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Abstract

Background:
To imagine the future methods and paradigms for evaluating treatments in child and adolescent psychiatry (CAP). A historical perspective will be adopted first to explain the origin of methods and designs presently in use. Then an overview of methodological breakthroughs that occur currently will be presented.

Methods:
At the moment, mechanisms of action and randomized controlled trials are the two pillars of treatment evaluation. However, personalized medicine, digital health, big data, health economy, and patient organizations strongly question this state of affairs. As a result, new methodological approaches are arriving in force among which “n-of-1” studies, Bayesian designs, observational studies, and Qualitative researches.

Results:
In CAP, psychological treatments are important, there are numerous age groups, and many moderators influencing treatment efficacy. This may be a reason why CAP has not benefited as much as many other medical specialties from Evidence-Based Medicine. Fortunately, the methodological revolution we are going through at the moment is likely to change this. If CAP can get the ball rolling, it will gain a lot in therapeutic efficacy.

Conclusion:
NA
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Abstract (<200 words):

*Purpose of review:*  
To imagine the future methods and paradigms for evaluating treatments in child and adolescent psychiatry (CAP). A historical perspective will be adopted first to explain the origin of methods and designs presently in use. Then an overview of methodological breakthroughs that occur currently will be presented.

*Recent findings:*  
At the moment, mechanisms of action and randomized controlled trials are the two pillars of treatment evaluation. However, personalized medicine, digital health, big data, health economy, and patient organizations strongly question this state of affairs. As a result, new methodological approaches are arriving in force among which “n-of-1” studies, Bayesian designs, observational studies, and Qualitative researches.

*Summary:*  
In CAP, psychological treatments are important, there are numerous age groups, and many moderators influencing treatment efficacy. This may be a reason why CAP has not benefited as much as many other medical specialties from Evidence-Based Medicine. Fortunately, the methodological revolution we are going through at the moment is likely to change this. If CAP can get the ball rolling, it will gain a lot in therapeutic efficacy.

*Key-words: Evidence-Based Medicine, Randomized controlled trials, health technology assessment, child and adolescent psychiatry, methodological revolution*
Introduction

If a patient asks a doctor during a consultation “how do you know that your treatment works?”, whatever the specialty, the answer will be most often: “this is very simple, we do trials with randomization. For instance, 200 patients with the same disease as you are included in a study. At random doctors give to half of them treatment A and the other half treatment B (maybe a placebo). Finally, statisticians compare the percentage of cures in the two groups. This is simple and efficient. This is called Evidence-Based Medicine (EBM). This is very serious”.

In reality, the situation is not so straightforward. For instance, money is a big problem. Randomized controlled trials (RCT) can be very expensive, up to more than 500 Million dollars for a unique trial (1). Big pharma can afford that, but who is going to spend that amount of money to evaluate new psychotherapy dedicated to migrant children? In child and adolescent psychiatry (CAP), the situation is all the more sensitive as treatments have to be evaluated separately in infants, children, and adolescents. We have thus to find alternatives to RCTs.

Where to start? With a quick look at history, to understand why RCTs are so important today.

A short history of evaluation of treatments in medicine

An essential reference here is the book of H. Marks (2). To say it in a few words, there has been, for a long, tensions between physiologists and statisticians concerning the way we should evaluate treatments. Claude Bernard, a famous physiologist of the XIXth century, expresses this tension very well: “In the patient who succumbed, the cause of death was evidently something which was not found in the patient who recovered; this something we must determine, and then we can act on the phenomena or recognize or foresee them accurately; then only scientific determinism will be achieved. But not by statistics shall we succeed in this; never have statistics taught anything, and never can they teach anything about the nature of phenomena. I shall apply what I have just said to
all the statistics compiled with the object of learning the efficacy of certain remedies in curing diseases” (3). In more modern words: “a medication is effective when it is proved that it acts on the cause of a disease. Statistics cannot do that, so statistics are useless”.

Unfortunately, Claude Bernard is wrong in many situations: if the cause of lung cancer is tobacco, this is irrelevant for the treatment of the tumor. With time, this appeared clearer and clearer and at the mid of the XXth century, some physicians decided to engage massively in another direction: the use of statistics and randomization as it was suggested by R. Fisher (4). The success has been total, with the sacralization of EBM but, nevertheless, the persistence of some remnants of physiological thinking in treatment evaluation: the ritual use of a placebo is one of them, the importance of mechanisms of action is another.

Harry Marks’ historical fresco ends in 1990. A recent paper extends the analysis to the XXIst century (5). Between 1990 and 2020, there has been an impressive penetration of RCTs and more generally of the EBM paradigm in the health care system as a whole, and even in the society itself. The “New Public Management”, the “What Works” movement have promoted the use of objective indicators, statistics, and randomized experiments in most domains. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses are intensively used to design Evidence-Based Practices (6) or Evidence-Based Policies that all professionals are supposed to follow. RCTs are even considered now as a methodology of reference in economics, as the 2019 Nobel price shows it (7).

CAP has no choice but to go along with it. Even psychoanalysts are now publishing meta-analyses of RCTs in high impact factor journals (8). But questions remain: how to deal with the unsustainability of such a paradigm? Even technical points appear more and more absurd: what is a placebo of psychotherapy? Critics become more and more frequent, and not only in CAP, in many domains of biomedical research.
The critics

Critics are an essential part of science, they are a driver of progress. In the domain of treatment evaluation, critics are nowadays intense and general, directed against the overuse of statistics, of RCTs, and even against the concept of EBM itself.

Critics against statistics

When interpreting the results of an RCT, people generally look at a series of “p” values. If these “p” are below 0.05 then the trial is said positive and the treatment effective, this is the rule. Many statisticians disagree with this simplistic ritual and denounce a situation that has lead with time to some kind of fake science (9)(10). The problem is, in fact, more epistemological than methodological (11). Statistical inference is inductive (observation of a sample and generalization to an underlying unknown population) while it is commonly considered as deductive (if “p”<0.05 then the treatment is effective). This error is tragic because the concept of “Evidence” in EBM is thus often extensively overinterpreted.

Critics against RCTs

Most people recognize that RCT has been a unique and wonderful tool for the advancement of knowledge in treatment evaluation. Critics against them are however more and more frequent (12). RCTs answer only to very narrow clinical questions, don’t take into consideration comorbidities, focus on outcomes that are not always relevant for patients, and can be biased because of conflicts of interests (financial or not). More importantly, they are done on very particular patients observed in experimental conditions so that the generalisability of results is poor. Also, they provide only statistical results that make sense for average patients that do not exist in practice, which is an authentic ethical concern (12).
When considering the evaluation of psychological treatments, particularly important in CAP, the limitations of RCTs are even more important (13). A psychotherapist has constantly to adapt his or her practice to the patient he or she faces and this is not easy to formalize in a protocol trial.

**Critics against EBM**

Critics about EBM are positive and negative. Researchers from the social and humans science (14) have pointed out that EBM is interesting because Evidence is established transparently (results are published in peer-reviewed journals), and because the power that comes from this evidence is transparent (when you can understand RCTs and when you know the literature you have the power to answer “yes” or “no” to the question “is the treatment effective?”).

The most powerful negative critics against EBM come from payers (health insurances) and molecular biologists. Indeed, EBM has a strong reputation concerning the evaluation of the efficacy of treatments but is quite valueless to assess risk/benefit and even more cost/utility ratios. Unfortunately, the incredible cost of new treatments becomes a worldwide problem, often more than the question of efficacy alone. Payers, health insurances are thus asking for a “data revolution”, with the harmonization of health financing data across countries that goes far beyond the simple question of EBM (15).

Concerning molecular biology, it has produced the fashion concept of “personalized medicine” that challenges more and more EBM (16,17). In cancer in particular, if each patient has a tumor with a given genotype that is likely to determine some specific treatment options, then EBM is no more relevant. Biological mechanisms become more important than statistical results.

CAP is of course highly concerned by the question of personalized medicine. In psychotherapy, the treatment is personalized too, so that in this domain psychological mechanisms instead of biological ones could become more important than statistics. There is another specificity of CAP that also challenges the paradigm of EBM, this is Digital Mental Health (DMH). Most of young people are intensive users of tablets or smartphone and there is a shortage of psychological treatments widely
acknowledged in this population (18). A natural solution to this problematic situation is to promote the use of DMH applications. Thousands of them are now available but very few are well evaluated, and a reason for this is that EBM standards seem inappropriate in this situation (19,20).

Fortunately, critics against EBM have led to a vast number of proposals to overcome them, they are all possible futures for treatment evaluation.

The future of treatment evaluation

Since the last decades, many solutions to the EBM crisis have appeared. Some have been proposed by the cacique of EBM: seeing that their place of power was challenged, they feel the necessity to propose improvements and alternatives. Some other proposals came from disruptive scientists, well recognized in the field of EBM they are more attracted by revolutions than with simple marginal adaptations. Among these revolutions, we will have a particular look at n-of-1 designs, Bayesian analyses, or qualitative approaches.

The caciques

In 2020 the European Medicine Agency (EMA) has published its roadmap for 2025 (21). No revolution, just the use of important keywords like “innovation”, “patient relevance”, “real-world data”, and “payers”. Everything changes, but nothing changes.

A paper co-authored by people from Janssen Pharmaceutical and the U.S. National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) suggests concentrating efforts on the constitution of huge cohorts of patients gathering high-dimensional data on genotypes and phenotypes (22). Big pharma, big science, big data, not sure this will be adapted to CAP.

In Great Britain, the National Institute for Health Research has published in 2015 a methodological research program for the evaluation of complex interventions in Mental Health (23). The document is very technical, it promotes the use of highly sophisticated statistical techniques to overcome some
limitations of randomized controlled trials. Open data (24) and big data (25) are also opportunities that are frequently suggested.

**Disruptive scientists coming from inside**

John P. A. Ioannidis is typically a member of this group. In a short paper published in 2019 (26) this author provocatively denounces the abusive position of biology in psychiatric research and suggests instead to focus on social issues using big cohorts, cluster randomized trials or single case studies.

Observational data, more generally, are discussed in the literature as potential alternatives to randomized controlled trials (27,28). Using statistical modeling, cohorts are likely to suggest causal relationships between a treatment and an outcome, with the interesting side effects to provide real-world conclusions and sub-group analyses to find good or poor responders.

**Disruptive psychotherapists**

For a long, psychotherapies were evaluated like medications, i.e. with RCTs. Rapidly, some specialists realized that the methodology was interesting but quite limited and proposed important alternatives. Alan E. Kazdin is one of them. This author has written a vast number of relevant papers that sketch the future of the evaluation of psychological treatments (29,29,30). For this author, efficacy is not a yes/no problem. More relevant questions are for example: “What components of treatment contribute to change?”, “What treatments can be added to optimize change?”. Traditional designs are in trouble to answer these questions, qualitative approaches or n-of-1 trials could be interesting alternatives.

**The proponents of personalized medicine**

Because of the essential place of singularity in personalized medicine, some authors promote here the use of n-of-1 trials (31). With this design, interventions are administered to the same person alternately. If this approach is most often considered for molecular personalized medicine, it is also very relevant in the field of child and adolescent psychiatry, especially when rare phenotypes are
considered. This has been done for instance in two patients with Williams Syndrome and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (32); the objective was to test the efficacy of methylphenidate. Five blocks of two weeks were proposed to each patient, in all blocks one week was randomly associated with a prescription of methylphenidate and the other to a placebo. For each patient, the weeks on treatment were statistically compared to the weeks without treatment (the results were negative in both cases).

The Bayesian revenge

For more than a century, some statisticians (33) promote a different way to consider statistical inference. Their position is that there are always some pieces of knowledge that exist before all experiments and that this knowledge should be incorporated in the decision rule, in addition to the data objectively observed. The Bayesian approach has been marginalized for a long because of its suggestion to mix “good scientific data” to “poor subjective a priori knowledge”. For a couple of decades, things are changing progressively because Bayesian inference can be used in situations where traditional “frequentist” inference cannot be used with sufficient statistical power. These situations are likely to be frequent in CAP. Two trials are good examples of that. The first one evaluates the effect of a smartphone application in the treatment of binge eating behaviors (34). The second one uses data from adults as an informative prior in the Bayesian analysis of an RCT comparing plasmapheresis to intravenous immune globuline in Guillan-Barré syndrome (35).

The coming out of qualitative research

Even if patient-reported outcomes are used in most clinical trials, many people consider that patients’ experience is not enough considered in the evaluation of medical treatments. For decades, some researchers have proposed that qualitative approaches could be used to fill this gap. Papers have been regularly written about that, even in most of the prestigious journals (36), but the situation mostly remains: qualitative researches are too often absent from biomedical journals. Recently, a series of papers (37,38) tried to conceptualize an epistemological bridge between
qualitative research and EBM. This is perhaps the beginning of a new era where interpretations of textual materials obtained from talks or observations will have the same consideration as physiology, molecular biology, or statistics in biomedical research.

Among all medical specialties, CAP is quite in advance in the use of qualitative studies to evaluate treatments and can be a leader in this change of paradigm. A recent paper (39) looked at depressed adolescents’ views and experience of SSRI antidepressants. Four basic themes were found: “a perceived threat to autonomy”, “a sign of severity”, “a support, not a solution”, and “an ongoing process of trial and error”. Different but complementary to traditional data provided by RCTs. In qualitative research, there is an equivalent of meta-analysis that is called meta-synthesis (40). These meta-syntheses have a high potential for the evaluation of CAP treatments. An illustration of this concerns the users’ experiences of trauma-focused cognitive behavioral therapy for children and adolescents (41).

Conclusion

Child and adolescent psychiatry is a medical specialty and, because of this, it is required to follow the rules of evaluation of treatments existing in medicine. For historical reasons, these rules are based on biology (mechanisms of action) and statistics (RCTs). Unfortunately, this state of affairs has not been favorable to CAP because of the important place of psychological treatments and because of the numerous age groups in which specific studies need to be done.

But things are changing. Because of the emergence of personalized medicine, digital health, big data, health economy, and because of the growing importance of patients’ experience new methods of evaluation are proposed. CAP has everything to gain from these changes.
Key points

- For historical reasons medical treatments are evaluated from their mechanism of action and RCTs
- Personalized medicine and digital health are game-changer in this context
- Qualitative researches, “n-of-1” studies, Bayesian designs and observational studies will be used more and more to evaluate treatments
- Child and adolescent psychiatry has everything to gain from these changes
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