ECAP-D-08-00177R1

Title: A randomised controlled trial of cognitive behavioural treatment for obsessive compulsive disorder in children and adolescents

Article Type: Original Contribution

Keywords: Obsessive compulsive disorder, Cognitive Behaviour Therapy, Randomised controlled trial, Treatment, Young people

Corresponding Author: Dr Tim I Williams, M.A., M.Sc., D.Phil.

Corresponding Author's Institution: Berkshire Healthcare NHS Trust

First Author: Tim I Williams, M.A., M.Sc., D.Phil.

Order of Authors: Tim I Williams, M.A., M.Sc., D.Phil.; Paul M Salkovskis, Ph.D.; Liz Forrester, Ph.D.; Sam Turner, D.Clin. Psych.; Hilary White, D.Clin.Psych.; Mark A Allsopp, M.D.

Abstract: Background: Cognitive behaviour therapy for young people with obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD) has become the treatment of first choice. However the literature is largely based on studies from specialist academic departments and uses methods emphasising exposure and response prevention. In this study we report on a randomised controlled trial of CBT for young people carried out in typical outpatient clinic conditions which focused on responsibility cognitions.

Design: A randomised controlled trial comparing 10 sessions of manualised cognitive behavioural treatment with a 12 week waiting list for adolescents and children with OCD. Assessors were blind to treatment allocation.

Participants: 21 consecutive patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder aged between 9 and 18 years.

Results: The group who received treatment improved more than a comparison group who waited for three months. The second group were treated subsequently using the same protocol and made similar gains.

Conclusion: Cognitive behaviour therapy can be delivered effectively to young people with obsessive compulsive disorder in typical outpatient settings.

Response to Reviewers: Thank you for your consideration of our submission to European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. We have made the following changes to the manuscript in view of the referee's comments. The changes made are described in the order in which they appear in the referee's comments.

Referee's paragraph 1 and 2

I have altered the second paragraph of the introduction to make it clearer that this study was intended to identify whether the Salkovskis model of CBT was usable with young people. I have therefore strengthened the argument for the importance of responsibility cognitions in the introduction, while acknowledging that other models might be supported. A more detailed argument could be produced if

there was space in the journal. In general the introduction and discussion have been substantially rewritten.

Referee's paragraph 3

We have altered the introduction to de-emphasise the non-academic service based component of the study.

Referee's paragraph 4

The in and exclusion criteria are now described – see also the CONSORT diagram.

Referee's paragraph 5

Further details of the patients have been described including medication, comorbidities and comparability of patients at baseline. Since treatment history was not part of the inclusion or exclusion criteria we have not described it further.

Referee's paragraph 6

We have included further descriptions of the measures that are new to this study, and included information about the CRIQ. Detailed information about these measures is also available on <http://psychology.iop.kcl.ac.uk/ocdkids/questionnaires/questionnaires.aspx> and in the book edited by Waite & Williams (2009). The MASC results are now included in the revised manuscript. They were missed out due to an oversight.

Referee's paragraph 7

We have explained that there was no further treatment during the follow-up.

Referee's paragraph 8

We have attempted to make clear that the purpose of the study was not to provide a comparison with other treatments which would require a much larger sample size, but rather to demonstrate that this model of treatment was usable in a clinic setting with young children.

Referee's paragraph 9

While it would be fair to state that our approach was strongly cognitive, it would not be correct to claim that it was purely cognitive. This treatment approach emphasises cognitive change as a means to enable behavioural change. Nevertheless we have attempted to de-emphasise the cognitive approach used here to satisfy the referee's concerns.

Referee's paragraph 10

We have rephrased our point to remove the implied criticism of the Cochrane review

Referee's paragraph 11

We have removed the word somewhat from the sentence.

Referee's paragraph 12

We have clarified the effect sizes used here. Because of the way that the data from the POTS trial has been reported it is not possible to report the Morris & Deshon type effect size.

Referee's paragraph 13

We have clarified the table to show that the POTS trial contained a placebo condition.

We hope that the revised paper now meets the conditions for publication in ECAP,

Running Head: RCT of CBT for young people with OCD

**A randomised controlled trial of cognitive behavioural treatment
for obsessive compulsive disorder in children and adolescents**

Tim I. Williams,
Berkshire Healthcare NHS Trust
& School of Psychology, University of Reading

Paul M. Salkovskis, Liz Forrester
Institute of Psychiatry, London

Sam Turner, Hilary White, Mark A. Allsopp
Berkshire Healthcare NHS Trust

Keywords: Obsessive compulsive disorder, Cognitive Behaviour Therapy, Randomised
controlled trial, Treatment, Young people

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. T. I. Williams, School of
Psychology, University of Reading, Earley Gate, Reading, RG6 6AL

E-mail: sxswiams@reading.ac.uk

Abstract

Background: Cognitive behaviour therapy for young people with obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD) has become the treatment of first choice. However the literature is largely based on studies from specialist academic departments and uses methods emphasising exposure and response prevention. In this study we report on a randomised controlled trial of CBT for young people carried out in typical outpatient clinic conditions which focused on responsibility cognitions.

Design: A randomised controlled trial comparing 10 sessions of manualised cognitive behavioural treatment with a 12 week waiting list for adolescents and children with OCD. Assessors were blind to treatment allocation.

Participants: 21 consecutive patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder aged between 9 and 18 years.

Results: The group who received treatment improved more than a comparison group who waited for three months. The second group were treated subsequently using the same protocol and made similar gains.

Conclusion: Cognitive behaviour therapy can be delivered effectively to young people with obsessive compulsive disorder in typical outpatient settings.

A randomised controlled trial of cognitive behavioural treatment of obsessive compulsive disorder in children and adolescents

Obsessive compulsive disorder is a particularly severe and disabling psychological disorder. Recent epidemiological studies suggest that it affects around 1.9 to 3.2% of the adult population and may have a one year prevalence rate of up to 4% in late adolescence [12]. Follow-up studies have shown that it has a chronic relapsing course such that 50% of adult patients report their first symptoms in childhood or adolescence and 50% of patients with obsessive compulsive disorder in adolescence will continue to suffer disabling effects from OCD in adulthood [2, 7, 34]. An effective treatment for OCD in adolescence could offer significant savings for the health service and improved quality of life for many patients.

For adults pharmacological treatments (selective serotonin re-uptake inhibitors; SSRIs) have been shown to reduce the level of symptomatology, but in up to 90% of patients these gains are lost within seven weeks of stopping treatment [33]. The benefits of SSRIs for young people with OCD have also been demonstrated (see Geller et al., [16] for a meta-analysis) but there are concerns about the safety of medication in young people on the grounds of both physiology and risk taking behaviour. Although controversial, these concerns impact on the acceptability of pharmacotherapy. In adults it is known that SSRIs do not enhance short-term adherence to psychological treatment, and in the long term their use may impair the efficacy of psychological treatments [15].

Recent expert consensus guidelines suggest that cognitive behavioural treatments are the first choice treatments for children and adolescents with OCD [20, 25] although a Cochrane review concluded only that “behavioural or cognitive-behaviour therapy appears to be a promising treatment

1
2
3
4 for OCD in children and adolescents” [26]. Until recently there have been few trials which examine
5
6 the effectiveness of cognitive behavioural therapy for young people, based on the assumption that
7
8 adult based research would generalise. In general controlled trials have demonstrated that CBT
9
10 techniques used for adults have generalised well [4, 6, 9, 11, 21]. The largest of these trials [21]
11
12 demonstrated that both medication and cognitive behavioural therapy were effective treatments for
13
14 OCD. However there was a significant site by treatment interaction such that in one site cognitive
15
16 behaviour therapy was significantly more effective than medication whereas in the other site
17
18 medication was found to be more effective. Other controlled trials of CBT for young people have
19
20 found similar beneficial effects of CBT compared with medication [4, 11].
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 The components of cognitive behaviour therapy for children have often been poorly
29
30 specified. Two components have been used by most studies – exposure and response prevention
31
32 (E/RP) and anxiety management [4, 6, 9, 11, 21]. Bolton and Perrin [9] have demonstrated that
33
34 E/RP alone (with minimal anxiety management) is sufficient to achieve significant benefits. De Haan,
35
36 Hoogduin, Buitelaar & Keijsers [11] investigated the use of targeted cognitive techniques including
37
38 manipulating responsibility cognitions demonstrating comparable effects for CBT and medication.
39
40 Two studies have delivered CBT in group format [4,6], without compromising the effect of CBT.
41
42 Furthermore, Barrett, Healy-Farrell & March [6] involved parents in treatment with beneficial effects.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 An alternative to managing anxiety around exposure and response prevention is to target
51
52 cognitions specific to OCD. A number of candidate cognitive processes have been suggested and a
53
54 systematic review of cognitions related to OCD symptoms in young people [27] suggested that three
55
56 models have some support: increased responsibility; meta-cognitions, and thought-action fusion.
57
58 These models are difficult to distinguish empirically, because the processes overlap. An appraisal of
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 responsibility for intrusive thoughts is a form of meta-cognition (thinking about thoughts) and the
5
6 appraisal that ones thoughts might result in actions or events occurring is of no significance unless
7
8 one appraises oneself as responsible for the thought. Evidence for responsibility cognitions being
9
10 specific to OCD in adults has been provided by Salkovskis and his coworkers who demonstrated that
11
12 they differentiate patients with OCD from those with other emotional disorders [30].
13
14
15
16
17

18
19 Studies with young people have not shown the clarity of the link between responsibility and
20
21 OCD expected from the adult results [27]. Other aspects of cognition such as thought action fusion
22
23 [7, 18], and perfectionism [18] are correlated with symptoms of OCD in young people, although these
24
25 relationships are substantially mediated by responsibility cognitions [18, 22]. Reynolds and Reeves [27]
26
27 point out however that the relationships between these cognitive processes are unclear and may be
28
29 mediated or moderated by other factors such as low mood. The robustness of the responsibility
30
31 cognitions model in adults and the evidence that responsibility cognitions seem to be problematic in
32
33 children with OCD suggest that there is utility in examining the extent to which CBT which
34
35 concentrated on responsibility cognitions could be used to treat OCD.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Salkovskis and his colleagues (e.g. Salkovskis, 1998 [27]) have developed a package of
44
45 cognitive behavioural treatment methods which concentrates on responsibility cognitions. The
46
47 components that seem to be particularly important are:

- 48
49 1. normalising the nature of unpleasant intrusive cognitions;
- 50
51 2. identifying the nature of the link between the thoughts and the feelings of
52
53 discomfort/anxiety and subsequent neutralising rituals;
- 54
55 3. examining the logical nature of the links, and putting them to the test by means of
56
57 behavioural experiments;
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 4. comparing real danger with the worry about causing harm - i.e. discriminating
5
6 between thinking about and acting upon;
7
8
- 9 5. helping the patient to identify that the effect of attempting to control the thoughts
10 leads to recurrence of the thoughts or images;
11
12
- 13 6. helping the patient to consider alternative non-threatening accounts of their
14
15 obsessive problems.
16
17

18 The therapy also includes psychoeducation about anxiety and an explanation of how trying to carry
19
20 out exposure and response prevention might seem difficult. Although some exposure work was
21
22 undertaken, it was always explained in terms of finding out what happens to cognitions and emotions.
23
24 The therapists did not insist on waiting until the uncomfortable feelings had subsided as is required
25
26 by exposure and response prevention. A pilot study [35] of this form of CBT with young people
27
28 suggested that the changes in symptoms were paralleled by the changes in the responsibility beliefs
29
30 which initiate and maintain compulsive behaviours. The techniques also affect metacognition in that
31
32 they alter the beliefs about the nature and meaning of cognitions associated with OCD. This form of
33
34 CBT differs from that used in the POTS trial [21] in its concentration on cognitions. The treatment
35
36 does not aim to teach the children to resist the impulse to carry out compulsions, but rather to
37
38 identify and change the misconceptions underlying the motivation to carry out compulsions. A much
39
40 larger study would be needed to test this form of CBT against other forms of CBT or indeed a purely
41
42 behavioural treatment such as that in Bolton & Perrin [9].
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Methods

Young people were recruited to the trial with a primary diagnosis of obsessive compulsive disorder based on a semi structured interview for mental health problems (ADIS-C [32]). In total 21 young people aged 9 to 18 years (mean age 13 years 7 months; 13 boys, 8 girls) were recruited from 22 cases referred by Child and Adolescent Mental Health Teams or Family Doctors for the trial (see figure 1 for CONSORT diagram). Children were included if OCD was the major problem, and it had been present for at least six months. Children were excluded if they were unable to speak and understand English fluently, if they had co-occurring psychosis or autism spectrum disorder. At initial assessments 11 presented with no other clinical diagnoses, while four received diagnoses of generalised anxiety disorder, four specific phobia, four separation anxiety, two ADHD, two social phobia, and one dysthymia. (the numbers do not add up to 10 because only two had one additional diagnosis, the others having up to three additional diagnoses). Seven of the participants were taking medication throughout the trial and had been taking the same dose for twelve weeks prior to the trial (two on paroxetine 5 mg/day, 3 on fluoxetine 20mgs/day, one on fluvoxamine 50 mgs per day, one on clomipramine 50 mgs/day). There was no significant multivariate difference between the groups at initial assessment ($F(6,13) = 0.58, N.S.$) The therapists for the trial (TW, HW, ST) were clinical psychologists employed by the National Health Service (NHS) in England to work in community child and adolescent mental health clinics. All treatment took place in NHS clinics and was recorded on audio tape if the young person consented.

1
2
3
4 *Procedure*
5
6
7
8

9 Once consent was received for taking part in the trial the participants were allocated to either
10 immediate treatment (10 one hour sessions) or a 12 week waiting list. Allocation was carried out on a
11 predetermined random number schedule with no replacements by the trial administrator. Participants
12 in the waiting list condition were informed that they would have to wait twelve weeks for therapy, but
13 they were given the phone number of the lead clinician (TW) to contact in the case of a significant
14 deterioration in OCD.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Assessments were conducted at the beginning and end of treatment (and/or waiting list
26 period), and 12 weeks after the end of treatment. All assessments were completed in the child's home
27 unless specifically requested to be elsewhere. Assessors were blind to the allocation of the
28 participants, and the participants were instructed not to reveal whether they had received treatment.
29
30 The assessors completed two semi-structured interviews: Children's Yale-Brown Obsessive
31 Compulsive Scale (C-YBOCS [31]), to assess OCD symptoms and the ADIS-C [32] a semi-structured
32 interview to assess the presence of other comorbid disorders. Participant completed measures
33 included Child Depression Inventory [16], Obsessions and Compulsions Inventory (OCI, [13])
34 modified for children, Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children [18], the Children's Responsibility
35 Attributions Scale (CRAS), the Children's Responsibility Interpretations questionnaire (CRIQ). Both
36 the CRIQ and the CRAS are instruments modified from the adult measures of responsibility
37 cognitions published in Salkovskis et al., [30]). The CRAS is scored such that increasing score
38 indicates a decreasing level of responsibility attributions, whereas the other self report scales are
39 scored such that increasing score indicates increasing difficulties. An unpublished study by the first
40 author found that the internal reliability of the CRAS was good in a large normative sample of 13-14
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 year olds (Cronbach's alpha = 0.85). The internal reliability in a sample of young people with mental
5
6 health problems for the other scales was also high (OCI - Cronbach's alpha = 0.93; RIQ frequency –
7
8 Cronbach's alpha = 0.86; RIQ belief Cronbach's alpha = 0.85). Copies of these measures are
9
10 available on <http://psychology.iop.kcl.ac.uk/ocdkids/questionnaires/questionnaires.aspx>.
11
12
13
14

15 16 *Treatments*

17
18 Cognitive behaviour therapy was based on the principles outlined by Salkovskis [28].
19
20 Participants worked with their therapists to understand the cognitive distortions which maintain their
21
22 obsessive compulsive disorder. The aim of treatment is to alter responsibility cognitions, primarily by
23
24 doing experiments both in session and at home. For instance, one common belief encountered in
25
26 OCD is that the sufferer is uniquely responsible for harm occurring if certain rituals are not carried
27
28 out satisfactorily. The therapist and the participant would agree during the session to carry out an
29
30 experiment designed to see what happens if responsibility is shared. Another common task during
31
32 therapy is to attempt to elicit the worrying intrusive thoughts and examine whether they have real
33
34 meaning or are just thoughts. Treatment fidelity was ensured through clinic notes, regular meetings of
35
36 the therapist team and audiotapes of treatment sessions.
37
38
39
40
41

42 Participants were allocated by the trial administrator to the two groups using a table of
43
44 random numbers. Only the trial administrator was aware which participants were in which group.
45
46 One participant from each group chose to leave the trial during the first phase, their results have been
47
48 extrapolated on the conservative assumption that no change occurred as a result of either
49
50 intervention.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Results

Plan of analysis

The primary measure of OCD symptoms is the CYBOCS. We report first an analysis of covariance of the CYBOCS score at three months post baseline assessment (with baseline CYBOCS as the covariate), at which stage only one of the two groups will have received an active treatment. This analysis tests the hypothesis that there will be a group effect at three months. We will then repeat the analysis of covariance of the CYBOCS scores at six months post base line when both groups will have received treatment. This analysis tests the hypothesis that there will be a period by group effect on the analysis of the CYBOCS scores at three and six months. Finally we will analyse the secondary measures (i.e. self-report data) in the same way using initial values of the measure as the covariate.

Two clients dropped out of the study during the first phase (one from each condition). In the following analyses the last observation was carried forward from the last available observation. This is therefore an intention to treat analysis.

Analysis of primary measure

Figure 2 shows the mean CYBOCS scores at baseline, three months and six months. The analysis of covariance (baseline CYBOCS as covariate) of the CYBOCS at 3 months showed a significant group effect ($F(1) = 7.07, p=0.016$). The figure shows that this is due to a much improved CYBOCS score for the group treated with CBT first. The group that were allocated to the waiting list showed little or no improvement over the same period. Cohen's effect size (d) for the difference between the two groups divided by the mean standard deviation was calculated as 1.07, which Cohen (1988) suggested was a large treatment effect.

At 6 months the analysis of covariance of CYBOCS (using baseline CYBOCS as covariate) showed no group effect as expected since both groups had received treatment, although there was a

1
2
3
4 trend towards a significant effect of the covariate ($F(1,19) = 3.70, p = 0.07$) suggesting that the severity
5
6 of OCD at the beginning of the trial influences the outcome. As can be seen from figure 2 both
7
8 groups had improved significantly and the group that was treated first showed continuing slight
9
10 improvement.
11
12
13
14
15

16 *Analysis of secondary measures*

17
18 Analysis of the secondary data (the self report questionnaires OCI, CRAS, CDI, CRIQ
19
20 frequency, CRIQ belief – see table 1) used the same procedures – i.e. analysis of covariance using the
21
22 baseline value of the measure as the covariate. There were no statistically significant group effects at
23
24 three months (OCI – $F(1,19) = 0.29, p = 0.59$; CDI – $F(1,19) = 0.49, p = 0.49$; CRIQ frequency – $F(1,$
25
26 $19) = 2.07, p = 0.17$; CRIQ belief – $F(1, 19) = 0.90, p = 0.36$; CRAS $F(1, 19) = 0.41, p = 0.53$; MASC –
27
28 $F(1,19) = 0.008, p = 0.929$) but there were significant effects of the covariate for each measure (OCI –
29
30 $F(1, 19) = 11.19, p = 0.004$; CDI – $F(1, 19) = 12.20, p = 0.003$; CRIQ frequency – $F(1, 19) = 13.06$;
31
32 $p = 0.002$; CRIQ belief – $F(1, 19) = 17.26, p = 0.001$; CRAS $F(1, 19) = 27.12, p < 0.001$), except the
33
34 MASC ($F(1,19) = 0.13, p = 0.72$). Inspection of table 2 shows that show that the groups were improving
35
36 on all measures at the three month point.
37
38
39
40
41

42 A second analysis of covariance was carried out to determine if the treatment was effective for
43
44 both groups using data from baseline and at six months after both groups had received CBT. The
45
46 results showed that there was only a significant time effect ($F(1, 19) = 53.14, p < 0.001$) and no group
47
48 ($F(1, 19) = 0.06, p = 0.82$) or interaction effect ($F(1, 19) = 0.73, p = 0.40$). As is shown in figure 1 the
49
50 changes in CYBOCS are largest when the groups are receiving treatment. Overall the CYBOCS
51
52 scores of the participants reduced from 22.12 (s.e. = 1.08) to 9.64 (s.e. = 1.79). Analysis of the
53
54 secondary data also showed significant changes from baseline to six months (OCI – $F(1,19) = 18.35,$
55
56 $p < 0.001$; CDI – $F = 23.16, p < 0.001$; RIQB – $F(1,19) = 32.8, p < 0.001$; RIQF – $F(1,19) = 25.15,$
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 $p < 0.001$; RAS – $F(1,19) = 10.75$, $p = 0.004$; MASC – $F(1,19) = 22.81$, $p < 0.001$), but no group effects
5
6 (OCI – $F(1,19) = 0.45$, $p = 0.51$; CDI – $F(1,19) = 0.53$, $p = 0.48$; RIQB – $F(1,19) = 0.30$, $p = 0.59$; RIQF
7
8 – $F(1,19) = 0.003$, $p = 0.38$; RAS – $F(1,19) = 0.89$, $p = 0.36$; MASC – $F(1,19) = 0.30$, $p = 0.60$) or interaction
9
10 effects (OCI – $F(1,19) = 1.41$, $p = 0.25$; CDI – $F(1,19) = 0.42$, $p = 0.53$; RIQB – $F(1,19) = 1.03$, $p = 0.32$;
11
12 RIQF – $F(1,19) = 0.83$, $p = 0.38$; RAS – $F(1,19) = 2.08$, $p = 0.17$; MASC – $F(1,19) = 0.27$, $p = 0.61$). Table 1
13
14 shows the means and standard deviations for all the measures.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 We followed the recommendations of Morris and Deschon, (2002 cited in Abramowitz et al.
22
23 [1]) to calculate the effect size as the difference between the immediately pre-treatment CYBOCS and
24
25 the post treatment CYBOCS divided by the pre-treatment standard deviation (effect size = 2.62)
26
27 which also allows for the calculation of the effect size of the placebo. This effect size was compared
28
29 with those from other published trials which included a control group (see table 2). The results from
30
31 this study fall within the range of values reported heretofore.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Discussion

39
40
41

42 Cognitive behaviour therapy largely based on the use of experiments to tackle the cognitive
43
44 bias of excessive personal responsibility produced a significantly greater reduction in OCD symptoms
45
46 of the participants than a waiting list condition. Being placed on the waiting list first did not affect the
47
48 power of the subsequent treatment. The self-report measures showed a statistically significant
49
50 reduction in self-reported symptoms over the two time periods but did not demonstrate an effect of
51
52 treatment. The study also shows only small changes in symptoms for the young people placed on the
53
54 waiting list (cf. Abramovitz et al. [1]) therefore confirming the chronic nature of obsessive compulsive
55
56 disorder in young people. This adds to the body of evidence in favour of CBT for OCD in young
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 people. In view of the potential problems associated with medication, the results of this study support
5
6 the view that young people with OCD should therefore be offered CBT as the first line treatment by
7
8 Child and Adolescent mental health services.
9

10
11
12
13
14 This is the first randomised controlled study of a CBT approach based on responsibility
15
16 cognitions (following Salkovskis [27,28]) with young people. Although the numbers treated in this
17
18 trial were small, the demonstration that the treatment was as effective on the waiting list group
19
20 demonstrates that waiting for treatment had no effect on eventual outcome and increases the power
21
22 of the study. The study was carried out in routine health service outpatient settings and thus
23
24 demonstrates that the effectiveness of cognitive behaviour therapy is not restricted to specialist or
25
26 university research clinics, an effect also seen in the De Haan study [11]. The three month follow up
27
28 of the group that was treated first suggests that, at least at first, the participants continued to improve
29
30 after cessation of treatment.
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 The failure of the self-report measures to demonstrate a difference between the groups at the
39
40 three month point is difficult to explain. Although a failure to find changes in depression symptoms is
41
42 not unusual in trials of CBT for OCD [25], we had predicted a change in OCD symptoms paralleling
43
44 responsibility cognitions as was found in a pilot study [35]. One possibility is that as found by Anholt
45
46 et al. [3] the changes in behaviour rather than the changes in cognitions were the most significant
47
48 feature of treatment. However it is also possible that the hope that someone else was going to help
49
50 with the problem improved the subjective feelings tapped by self report measures including the
51
52 appraisals of responsibility, but did not alter the assessor rated severity. Yet another possibility is that
53
54 the self-report measures are not valid in this population. Further research on the validity and
55
56 reliability of self-report measures would be helpful.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Other trials of CBT with young people have tended to concentrate on managing the anxiety
8 or discomfort experienced when undertaking exposure and response prevention (e.g. [4,6,21]). The
9 effect size observed in this trial is somewhat less than those seen in previous trials of CBT for young
10 people with OCD (mean effect size 1.98 – Table 3 in Abramovitz et al. [1]), although the differences
11 in the methods of effect size calculation make the comparison somewhat problematic.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Differences in the treatment offered may also be important in determining the effectiveness
22 of the intervention. There are two lines of evidence: intra-trial site differences and inter-trial
23 differences. The POTS trial compared CBT using E/RP and management of the distress associated
24 with OCD with a placebo medication condition but found considerable site differences for both the
25 CBT and a third medication only condition [21]. (Unfortunately because the site data is only reported
26 as Hedge's g effect sizes, we were unable to compare effect sizes using the Morris & DeShon method
27 [24] and calculated Hedge's g effect sizes in the following text). The Hedge's g effect size for the
28 POTS trial form of CBT varied from 0.51 in Chapel Hill to 1.6 in Pennsylvania (a statistically
29 significant difference). The Hedge's g effect size in this trial (1.07) falls within that range. Bolton &
30 Perrin [9] demonstrated the benefits of E/RP alone compared with a wait list (Hedge's g effect size
31 1.23).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Our study does not provide information on the relative merits of different forms of CBT.
51 The difficulty with attempting such a comparison is that the effect sizes of different models of CBT
52 appear to be comparable (see previous paragraph). Of more interest in clinical practice are issues such
53 as the use of combinations of medication and CBT and the involvement of the family. Studies with
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 adults have begun to show that offering medication first diminishes the subsequent effectiveness of
5
6 CBT [15].
7
8
9

10
11 Most of the studies on CBT with young people have included the parents in treatment
12 sessions, although Bolton and Perrin [9] only provided feedback at the end of each session. Recent
13 work by Barrett, Healy-Farrell & March [6] showed that very substantial reductions in OCD could be
14 obtained by the use of family management components in the treatment package. The families of
15 young people with OCD differ in some important respects from the families of young people with
16 anxiety disorders [5, 12]. Barrett's study demonstrated that the parents were less confident in their
17 child's ability, less rewarding of independence, and were less likely to use positive problem solving
18 than the parents of children with anxiety disorders. Derisley et al. [11] found that parents tended to
19 use avoidant coping techniques as well as having more symptoms of mental health problems. The
20 NICE guidelines too [24] suggest that the contribution of the family to the treatment of young people
21 with OCD needs further investigation. However the involvement of families in the treatment of
22 other emotional disorders in young people has not always been successful [10]. Nevertheless it would
23 be worth investigating whether a family component focused on problem solving strategies and
24 developing confidence in the child's abilities would be helpful in increasing the effect of the CBT
25 used in this study as has been partially demonstrated by Barrett, Healy-Farrell & March [6].
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

1. Abramowitz, J. S., Whiteside, S. R., & Deacon, B. J. (2005). The effectiveness of treatment for pediatric obsessive-compulsive disorder: A meta-analysis. Behavior Therapy, *36*(1), 55-63.
2. Allsopp, M., & Verduyn, C. (1989). A Follow-up of Adolescents with Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. British Journal of Psychiatry, *154*, 829-834.
3. Anholt, G. E., Kempe, P., de Haan, E., van Oppen, P., Cath, D. C., Smit, J. H., et al. (2008). Cognitive versus Behavior Therapy: Processes of Change in the Treatment of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. Psychother Psychosom, *77*(1), 38-42.
4. Asbahr, F. R., Castillo, A. R., Ito, L. M., Latorre, M. D., Moreira, M. N., & Lotufo-Neto, F. (2005). Group cognitive-behavioral therapy versus sertraline for the treatment of children and adolescents with obsessive-compulsive disorder. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, *44*(11), 1128-1136.
5. Barrett, P., Shortt, A., & Healy, L. (2002). Do parent and child behaviours differentiate families whose children have obsessive-compulsive disorder from other clinic and non-clinic families? Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, *43*, 597-607.
6. Barrett, P., Healy-Farrell, L., & March, J. S. (2004). Cognitive-behavioral family treatment of childhood obsessive-compulsive disorder: A controlled trial. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, *43*, 46-62.
7. Barrett, P., & Healy-Farrell, L. (2003). Perceived responsibility in juvenile obsessive-compulsive disorder: An experimental manipulation. Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, *32*, 430-441.
8. Bolton, D., Luckie, M., & Steinberg, D. (1995). Long-Term Course of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder Treated in Adolescence. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, *34*, 1441-1450.

- 1
2
3
4 9. Bolton, D., & Perrin, S. (2008). Evaluation of exposure with response-prevention for obsessive
5 compulsive disorder in childhood and adolescence. Journal of Behavior Therapy and
6
7
8
9 Experimental Psychiatry, 39, 11-22.
- 10
11 10. Bodden, D. H. M., Bögels, S. M., Nauta, M. H., De Haan, E., Ringrose, J., Appelboom, C., et al.
12
13 (2008). Child Versus Family Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy in Clinically Anxious Youth: An
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
10. Bodden, D. H. M., Bögels, S. M., Nauta, M. H., De Haan, E., Ringrose, J., Appelboom, C., et al. (2008). Child Versus Family Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy in Clinically Anxious Youth: An Efficacy and Partial Effectiveness Study. Journal of American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 47(12), 1384-1394.
11. De Haan, E., Hoogduin, K. A. L., Buitelaar, J. K., & Keijsers, G. P. J. (1998). Behavior therapy versus clomipramine for the treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder in children and adolescents. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 37, 1022-1029.
12. Derisley, J., Libby, S., Clark, S., & Reynolds, S. (2005). Mental health, coping and family-functioning in parents of young people with obsessive-compulsive disorder and with anxiety disorders. British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 44, 439-444.
13. Douglass, H. M., Moffitt, T. E., Dar, R., McGee, R., & et al. (1995). Obsessive-compulsive disorder in a birth cohort of 18-year-olds: Prevalence and predictors. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 34, 1424-1431.
14. 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, 206-214.
15. 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). Randomized, placebo-controlled trial of exposure and ritual prevention, clomipramine, and their combination

- 1
2
3
4 in the treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder. American Journal of Psychiatry, 162, 151-
5
6 161.
7
8
9 16. Geller, D. A., Biederman, J., Stewart, S. E., Mullin, B., Martin, A., Spencer, T., & Faraone, S. V.
10
11 (2003). Which SSRI? A meta-analysis of pharmacotherapy trials in pediatric obsessive-
12
13 compulsive disorder. American Journal of Psychiatry, 160, 1919-1928.
14
15
16 17. Kovacs, M. (1992). The children's depression inventory manual. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
17
18
19 18. Libby, S., Reynolds, S., Derisley, J., & Clark, S. (2004). Cognitive appraisals in young people with
20
21 obsessive-compulsive disorder. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45, 1076-1084.
22
23
24 19. March JS (1997). Technical Manual for the Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children
25
26 (MASC). New York: Multi-Health Systems.
27
28
29 20. March, J.S., Frances, A., Carpenter, D. and Kahn, M.D., (1997) Treatment of obsessive-
30
31 compulsive disorder. The Expert Consensus Panel for obsessive-compulsive disorder. Journal
32
33 of Clinical Psychiatry, 58 Suppl 4, 2-72.
34
35
36 21. March, J. S., Foa, E., Gammon, P., Chrisman, A., Curry, J., Fitzgerald, D., Sullivan, K., Franklin,
37
38 M., Huppert, J., Rynn, M., Zhao, N., Zoellner, L., Leonard, H., Garcia, A., Freeman, J., & Tu, X.
39
40 (2004). Cognitive-behavior therapy, sertraline, and their combination for children and
41
42 adolescents with obsessive-compulsive disorder - The Pediatric OCD Treatment Study (POTS)
43
44 randomized controlled trial. Journal of the American Medical Association, 292, 1969-1976.
45
46
47 22. Mather, A., & Cartwright-Hatton, S. (2004). Cognitive predictors of obsessive-compulsive
48
49 symptoms in adolescence: A preliminary investigation. Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent
50
51 Psychology, 33, 743-749.
52
53
54 23. Matthews, L., Reynolds, S., & Derisley, J. (2006). Examining cognitive models of obsessive
55
56 compulsive disorder in adolescents. Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy, 35(02), 149-163.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 24. Morris, S.B. and DeShon, R.P. (2002) Combining Effect Size Estimates in Meta-Analysis With
5 Repeated Measures and Independent-Groups Designs. Psychological Methods, 7, 105–125.
6
7
8
9 25. National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health (2006) Obsessive compulsive disorder: Core
10 interventions in the treatment of obsessive compulsive disorder and body dysmorphic disorder.
11 National Clinical Practice Guideline Number 31. London: The British Psychological Society &
12 The Royal College of Psychiatrists.
13
14
15
16
17
18 26. O’Kearney R.T., Anstey, K.J., & von Sanden, C. (2006) Behavioural and cognitive behavioural
19 therapy for obsessive compulsive disorder in children and adolescents. Cochrane Database of
20 Systematic Reviews, Issue 4. Art. No.: CD004856. DOI:10.1002/14651858.CD004856.pub2.
21
22
23
24
25
26 27. Reynolds, S., & Reeves, J. (2008). Do Cognitive Models of Obsessive Compulsive Disorder
27 Apply to Children and Adolescents? *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 36(04), 463-471.
28
29
30 28. Salkovskis, P. M. (1998). Psychological approaches to the understanding of obsessional
31 problems. In R. P. Swinson, M. M. Antony, S.J. Rachman, and Richter, M.A. (Ed.), Obsessive-
32 compulsive Disorder: theory, research and treatment. New York: Guilford.
33
34
35
36
37 29. Salkovskis, P. M. (1999). Understanding and treating obsessive-compulsive disorder. Behaviour
38 Research and Therapy, 37, s29-52.
39
40
41
42 30. Salkovskis, P., Wroe, A., Gledhill, A., Morrison, N., Forrester, E., Richards, C., Reynolds, M., &
43 Thorpe, S. (2000). Responsibility attitudes and interpretations are characteristic of obsessive
44 compulsive disorder. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 38, 347-372.
45
46
47
48
49 31. Scahill, L., Riddle, M. A., McSwiggin Hardin, M., Ort, S. I., King, R. A., Goodman, W. K.,
50 Cicchetti, D., & Leckman, J. F. (1997). Children's Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale:
51 reliability and validity. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry,
52 36, 844-852.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 32. Silverman, W. K., & Albano, A. M. (1996). Anxiety disorders interview schedule for DSM-IV:
5
6 Child and parent versions. San Antonio: The Psychological Corporation.
7
8
9 33. Simpson, H. B., Franklin, M. E., Cheng, J. F., Foa, E. B., & Liebowitz, M. R. (2005). Standard
10
11 criteria for relapse are needed in obsessive-compulsive disorder. Depression and Anxiety, 21, 1-
12
13 8.
14
15
16 34. Thomsen, P. H., & Mikkelsen, H. U. (1995). Course of obsessive compulsive disorder in
17
18 children and adolescents. A prospective follow-up study of 23 Danish cases. Journal of the
19
20 American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 34, 1432-1440.
21
22
23 35. Williams, T., Salkovskis, P., Forrester, E. A., & Allsopp, M. A. (2002). Changes in Symptoms of
24
25 OCD and Appraisal of Responsibility During Cognitive Behavioural Treatment: A Pilot Study.
26
27 Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy, 30, 69-78.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Author Note

Tim I Williams is Honorary Research Fellow at the School of Psychology, University of Reading and Consultant Clinical Psychologist with the Berkshire Healthcare NHS Trust. Professor Salkovskis and Dr Forrester are at the Department of Psychology at the Institute of Psychiatry, Kings College, University of London. Dr Mark Allsopp is Consultant Child and Adolescent Psychiatrist, Berkshire Adolescent Service, Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust, Wokingham Hospital.

This research was supported by a grant (SPGS 808) from the National Health Service Responsive Funding Scheme to the first author.

Table 1

Means (s.e.) of self-report measures at baseline, three months (after first phase – one group treated) and six months (after second phase – both groups treated)

Measure	Baseline		3 months		6 months	
	CBT	WL	CBT	WL	CBT	WL
CYBOCS	23.09 (1.22)	21.05 (1.84)	12.09 (2.25)	19.60 (2.03)	9.23 (2.45)	10.10 (2.74)
OCI	59.30 (8.28)	73.55 (8.26)	45.00 (8.30)	60.30 (9.62)	37.10 (8.73)	34.30 (5.51)
CDI	17.85 (2.76)	14.67 (1.82)	12.9 (2.62)	12.78 (2.92)	10.50 (2.41)	9.06 (2.56)
MASC	59.8 (6.87)	66.3 (6.74)	49.7 (5.90)	56.6 (6.69)	41.1 (4.40)	43.0 (7.28)
CRAS	49.00 (6.00)	51.00 (8.10)	58.00 (7.54)	63.63 (6.15)	58.00 (8.03)	74.13 (8.31)
CRIQ Belief	634.38 (103.66)	781.11 (152.50)	563.13 (99.26)	537.78 (150.76)	320.63 (86.94)	332.22 (102.34)
CRIQ Frequency	29.25 (4.31)	31.44 (5.14)	25.38 (3.90)	19.33 (5.45)	16.75 (4.36)	13.89 (4.35)

Table 2

Effect sizes on CYBOCS calculated according to Morris and Schon (2002) for controlled studies of CBT in young people.

Study	Individual CBT effect size	Waiting list or placebo control effect size
This study	-2.61792	-0.24914
March et al. 2004 (placebo)	-2.6087	-0.81818
De Haan et al. 1998	-2.10169	N/A
Barrett et al. 2004	-3.55349	0.198543

Table notes: Negative numbers indicate improved CYBOCS scores. N/A indicates that the study did not include a waiting list control


Figure Captions


Figure 1. Consort diagram.

Figure 2. Mean CYBOCS scores for both groups at baseline, three months and six months. Error bars represent standard errors of the mean at each time point.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65





1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65



The University of Reading

School of Psychology

Head of Department
Dr. J. Ellis

Earley Gate
Reading RG6 6AL

The Editor
European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry

Phone +44 (0)118 3786604
Fax +44 (0)118 3786715
Email sxswiams@reading.ac.uk
Web www.rdg.ac.uk/

Monday, 30 March 2009

Dear Sir,

Submission no.

Thank you for your consideration of our submission to European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. We have made the following changes to the manuscript in view of the referee's comments. The changes made are described in the order in which they appear in the referee's comments.

Referee's paragraph 1 and 2

I have altered the second paragraph of the introduction to make it clearer that this study was intended to identify whether the Salkovskis model of CBT was usable with young people. I have therefore strengthened the argument for the importance of responsibility cognitions in the introduction, while acknowledging that other models might be supported. A more detailed argument could be produced if there was space in the journal. In general the introduction and discussion have been substantially rewritten.

Referee's paragraph 3

We have altered the introduction to de-emphasise the non-academic service based component of the study.

Referee's paragraph 4

The in and exclusion criteria are now described – see also the CONSORT diagram.

Referee's paragraph 5

Further details of the patients have been described including medication, comorbidities and comparability of patients at baseline. Since treatment history was not part of the inclusion or exclusion criteria we have not described it further.

Referee's paragraph 6

We have included further descriptions of the measures that are new to this study, and included information about the CRIQ. Detailed information about these measures is also available on <http://psychology.iop.kcl.ac.uk/ocdkids/questionnaires/questionnaires.aspx> and in the book edited by Waite & Williams (2009). The MASC results are now included in the revised manuscript. They were missed out due to an oversight.

Referee's paragraph 7

We have explained that there was no further treatment during the follow-up.

Referee's paragraph 8

We have attempted to make clear that the purpose of the study was not to provide a comparison with other treatments which would require a much larger sample size, but rather to demonstrate that this model of treatment was usable in a clinic setting with young children.

Referee's paragraph 9

There is a consistent thread in this referee's comments that suggests that they have over-emphasised the cognitive nature of our approach. While it would be fair to state that our approach was strongly cognitive, it would not be correct to claim that it was purely cognitive. This treatment approach emphasises cognitive change as a means to enable behavioural change. Nevertheless we have attempted to de-emphasise the cognitive approach used here to satisfy the referee's concerns.

Referee's paragraph 10

We have retained the sentence about O'Kearney et al.'s Cochrane review being overly pessimistic, but removed the phrase about the number of studies included. We hope that the referee would agree that the review might be considered over-pessimistic, the use of the word suggests indicates that we are not stating this as a fact but rather as an opinion.

Referee's paragraph 11

We have removed the word somewhat from the sentence.

Referee's paragraph 12

We have clarified the effect sizes used here. Because of the way that the data from the POTS trial has been reported it is not possible to report the Morris & Descon type effect size.

Referee's paragraph 13

We have clarified the table to show that the POTS trial contained a placebo condition.