Pharmacological class interventions for benzodiazepine withdrawal discontinuation: a meta-analysis

List of authors, and their affiliations. Corresponding author and their details

1 - Dimy Fluyau (first author and corresponding author).
Assistant Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Emory University School of Medicine
Board certified of Addiction medicine and Psychiatry
Affiliation: Emory University, School of Medicine. Brain Health .1648 Pierce Dr NE, Atlanta, GA 30307. Contact information: dfluyau@gmail.com or dimy.fluyau@emory.edu. Telephone: 347 -792 - 3031.
2- Neelambika Revadigar
Assistant Professor of Psychiatry
Affiliation; Columbia University, Department of Psychiatry
Milstein 9 Garden North
Mail Code: 177 Fort Washington Avenue
New York NY 10032
United States
Contact: nsr2123@cumc.columbia.edu. Telephone: 212-305-7090
3-Paroma Mitra (co -author)
Assistant Professor of Psychiatry
Board certified of Psychiatry and Geriatrics
Affiliation: NYU, Langone Health. Department of Psychiatry .1 Park Avenue, 8th Floor New York, NY 10016.
Contact: paromamitra84@gmail.com. Telephone: 212 -263 -7419. 617 -997 -3458.
4- Christopher G. Pierre (co -author)
Affiliation: Grady Memorial Hospital. Emergency Department. 80 Jesse Hill Jr Dr SE, Atlanta, GA 30303. Contact: christopher.je.suis@gmail.com. Telephone: (404) 616 -1000.561 -386 - 8210.
Acknowledgement
We thank Dr. Challyn Malone for the language help.
Conflict of interest
'The Author(s) declare(s) that there is no conflict of interest'.
Funding
This *research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.*
Ethics statement and consent
Ethical approval was not required because the study was a secondary analysis of anonymized data that were already published.

Pharmacological class interventions for benzodiazepine withdrawal discontinuation: a meta-analysis

Abstract

Background

Long-term benzodiazepine (BZD) use may lead to dependence, addiction, and neuropsychiatric disturbances. BZD discontinuation can cause severe withdrawal symptoms and resurgence of premorbid conditions. There are guidelines on how to stop BZD if it is necessary. Pharmacological management is an option among several other recommendations, but its benefit remains unclear. The current meta-analysis aims to supplement the existing literature by dividing the pharmacological agents studied for the management of BZD discontinuation into pharmacological classes according to the Neuroscience-based Nomenclature and to investigate whether these classes (e.g., BZD receptor antagonist) are efficient in managing and facilitating BZD withdrawal discontinuation.

Methods

Data collected from (1985 to 2018) in Google Scholar, Medline Ovid, Scopus, PsychInfo, ClinicalTrials.gov, Cochrane Review Database, Embase, Scopus, Pubmed, and Proquest databases; involved controlled clinical trials on drugs studied for BZD withdrawal discontinuation. Single drugs were clustered into their pharmacological class (domain). The Oxford Quality Scoring System assessed the quality of a trial. The GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluations) was used for clinical practice recommendations. For publication bias, we visually inspected the Funnel plot. We adopted the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool to assess biases inherent to individual trials. The standardized mean difference measured the magnitude of the benefit of a pharmacological class.

Results

We analyzed forty-nine controlled trials of 2815 assigned participants. Of fourteen classes, the BZD receptor antagonist class (d 0.671, CI 0.199 -1.143, p=0.005, I^2=0),5-HT1A receptor partial agonist, and the glutamate class seemed to have the potentiality to manage BZD withdrawal discontinuation clinically. Around 61 % of the trials received an Oxford Quality score of three, 86% of the trials were granted a GRADE recommendation low. About 29 trials were at low risk of bias in general.

Conclusions

Even though we could not prove that the pharmacological classes of drugs we analyzed for the clinical management of BZD withdrawal discontinuation were efficacious, our investigation showed that some of these classes have the potentiality to manage BZD withdrawal discontinuation and clinically facilitate the process when it is necessary, relevant, and recommended based on established guidelines. Further investigations are warranted to support our findings.
Keywords: benzodiazepine withdrawal, benzodiazepine discontinuation, benzodiazepine cessation, benzodiazepine dependence.

Introduction

The widespread use of benzodiazepines (BZDs) has been the topic of attention since the 1980s (1). A higher risk of death by suicide was observed among patients with long-term BZD use (2). There is a high prevalence of BZD use around the world. In Germany, the estimate BZD-dependent persons ranged from 128 000 to 1.6 million. Most estimates did not include many private prescriptions (3). In France, around 12.5% of patients older than eighteen were prescribed BZDs at least once during 2006(4). Australia assisted in a 21% increase of BZD use from years 2000– 2006 in the elderly with low socioeconomic status. In Thailand, 50% of the physicians prescribed BZDs for more than 25% of their patients (5). Between 2002-2014, the number of patients receiving BZDs in the United States of America increased to a greater extent than the number of patients receiving opioids. BZD use is comorbid with infections such as human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and hepatitis C (6, 7). Medical and neuropsychiatric complications such as falls, confusion, depression, memory loss, and sleepiness are debilitating. BZD prescriptions have legal ramifications and criminal responsibilities as well as clinical and ethical concerns when one discontinues the medication against the patient's wishes. Some authors suggested to discontinue psychotropic medications slowly as a prudent clinical and research policy (8). In most of the states in the United States of America; physicians are obligated to check the Prescription Drug Monitoring Program (PDMP) database before prescribing BZDs.

Continued BZD use can cause dependence. Attempts to discontinue the drug can lead to withdrawal discontinuation, thus the re-emergence of premorbid conditions (anxiety, insomnia,

panic attacks…) and subsequently the reintroduction of the drug. The pharmacological mechanism of BZD withdrawal is complicated and unclear (9). Several experimental mechanistic approaches of BZD discontinuation were the subject of research; most of the theory targeted BZD withdrawal. It is suggested that upregulation of the gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA-A) receptor binding complex is one of the molecular mechanisms for BZD discontinuation (10). However, other hypotheses have been the subject of many publications. The alterations in GABA-A receptor subunit expression suggested that chronic BZD exposure led to impaired sensitivity by down-regulating the response of a drug to the GABA-A receptors, mainly GABA-A receptors that contain an α1, α2, α3, or α5 subunit (11, 12). Other neurobiological components are also involved in BZD discontinuation such as glutamate, transcriptional and neurotrophic factors (GABARAP, BIG2, PRIP, gephyrin, and radixin), serotonin, dopamine, acetylcholine receptor systems and neurosteroids complex (13).

There are several medications (buspirone, lithium, atenolol, carbamazepine, flumazenil) investigated for the management of BZD withdrawal discontinuation. Carbamazepine, for example, was suggested in two systematic reviews (years: 2006 and 2018) (14,15) to have the potentiality to control withdrawal discontinuation. A meta-analysis suggested that flumazenil successfully facilitated BZD discontinuation (year:2006) (16). There is still inconclusive evidence that these treatments are effective. The previous investigations focused on a single pharmacological agent for BZD discontinuation. We attempted another approach by clustering single drugs into their pharmacological classes (glutamate, BZD receptor antagonist…) according to the Neuroscience-based Nomenclature (NbN).

Several debates and publications reflected that the World Health Organization (WHO) psychopharmacological nomenclature does not reflect the contemporary developments and knowledge relevant to brain disorders. The WHO's nomenclature can choose an "antipsychotic" to treat both depression and schizophrenia. Such intervention can confuse the patients and compromise their adherence to treatment (17,18). In contrast, the NbN identifies the pharmacological drug target, mechanism, and family that reflect the primary neurotransmitter, neurobiological activities (neurotransmitter, brain circuits, and physiological effects), and details clinical observations (the drug efficacy and side effects) (18). Referring to the NbN; Nutt and colleague suggested that a" better understanding of pharmacology can benefit translational neuroscience and the discovery of new treatments for brain disorders" (19).

Thus, this study aims to supplement the existing literature by dividing the pharmacological agents studied for BZD discontinuation management into pharmacological classes and to investigate whether these classes are efficacious in managing and facilitating BZD withdrawal discontinuation.

Methods

Figure 1 outlines the search process. Ethical approval was not required because the study was a secondary analysis of anonymized data that were already published. The meta-analysis was not registered in systematic review databases.

Included

We selected published controlled clinical trials that compared an active drug with a placebo or with another active drug or a control(non-placebo) in participants with a history of long-term BZD use or BZD-dependent who are undergoing BZD discontinuation.

Excluded

We excluded cross-sectional, longitudinal studies, and uncontrolled trials.

Types of participants

The participants were approximately 18 years of age or older, male or female, on a BZD for medical or neuropsychiatric reasons.

Types of interventions

Controlled trials evaluating any active drug to facilitate BZD withdrawal discontinuation.

Control intervention

Controlled trials comparing an active drug with a placebo or with another drug or a control(non-placebo) to facilitate BZD discontinuation.

Types of outcome measures

Investigate the effectiveness (reduction of anxiety or depressive symptoms, improve sleep, decrease irritability or aggression) of drugs (clustered into pharmacological classes) studied for the clinical management of BZD withdrawal symptoms during the discontinuation period.

Types of settings

The investigations were conducted in outpatients, hospital, multicenter, psychopharmacology research unit, research centers, and specialized clinics (methadone clinic, for example).

Electronic searches

We integrated the Boolean logic strategy by free-texting: "benzodiazepine withdrawal, benzodiazepine withdrawal discontinuation, benzodiazepine discontinuation, benzodiazepine discontinuation trial, and benzodiazepine withdrawal trial" in Google Scholar, Medline Ovid, Scopus, PsychInfo, ClinicalTrials.gov, Cochrane Review Database, Embase, Scopus, Pubmed, and Proquest by customizing articles by dates of publications (from 1985 to 2018). A search in the Grey Literature was also undertaken using the above strategy at Open Grey.

Searching other resources

We searched for other sources of trials. We were able to find two additional copies of publications that we could not find via the electronic search. We could not find unpublished trials despite our effort in contacting two drug manufacturers.

Data collection and analysis

Selection of studies

Two authors (DF and PM) independently searched for publications, screened abstracts, full articles, and extracted data using the AbstractionForm (20) on the intervention components, methods of blinding and randomization, outcomes of interest, study design, sample size, and age. The two authors also scored the quality of the trials by using the Oxford Quality Scoring System (21) (≤ 2: low range of quality score, ≥ 3: high range of quality score, and 5: highest score) and granted a GRADE recommendation level for each trial (22) (Refer to table 1). Two other authors (CP and NR) settled disagreements between DF and PM.

Measures of treatment effect

We calculated, recalculated, or extracted the mean and standard deviation score of a trial. If the mean and standard deviation was plotted in a graph, we used the WebPlotDigitizer (23) to extract data so we could convert them later to the mean and standard deviation. For the group effect, we opted for the random effect model (24) because of sampling variability and difference in treatment effect of individual trials. For the measure of treatment, we adopted the standardized mean difference between the two groups (Cohen's d). Cohen's d =0.2 was interpreted as a small benefit or advantage, 0.5 was medium, and 0.8 was large.

Unit of analysis issues

None.

Dealing with missing data

We contacted two authors for missing data; however, only one author replied and said that the requested data could not be found.

Assessment of heterogeneity

We used I^2 to quantify the dispersion of effect size. An I^2 of 25% was low, 50% was moderate, and 75% was high (20).

Assessment of biases

For **publication bias**, we visually inspected the funnel plot for symmetry or asymmetry and for the distribution of small studies (smaller sample size) in comparison to more extensive studies. We drew some suggestions on the possibility that publication bias might show asymmetry in the funnel plot, and that smaller studies and positive studies had more chance to be published. The funnel plot might not be an accurate representation of publication bias; its interpretation should be considered inconclusive. We adopted the Cochrane risk of bias tool (25) to assess **selection, detection**, **attrition**, and **performance biases** of individual trials (Table 1).

Data synthesis

The data we analyzed were combinable based on both outcome measures and neuropharmacological mechanism of action. We conducted the statistical analyses in the Comprehensive Meta-Analysis software, version 3(26) (14 North Dean Street, Englewood, NJ 07631 USA, and OpenMEE (27) (British Ecological Society, Charles Darwin House, 12 Roger St, London, WC1N 2JU, UK) with the latest version for Windows 10.

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

We clustered single drugs into their respective pharmacological classes and compared them with placebo or with another active drug or a control(non-placebo). We hypothesized that such methodology could lessen heterogeneity and make the data more analyzable and clinically relevant.

Sensitivity analysis

We performed a sensitivity analysis for subgroups with a minimum of four studies whenever it was possible.

Results

Trials included and their characteristics

Our search (in line with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) (28) indicated 1866 published studies from 1985 to 2018 and two other studies additional identified through other sources. After removal of 1641 studies based on titles, abstracts, and duplicates, the literature yielded 224 potentially relevant trials. Subsequently, 173 trials of the 224 were excluded for various reasons (Fig. 1). In total, forty-nine controlled clinical trials were selected and included in this meta-analysis after two suitable one (29,30) were removed because we could not extract enough data, in conformity to the measures of treatment effect that we opted to perform statistical analysis. The trials involved 2724 assigned participants (allocated or completers):1384 participants in the active medication group and 1340 in the placebo group, another group or a control group(non-placebo) (Table 1). Eleven trials studied buspirone, six trials studied melatonin, and five trials studied flumazenil. The mean sample size for the medications was 26.61, with a margin error:95% CI, $1.960\sigma_{x\square}$, 26.6154±6.367 (±23.92%). The mean sample size for the placebo or another active drug(non-placebo) was 25.76, with a margin error: 95% CI, $1.960\sigma_{x\square}$, 25.7692 ±5.669(±22.00%).

Study quality

On average, 61 % of the trials received an Oxford Quality score of three; 20% of them received a score of five; 11% received a score of four, and less than 12% of them received a score of two. Around 86% of the trials were granted a GRADE recommendation low (Table 1). We judged that 21 % of the trials were at high risk for selection bias due to inadequate generation of a randomized sequence trial, and 19% of them were at high risk of performance bias due to insufficient description of blinding procedures for participants and personnel. Around 12% of the trials were at high risk for detection bias due to insufficient information about the knowledge of the allocated interventions by outcome assessors. In 41% of trials, attrition bias was unclear, though we judged that around 12% of the trials had a low risk of attrition bias. Overall, 86% of the trials had a low risk of reporting bias, and about 29 trials were at low risk of bias in general (Table 1).

Meta-analysis involving placebo as a comparator (Forest plot 1)

1.Management of anxiety

1.1. HT1A receptor partial agonist

The 5-HT1A receptor partial agonist class involved seven trials. In two trials, buspirone did not alleviate BZD-withdrawal symptoms, and there was a high dropout compared with placebo (31,

32). During BZD discontinuation buspirone showed no difference to placebo at attenuating anxiety symptoms severity (33). In other trials, buspirone showed no BZD-withdrawal symptom in participants off lorazepam (34), and the drug lowered anxiety level (35). Data collected for buspirone showed a modest reduction in symptoms of anxiety and depression during BZD-tapered (36). Anxiety was significantly reduced in the buspirone group at the beginning of alprazolam withdrawal and endpoint (37). The class's effect size was very small (d 0.086). The result was not statistically significant(p=0.711). Heterogeneity was moderate: I^2= 65.99%. The margin of error of the sample size for the five studies was estimated to be around 32.8 ±21.694(95%, 1.960σx□). Leaving out two studies with sample size ≤ 32 increased the effect size (d 0.119) but remained statistically non-significant(p=0.776). The effect size was large (d 3.000) when studies were adjusted based on a high dropout rate. The heterogeneity lessened (I^2=53.014%). The result was still not statistically significant.

1.2. **HT2A antagonist**

The 5-HT2A antagonist involved two trials**.** Trazodone did not reduce withdrawal severity when compared with placebo. Participants complained of sedation and dry mouth (38). Another trial reported that trazodone lower BZD-withdrawal symptoms based on the interpretation of scores of the Withdrawal Symptoms Checklist. Also, no adverse effect was found (39). There was no apparent benefit of 5-HT2A antagonist (d 0.068). This result was not statistically significant(p=0.769). There was no heterogeneity: I^2=0%.

1.3. **Beta- adrenergic blocker**

This class included two trials. Propranolol(non-cardioselective) did not reduce BZD withdrawal symptoms in BZD-dependent patients over ten weeks (40). Atenolol(cardioselective) ameliorated both the affective and somatic symptoms of anxiety (41). The b-blockers showed a small effect size benefit to lessen somatic symptoms during BZD withdrawal (d 0.107), with a high degree of imprecision (95% CI -0.347- 0.562) and the result was not statistically significant (p= 0.644).

1.4. **BZD receptor antagonist**

In an interrupted trial in which flumazenil precipitated panic and dysphoria, it was suggested that the drug could potentially benefit patients dependent on BZDs (42). Other trials found that flumazenil could treat BZD withdrawal in BZD-dependent patients (43) and reduce aggression and hostility during BZD discontinuation (44). Mean withdrawal symptoms were not elevated in comparison to placebo in chronic use of a high dose of flunitrazepam or lormetazepam (45). In

four trials, BZD receptor antagonist could potentially abate BZD withdrawal symptoms during BZD discontinuation period (d 0.671, CI 0.199 -1.143). The overall benefit of flumazenil was statistically significant(p=0.005). There was no heterogeneity: I^2=0%. The funnel plot appeared to be symmetric, suggesting no publication bias. The observed outcome yielded a significant p-value =0.0033, and the target was p <0.05(Funnel plot 1). However, a sensitivity analysis of high-quality trials showed no statistical significance (p= 0.085).

1.5. **$GABA_A$ receptor positive allosteric modulator**

The GABAA -PAM included four trials. Alpidem (46,47), and zolpidem (48,49) clustered into their pharmacology class showed limited efficacy in alleviating withdrawal symptoms (e.g., withdrawal insomnia) during BZD discontinuation, but the effect size was small, and the result was not statistically significant (d= 0.108, p=0.479). Heterogeneity was small: I^2= 8.261%. Analysis of high dropout due to poor tolerance and adverse events remained non-statistically significant(p=0.912).

1.6. **Glutamate: carbamazepine pregabalin, and valproic acid**

The glutamate class included four trials. One trial found that pregabalin 300–600mg/day could help in discontinuing BZD in BZD-dependent patients (50). In a joint trial with trazodone, valproic acid did not lessen withdrawal symptoms in patients of long-term BZD use (38). On the contrary, carbamazepine lowered the incidence of withdrawal symptoms in patients who used BZD for an extended period (51,52). The class could lessen withdrawal symptoms during BZD discontinuation (d 0.344, CI 0.065-0.623). The overall benefit was statistically significant (p= 0.016). Heterogeneity was null: I^2= 0%. There was no indication of publication bias on the funnel plot (Funnel plot 2). The drugs used in the four trials were well-tolerated, and the trials were apparently of high quality, except that the sample size (allocated participants) of three studies (38,50,52) was altogether below 40(95%,1.960σx□: 33.6667 ±5.254), leaving one study with an estimated sample size above 50(95%,1.960σx□: 53 ±4.158) (51). Adjusting studies with sample size below 40, the benefit of glutamate for BZD withdrawal became non-statistically significant(p=0.063).

1.7. **Histamine receptor antagonist**

The histamine domain included three trials. Captodiamine addressed the prevention of emergence of a BZD withdrawal during discontinuation (53). Hydroxyzine was investigated as a substitute for BZD withdrawal, and as a method to wean patients off lorazepam (54,55).

Although histamine's effect size showed that the class could aid in managing BZD withdrawal symptoms (d 0.329), the result was not statically significant (p= 0.213), and there was a broad level of imprecision where the actual effect lies (95% CI -0.188-0.0.845).

1.8. **alpha-beta L-aspartate magnesium**

We analyzed one trial that evaluated the efficacy of alpha-beta L-Aspartate Magnesium (Asp Mg) for BZD withdrawal discontinuation (56). L-aspartate Mg's ability to reduce the intensity of BZD withdrawal during the cessation period was not demonstrated (d 0.070).

1.9. **Lithium**

In one trial, gluconate lithium (57) did not facilitate benzodiazepine withdrawal discontinuation among patient treated with less or equal 10 mg of benzodiazepine (d -0.047), and there was more placebo effect (60% success rate).

1.10. **Serotonin, norepinephrine** reuptake inhibitor (SERT and NET) (dothiepin and imipramine)

The SERT and NET class included three trials (66,33,67). Overall, the benefit of the class to alleviate symptoms of depression or anxiety during BZD discontinuation was small (d 0.234). Heterogeneity was moderate I^2=51.063. Statistical significance was not reached(p=0.345).

2.Management of sleep

2.1. **Melatonin receptor agonist**

This domain included seven trials. Trials analyzed found no modification of sleep or wakefulness by melatonin after benzodiazepine withdrawal (58), no conclusive evidence that the drug could facilitate BZD discontinuation in patients with insomnia (59), no withdrawal benefit, neither could facilitate BZD discontinuation (60,61). Three trials found that melatonin could improve and maintain sleep quality during BDZ withdrawal (62,63,64). Overall melatonin showed no sleep benefit during BZD withdrawal discontinuation (d -0.059). The primary analysis suggested a high degree of imprecision (95%CI -0.465- 0.347) with no statistical significance (p= 0.776). Heterogeneity was moderate: I^2= 57.482%. A sensitivity analysis of high-quality trials did not significantly change the result (p= 0.592). This analysis also increased heterogeneity (I^2= 71.041%).

2.2. **Progesterone**

In one trial, micronized oral progesterone doses up to 3600 mg/day did not facilitate BZ discontinuation in BZD-dependent participants (65) (d -0.361).

3.**Management of depressive symptoms**

3.1. Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRI) (paroxetine)

One trial evaluated the long-term outcome of an SSRI (paroxetine) after BZD withdrawal (68). Analysis of paroxetine on participants tapered off diazepam showed a small effect size compared with placebo on the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HAM-D) (d 0.087). This result was not statistically significant(p=0.647). However, another scale such as the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory showed a large effect size (STAI) (d 1.014), and a p-value equals to zero(p=0).

Meta-analysis involving another drug as comparator (Forest plot 2)

1.Management of symptoms of anxiety

1.1. 5-HT1A receptor partial agonist **(buspirone, ipsapirone)**

The 5-HT1A receptor partial agonist was investigated in five comparative trials involving an active drug vs. another drug, especially another BZD. Participants who underwent 2-week withdrawal on either buspirone or oxazepam did not show a significant difference in the Hamilton anxiety scale or Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (69). No significant difference between was found buspirone vs. lorazepam in term of withdrawal discontinuation symptoms (Day 63 and Day 70) (70) and compared with lorazepam ipsapirone had fewer symptoms for withdrawal discontinuation (71). Diazepam's participants reported more withdrawal symptoms than buspirone's participants (72,73). Participants allotted to 5-HT1A receptor partial agonist exhibited fewer withdrawal symptoms discontinuation (d 0.369), but statistical significance was not reached (p= 0.126). Heterogeneity was low: I^2=48.768%. Leaving out studies with a higher dropout rate did not statistically make a difference (p= 0.236). In that case, the heterogeneity was moderate: I^2=61.558%.

1.2.**BZD receptor antagonist(flumazenil)**

A comparison trial between oxazepam and flumazenil (74) suggested that intravenous flumazenil could reduce withdrawal symptoms such as feeling tired, tense, hungry, body aches, and heart pounding. The finding could not be substantiated based on the data we analyzed. The effect size was small (d 0.138), and the overall benefit was not statistically significant (p= 0.663).

1.3. **Dopamine, serotonin** receptor antagonist **(**5-HT2AR, HT2CR and D2R) (cyamemazine)

In a comparative efficacy trial, cyamemazine was able to control rebound anxiety symptoms

comparable to bromazepam, though the cyamemazine group had a higher dropout rate (75). Cyamemazine did not appear to be efficacious in facilitating BZD discontinuation based on the data we analyzed (d 0.044). Heterogeneity was not assessed due to a low number of trials.

1.4. **$GABA_A$ -PAM (alpidem, zopiclone)**

Alpidem produced fewer withdrawal discontinuation symptoms than alprazolam and was also better tolerated than lorazepam (76). Zopiclone was suggested to facilitate the gradual withdrawal from long-term use of long-acting BZDs. It was found that withdrawal symptoms were milder among zopiclone's participants compared with flunitrazepam's participants (77). Statistical significance was not reached; the GABAA -PAM's effect size was (d 0.319). Heterogeneity was low: I^2=23.451%.

1.5. **Glutamate (tianeptine, valproic acid)**

In one double-blind comparison trial, tianeptine was found to be as effective and safe as carbamazepine to treat BZD withdrawal in dependent patients (78). Valproic acid could potentially reduce withdrawal symptoms in opioid-dependent patients on BZDs (79).

For a total of two trials, the glutamate class potentiality at reducing BZD withdrawal symptoms was not demonstrated (d 0.149, p= 0.537). Though, there was no heterogeneity: I^2= 0.

2.**Management of depressive symptoms**

2.1. **SSRI (paroxetine)**

In one trial, paroxetine could facilitate BZD withdrawal in SSRI (+) (with paroxetine) compared with no SSRI (–) (no paroxetine) in non-depressive participants of chronic use of BZD (80). Although the effect size was medium (d 0.555), the result was not statistically significant, and there was a large degree of imprecision (95% CI -0.048-1.157).

Discussion

Although, we could not prove that some pharmacological classes of drugs studied for the clinical management of BZD withdrawal discontinuation were efficacious, three pharmacological classes: BZD receptor antagonist, 5-HT1A receptor partial agonist, and glutamate may be able to facilitate BZD withdrawal discontinuation management. Both BZD receptor antagonist and glutamate fared better than placebo in the primary analysis. The 5-HT1A receptor partial agonist fared better than placebo in the secondary analysis with a large effect size. For the three classes, statistical significance was not reached in the sensitivity analysis. This meta-analysis may agree

and complement two previous systematic reviews (years: 2006- 2018) (14,15) by the Cochrane group and one meta-analysis (year: 2006) (16) in which carbamazepine, pregabalin, and flumazenil showed positive results for BZD withdrawal. Also, lithium and melatonin (year: 2018) did not show any benefit regarding BZD withdrawal discontinuation management (14). In our meta-analysis, lithium and melatonin's effect size were negative in the primary analysis.

The study has several limitations. L-aspartate of magnesium was analyzed as if it belongs to a pharmacological class. L-aspartate of magnesium as a class by itself is hypothetical. Carbamazepine and pregabalin may bind with different receptors resulting in different clinical benefits despite studies suggested that both drugs 'mechanism of action may be related to the NMDA subtype of glutamate receptors (81,82). For example, carbamazepine binds to inactivated Na+ channels and reduces Ca2+and Na+ flux across the neuronal membrane (83), and pregabalin favors a selective inhibitory effect on voltage-gated calcium channels containing the α2δ-1 subunit (84). Valproic acid's mechanism action is yet to be determined. Valproic acid causes blockade of voltage-gated sodium channels, but some studies link valproic mechanism's action mostly to the increase of gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA) (85). Administration of chronic lithium or carbamazepine was suggested to downregulate brain arachidonic acid signaling via NMDA receptors and may contribute to their mood stabilizer's activity (86). Glutamatergic signaling via NMDA receptors is pathologically upregulated in bipolar disorder; valproic acid may dampen the upregulated NMDA involving arachidonic acid (86). Thus carbamazepine, pregabalin, and lithium could have been clustered into the same pharmacological class. One cannot assume that carbamazepine, valproic acid or pregabalin's potentiality at managing BZD withdrawal is solely related to the NMDA subtype of glutamate receptor. Tianeptine's classification as glutamate is another limitation. The drug has been suggested to be both an SSRI and SNRI. It was suggested that tianeptine does not inhibit the uptake of serotonin or noradrenaline in the central nervous system (87). Tianeptine's effect on the glutamatergic may represent the most proximal target for the drug antidepressant's efficacy (88).

The data we analyzed favored flumazenil. Flumazenil can itself cause severe withdrawal symptoms in long-term benzodiazepine users and seizures, especially among patients who overdose on BZD. Many practitioners remain very cautious when using flumazenil; though a study suggested that slow titration may reduce its adverse effects (89). Among the glutamate class, carbamazepine can cause leucopenia and thrombocytopenia, and pregabalin has the

potentiality for abuse. Long-term use of zolpidem and zopiclone increases the risk of addiction, tolerance, dependence, and withdrawal. Thus, regardless of the outcome; zolpidem and zopiclone may have limited clinical indications for BZD withdrawal discontinuation. Another limitation is that most of the trials focused on BZD discontinuation or BZD-substitution, but some trials focused on BZD-tapered in which participants were followed-up over time.

The tool we utilized to assess the quality of the trials or to cluster medications into class also has limitations. The Oxford Quality Scoring System (Jadad scale) was criticized for possessing low interrater reliability and for being too mechanistic. The GRADE was criticized for being too subjective. The Neuroscience-based Nomenclature (NbN) is still updating, and it has not been generally adopted yet worldwide. The data extracted to calculate the effect size came from different scales that the authors utilized to report the benefit of a drug for the management of BZD discontinuation. In some cases, the authors utilized a non-standardized scale or their questionnaire. A sensitivity analysis involving a unified scale could be warranted and could have changed the results.

Stopping BZD as much as using it are both challenging. Medical and neuropsychiatric complications of BZD use, abuse, and dependence can be harmful to some patients. The British Association for Psychopharmacology (BAP) produced guidance on the risks and benefits of BZD use (90). The BAP recommended prescribing BZD for a short time. The BAP acknowledged that BZD dependence is a significant risk in some patients receiving treatment for longer than one month. Clinical judgment can guide whether alternatives (taper, psychological or pharmacological treatment) be more suitable, for each patient, and each proposed medication (90). If there is no history of drug dependence, the decision to continue BZD treatment may be more reasonable than the alternatives. Salzman and colleagues suggested that BZD prescribed for long-term use should be regularly re-evaluated, tapered and ceased when proper to decrease drug-related harm and lessen the impact of medication burden on quality of life in the elderly (91). From a clinical perspective, Soyka suggested that BZD withdrawal not need to be tried in every case, and it should be tailored to patient motivation, severe psychopathological symptoms such as depression (92). Interest should also target elderly persons. Analyzing data of a nationwide cohort study in Denmark 2000–2010, Tjagvad and colleagues found that patients with opioid use disorder were prescribed more BZDs than any other substance use disorder (93). Such data points out the imminent risk of overdose and respiratory arrest. In some parts of the

United States of America, BZD prescription incurs legal consequences. BZD discontinuation seems appropriate if it is clinically warranted. A systematic review suggested that a pharmacological approach that aimed substitution to withdraw BZD with or without psychological aid had the highest success rates (94). Adequate pharmacotherapy and more evidence-based strategies are necessary during and after BZD discontinuation (92). In high dose, BZD-dependent patients' relapse was prevalent among the one who tried to discontinue the drug. These patients perceived BZD discontinuation to be difficult, unpredictable, and complicated (95). For this category, medications that can facilitate the process may be warranted.

We present a set of statistical data as an attempt to aid the interpretation and clarification of an unclear topic by analyzing the clinical benefit of some pharmacological classes for BZD withdrawal discontinuation management. We suggest this pharmacologically driven approach that reflects the neurotransmitters and mechanism of drugs is clinically relevant and more practical. We hope our analysis can assist practitioners in making an informed decision with their patients when it is necessary to discontinue BZD and when established guidelines recommend it. This meta-analysis expands the arsenal of knowledge and evidence of the efficacy of medications for BZD withdrawal discontinuation. We believe it can illuminate the need for further researches for the benefit of the patients and make BZD discontinuation less stressful for practitioners.

References

1-Guina J, Merrill B. Benzodiazepines I: Upping the Care on Downers: The Evidence of Risks, Benefits and Alternatives. *J Clin Med*. 2018 Jan 30;7(2):17. doi: 10.3390/jcm7020017.

2- Donovan LM, Malte CA, Spece LJ, Griffith MF, Feemster LC, Engelberg RA, Au DH, Hawkins EJ. Risks of benzodiazepines in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease with comorbid posttraumatic stress disorder. Annals of the American Thoracic Society. 2019 Jan;16(1):82-90.

3-Janhsen K, Roser P, Hoffmann K. The problems of long-term treatment with benzodiazepines and related substances: prescribing practice, epidemiology, and the treatment of withdrawal. Deutsches Ärzteblatt International. 2015 Jan;112(1-2):1.

4- Rosman S, Le Vaillant M, Pelletier-Fleury N. Gaining insight into benzodiazepine prescribing in General Practice in France: a data-based study. BMC Family Practice. 2011 Dec;12(1):28.

5-Srisurapanont M, Garner P, Critchley J, Wongpakaran N. Benzodiazepine prescribing

behaviour and attitudes: a survey among general practitioners practicing in northern Thailand. BMC family practice. 2005 Dec;6(1):27.
6- Ickowicz S, Hayashi K, Dong H, Milloy MJ, Kerr T, Montaner JS, Wood E. Benzodiazepine use as an independent risk factor for HIV infection in a Canadian setting. Drug and alcohol dependence. 2015 Oct 1; 155:190-4.
7- Bach P, Walton G, Hayashi K, Milloy MJ, Dong H, Kerr T, Montaner J, Wood E. Benzodiazepine use and hepatitis C seroconversion in a cohort of persons who inject drugs. American journal of public health. 2016 Jun;106(6):1067-72.
8-Baldessarini RJ, Tondo L. Effects of Treatment Discontinuation in Clinical Psychopharmacology. Psychotherapy and psychosomatics. 2019;88(2):65-70.
9- Martínez N., Pintado MC. Substance Withdrawal in ICU Environment. In: Nates J., Price K. (eds) Oncologic Critical Care. Springer, Cham .2019, pp 1-21. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74698-2_143-1.
10-Greenblatt DJ, Miller LG, Shader RI. Benzodiazepine discontinuation syndromes. Journal of psychiatric research. 1990 Jan 1; 24:73-9.
11- Klein RL, Mascia MP, Harkness PC, Hadingham KL, Whiting PJ, Harris RA. Regulation of allosteric coupling and function of stably expressed gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA) A receptors by chronic treatment with GABAA and benzodiazepine agonists. Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics. 1995 Sep 1;274(3):1484-92.
12-Ali NJ, Olsen RW. Chronic benzodiazepine treatment of cells expressing recombinant GABAA receptors uncouples allosteric binding: studies on possible mechanisms. Journal of neurochemistry. 2001 Nov 1;79(5):1100-8.
13- Vinkers CH, Olivier B. Mechanisms underlying tolerance after long-term benzodiazepine use: a future for subtype-selective GABAA receptor modulators? Advances in pharmacological sciences. 2012;2012.
14-Baandrup L, Ebdrup BH, Rasmussen JØ, Lindschou J, Gluud C, Glenthøj BY. Pharmacological interventions for benzodiazepine discontinuation in chronic benzodiazepine users. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2018(3).
15-Denis C, Fatseas M, Lavie E, Auriacombe M. Pharmacological interventions for benzodiazepine mono□dependence management in outpatient settings. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2006(3).

16- Voshaar RC, Couvée JE, Van Balkom AJ, Mulder PG, Zitman FG. Strategies for discontinuing long-term benzodiazepine use: meta-analysis. The British Journal of Psychiatry. 2006 Sep;189(3):213-20.
17- Wilson S. Naming the drugs we use: neuroscience-based nomenclature, a helpful innovation. Ther Adv Psychopharmacol. 2018 Jun;8(6):171-172. doi:10.1177/2045125318762065.
18- Zohar J, Nutt DJ, Kupfer DJ, Moller HJ, Yamawaki S, Spedding M, Stahl SM. A proposal for an updated neuropsychopharmacology nomenclature. European Neuropsychopharmacology. 2014 Jul 1;24(7):1005-14.
19-Nutt DJ, Blier P. Neuroscience-based Nomenclature (NbN) for Journal of Psychopharmacology. J Psychopharmacol. 2016 May;30(5):413-5. doi: 10.1177/0269881116642903.
20-Abstractionform:(templatehttps://www.thecommunityguide.org/sites/default/files/assets/abstractionform.pdf). Accessed on 02/02/2018.
21- Oxford Quality Scoring System: http://www.pmidcalc.org/?sid=8721797&newtest=Y. Accessed 02/02/2018-01/31/2019.
22- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, Schünemann HJ. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ (Clinical research ed.). 2008 Apr;336(7650):924-6.
23-WebPlotDigitizer. https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer/. Accessed on 04/02/2018.
24- DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Controlled clinical trials. 1986 Sep 1;7(3):177-88.
25- Higgins JP, Sterne JA, Savovic J, Page MJ, Hróbjartsson A, Boutron I, Reeves B, Eldridge S. A revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomized trials. Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2016;10(Suppl 1):29-31.
26-Comprehensive Meta-Analysis Version 3. Borenstein, M., Hedges, L., Higgins, J., & Rothstein, H. Biostat, Englewood, NJ 2013.
27- Wallace BC, Lajeunesse MJ, Dietz G, Dahabreh IJ, Trikalinos TA, Schmid CH, Gurevitch J. OpenMEE: Intuitive, open□source software for meta□analysis in ecology and evolutionary biology. Methods in Ecology and Evolution. 2017 Aug 1;8(8):941-7.
28-Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting

items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. Int J Surg.2010;8(5):336-41. doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2010.02.007. Epub 2010 Feb 18. Erratum in: Int J Surg. 2010;8(8):658.
29- Mariani JJ, Malcolm RJ, Mamczur AK, Choi JC, Brady R, Nunes E, Levin FR. Pilot trial of gabapentin for the treatment of benzodiazepine abuse or dependence in methadone maintenance patients. The American journal of drug and alcohol abuse. 2016 May 3;42(3):333-40.
30- Shapiro CM, Sherman D, Peck DF. Withdrawal from benzodiazepines by initially switching to zopiclone. European Psychiatry. 1995 Jan 1; 10:145s-51s,
31-Lader MA, Olajide DE. A comparison of buspirone and placebo in relieving benzodiazepine withdrawal symptoms. Journal of clinical psychopharmacology. 1987 Feb;7(1):11-5.
32- Ashton CH, Rawlins MD, Tyrer SP. A double-blind placebo-controlled study of buspirone in diazepam withdrawal in chronic benzodiazepine users. The British Journal of Psychiatry. 1990 Aug;157(2):232-8.
33-Rynn M, García-España F, Greenblatt DJ, Mandos LA, Schweizer E, Rickels K. Imipramine and buspirone in patients with panic disorder who are discontinuing long-term benzodiazepine therapy. Journal of clinical psychopharmacology. 2003 Oct 1;23(5):505-8.
34- Delle Chiaie R, Pancheri P, Casacchia M, Stratta P, Kotzalidis GD, Zibellini M. Assessment of the efficacy of buspirone in patients affected by generalized anxiety disorder, shifting to buspirone from prior treatment with lorazepam: a placebo-controlled, double-blind study. Journal of clinical psychopharmacology. 1995 Feb 1;15(1):12-9.
35- Morton S, Lader M. Buspirone treatment as an aid to benzodiazepine withdrawal. Journal of Psychopharmacology. 1995 Jul;9(4):331-5.
36-Rickels K, DeMartinis N, García-España F, Greenblatt DJ, Mandos LA, Rynn M. Imipramine and buspirone in treatment of patients with generalized anxiety disorder who are discontinuing long-term benzodiazepine therapy. American Journal of Psychiatry. 2000 Dec 1;157(12):1973-9.
37- Udelman HD, Udelman DL. Concurrent use of buspirone in anxious patients during withdrawal from alprazolam therapy. The Journal of clinical psychiatry. 1990 Sep; 51:46-50.
38-Rickels K, Schweizer E, Espana FG, Case G, DeMartinis N, Greenblatt D. Trazodone and valproate in patients discontinuing long-term benzodiazepine therapy: effects on withdrawal symptoms and taper outcome. Psychopharmacology. 1999 Jan 1;141(1):1-5.
39-Hong-ju ZH, Xiao-feng JI, Ming-ming MA, Jie-wen ZH. A control study on treatment for

benzodiazepine dependence with trazodone. Chinese Journal of Contemporary Neurology & Neurosurgery. 2013;13(5):411.
40- Cantopher T, Olivieri S, Cleave N, Edwards JG. Chronic benzodiazepine dependence: a comparative study of abrupt withdrawal under propranolol cover versus gradual withdrawal. The British Journal of Psychiatry. 1990 Mar;156(3):406-11.
41- Saul P, Jones BP, Edwards KG, Tweed JA. Randomized comparison of atenolol and placebo in the treatment of anxiety: a double-blind study. European journal of clinical pharmacology. 1985 Jan 1;28(1):109-10.
42--Harrison-Read PE, Tyrer P, Lawson C, Lack S, Fernandes C, File SE. Flumazenil precipitated panic and dysphoria in patients dependent on benzodiazepines: a possible aid to abstinence. Journal of Psychopharmacology. 1996 Mar;10(2):89-97.
43-Saxon L, Hjemdahl P, Hiltunen AJ, Borg S. Effects of flumazenil in the treatment of benzodiazepine withdrawal–a double-blind pilot study. Psychopharmacology. 1997 May 1;131(2):153-60.
44-Saxon L, Borg S, Hiltunen AJ. Reduction of aggression during benzodiazepine withdrawal: effects of flumazenil. Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior. 2010 Aug 1;96(2):148-51.
45-Gerra G, Marcato A, Caccavari R, Fertonani-Affini G, Fontanesi B, Zaimovic A, Avanzini P, Delsignore R. Effectiveness of flumazenil (RO 15-1788) in the treatment of benzodiazepine withdrawal. Current therapeutic research. 1993 Nov 1;54(5):580-7.
46- Cassano GB, Petracca A, Borghi C, Chiroli S, Didoni G, Garreau M. A randomized, double blind study of alpidem vs placebo in the prevention and treatment of benzodiazepine withdrawal syndrome. European psychiatry.1996 Jan 1;11(2):93-9.
47- Lader M, Farr I, Morton S. A comparison of alpidem and placebo in relieving benzodiazepine withdrawal symptoms. International clinical psychopharmacology. 1993.
48-Allain H, Le Coz F, Borderies P, Schuck S, de La Giclais B, Patat A, Gandon JM. Use of zolpidem 10 mg as a benzodiazepine substitute in 84 patients with insomnia. Human Psychopharmacology: Clinical and Experimental. 1998 Dec;13(8):551-9.
49- Declebck A, Smits M. Zolpidem, a valuable alternative to benzodiazepine hypnotics for chronic insomnia? Journal of international medical research. 1999 Nov;27(6):253-63.
50- Hadley SJ, Mandel FS, Schweizer E. Switching from long-term benzodiazepine therapy to pregabalin in patients with generalized anxiety disorder: a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial.

Journal of Psychopharmacology. 2012 Apr;26(4):461-70.
51-Schweizer E, Rickels K, Case WG, Greenblatt DJ. Carbamazepine treatment in patients discontinuing long-term benzodiazepine therapy: effects on withdrawal severity and outcome. Archives of General Psychiatry. 1991 May 1;48(5):448-52.
52- Di EC, Rovea A. The prophylaxis of benzodiazepine withdrawal syndrome in the elderly: the effectiveness of carbamazepine. Double-blind study vs. placebo. Minerva psichiatrica. 1992;33(4):301-4.
53-Mercier-Guyon C, Chabannes JP, Saviuc P. The role of captodiamine in the withdrawal from long-term benzodiazepine treatment. Current medical research and opinion. 2004 Sep 1;20(9):1347-55.
54-Avedisova AS, Iastrebov DV. Use of anxiolytic atarax as a substitutive drug for benzodiazepine tranquilizers. Zhurnal nevrologii i psikhiatrii imeni SS Korsakova. 2007;107(3):37-41.
55-Lemoine P, Touchon J, Billardon M. Comparison of 6 different methods for lorazepam withdrawal. A controlled study, hydroxyzine versus placebo. L'Encephale. 1997;23(4):290-9.
56- Hantouche EG, Guelfi JD, Comet D. Alpha-beta L-aspartate magnesium in treatment of chronic benzodiazepine abuse: controlled and double-blind study versus placebo. L'Encephale. 1998;24(5):469-79.
57- Lecrubier Y, Fessard N. Arrêt des benzodiazépines chez des consommateurs chroniques: un essai en double insu du gluconate de lithium vs placebo. InAnnales Médico-psychologiques, revue psychiatrique 2005 Feb 1 (Vol. 163, No. 1, pp. 24-29). Elsevier Masson.
58-Cardinali DP, Gvozdenovich E, Kaplan MR, Fainstein I, Shifis HA, Perez Lloret S, Albornoz L, Negri A. A double blind-placebo controlled study on melatonin efficacy to reduce anxiolytic benzodiazepine use in the elderly. Neuroendocrinology Letters. 2002 Feb 1;23(1):55-60.
59-Vissers FH, Knipschild PG, Crebolder HF. Is melatonin helpful in stopping the long-term use of hypnotics? A discontinuation trial. Pharmacy World & Science. 2007 Dec 1;29(6):641-
60-Baandrup L, Lindschou J, Winkel P, Gluud C, Glenthoj BY. Prolonged-release melatonin versus placebo for benzodiazepine discontinuation in patients with schizophrenia or bipolar disorder: A randomised, placebo-controlled, blinded trial. The World Journal of Biological Psychiatry. 2016 Oct 2;17(7):514-24.
61- Lähteenmäki R, Puustinen J, Vahlberg T, Lyles A, Neuvonen PJ, Partinen M, Räihä I, Kivelä

SL. Melatonin for sedative withdrawal in older patients with primary insomnia: a randomized double□blind placebo□controlled trial. British journal of clinical pharmacology. 2014 Jun 1;77(6):975-85.
62-Baandrup L, Glenthøj BY, Jennum PJ. Objective and subjective sleep quality: Melatonin versus placebo add-on treatment in patients with schizophrenia or bipolar disorder withdrawing from long-term benzodiazepine use. Psychiatry research. 2016 Jun 30; 240:163-9.
63-Garfinkel D, Zisapel N, Wainstein J, Laudon M. Facilitation of benzodiazepine discontinuation by melatonin: a new clinical approach. Archives of internal medicine. 1999 Nov 8;159(20):2456-60.
64-Peles E, Hetzroni T, Bar□Hamburger R, Adelson M, Schreiber S. Melatonin for perceived sleep disturbances associated with benzodiazepine withdrawal among patients in methadone maintenance treatment: a double□blind randomized clinical trial. Addiction. 2007 Dec;102(12):1947-53.
65- Schweizer E, Case WG, Garcia-Espana F, Rickels K, Greenblatt DJ. Progesterone coadministration in patients discontinuing long-term benzodiazepine therapy: effects on withdrawal severity and taper outcome. Psychopharmacology. 1995 Feb 1;117(4):424-9.
66-Rickels K, DeMartinis N, García-España F, Greenblatt DJ, Mandos LA, Rynn M. Imipramine and buspirone in treatment of patients with generalized anxiety disorder who are discontinuing long-term benzodiazepine therapy. American Journal of Psychiatry. 2000 Dec 1;157(12):1973-9.
67-Tyrer P, Ferguson B, Hallström C, Michie M, Tyrer S, Cooper S, Caplan R, Barczak P. A controlled trial of dothiepin and placebo in treating benzodiazepine withdrawal symptoms. The British Journal of Psychiatry. 1996 Apr;168(4):457-61.
68-Zitman FG, CouvÉe JE. Chronic benzodiazepine use in general practice patients with depression: an evaluation of controlled treatment and taper-off: report on behalf of the Dutch Chronic Benzodiazepine Working Group. The British Journal of Psychiatry. 2001 Apr;178(4):317-24.
69- Ansseau M, Papart P, Gérard MA, von Frenckell R, Franck G. Controlled comparison of buspirone and oxazepam in generalized anxiety. Neuropsychobiology. 1990;24(2):74-8.
70- Bourin M, Couetoux A, Ortega A. controlled Comparison of The Effects and Abrupt Discontinuation on Buspirone And Lorazepam in Generalized Anxiety Disorder. Clinical Neuropharmacology. 1992 Jan 1; 15:540B.

71- Busto UE, Naranjo CA, Bremner KE, Peachey JE, Bologa M. Safety of ipsapirone treatment compared with lorazepam: discontinuation effects. Journal of Psychiatry and Neuroscience. 1998 Jan;23(1):35.
72- Fontaine R, Beaudry P, Beauclair L, Chouinard G. Comparison of withdrawal of busiprone and diazepam: A placebo-controlled study. Progress in neuro-psychopharmacology & biological psychiatry. 1987.
73- Murphy SM, Owen R, Tyrer P. Comparative assessment of efficacy and withdrawal symptoms after 6- and 12-weeks' treatment with diazepam or buspirone. The British Journal of Psychiatry. 1989 Apr;154(4):529-34.
74- Gerra G, Zaimovic A, Giusti F, Moi G, Brewer C. Intravenous flumazenil versus oxazepam tapering in the treatment of benzodiazepine withdrawal: a randomized, placebo□controlled study.
Addiction biology. 2002 Oct;7(4):385-95.
75-Lemoine P, Kermadi I, Garcia-Acosta S, Garay RP, Dib M. Double-blind, comparative study of cyamemazine vs. bromazepam in the benzodiazepine withdrawal syndrome. Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry. 2006 Jan 1;30(1):131-7.
76- Frattola L, Garreau M, Piolti R, Bassi S, Albizzati MG, Borghi C, Morselli PL. Comparison of the efficacy, safety and withdrawal of alpidem and alprazolam in anxious patients. The British Journal of Psychiatry. 1994 Jul;165(1):94-100.
77-Pat-Horenczyk R, Hacohen D, Herer P, Lavie P. The effects of substituting zopiclone in withdrawal from chronic use of benzodiazepine hypnotics. Psychopharmacology. 1998 Dec 1;140(4):450-7.
78- Kornowski J. The comparison of tianeptine and carbamazepine in benzodiazepines withdrawal symptoms. Psychiatria polska. 2002;36(6 Suppl):311-8.
79-Vorma H, Katila H. Effect of valproate on benzodiazepine withdrawal severity in opioid-dependent subjects: a pilot study. Heroin Addict Relat Clin Probl. 2011 Mar 1;13(1):15-20.
80- Nakao M, Takeuchi T, Nomura K, Teramoto T, Yano E. Clinical application of paroxetine for tapering benzodiazepine use in non□major□depressive outpatients visiting an internal medicine clinic. Psychiatry and clinical neurosciences. 2006 Oct;60(5):605-10.
81- Lancaster JM, Davies JA. Carbamazepine inhibits NMDA-induced depolarizations in cortical wedges prepared from DBA/2 mice. Experientia. 1992 Aug 1;48(8):751-3.

82-Chen J, Li L, Chen SR, Chen H, Xie JD, Sirrieh RE, MacLean DM, Zhang Y, Zhou MH, Jayaraman V, Pan HL. The α2δ-1-NMDA receptor complex is critically involved in neuropathic pain development and gabapentin therapeutic actions. Cell reports. 2018 Feb 27;22(9):2307-21.
83-Flynn S., Babi M.A. Anticonvulsants. In: Dowd FJ, Johnson B, Mariotti A. Pharmacology and Therapeutics for Dentistry-E-Book. Elsevier Health Sciences; 2016, pp. 176-192. doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-39307-2.00012-6.
84- Sills GJ. The mechanisms of action of gabapentin and pregabalin. Current opinion in pharmacology. 2006 Feb 1;6(1):108-13.
85- Ghodke-Puranik Y, Thorn CF, Lamba JK, Leeder JS, Song W, Birnbaum AK, Altman RB, Klein TE. Valproic acid pathway: pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. *Pharmacogenet Genomics*. 2013 Apr;23(4):236-41. doi: 10.1097/FPC.0b013e32835ea0b2,
86-Basselin M, Chang L, Chen M, Bell JM, Rapoport SI. Chronic administration of valproic acid reduces brain NMDA signaling via arachidonic acid in unanesthetized rats. *Neurochem Res*. 2008 Nov;33(11):2229-40. doi: 10.1007/s11064-008-9700.
87- Svenningsson P, Bateup H, Qi H, Takamiya K, Huganir RL, Spedding M, Roth BL, McEwen BS, Greengard P. Involvement of AMPA receptor phosphorylation in antidepressant actions with special reference to tianeptine. European Journal of Neuroscience. 2007 Dec;26(12):3509-17.
88- McEwen BS, Chattarji S, Diamond DM, Jay TM, Reagan LP, Svenningsson P, Fuchs E. The neurobiological properties of tianeptine (Stablon): from monoamine hypothesis to glutamatergic modulation. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2010 Mar;15(3):237-49. doi: 10.1038/mp.2009.80.
89-Weinbroum AA, Flaishon R, Sorkine P, Szold O, Rudick V. A risk-benefit assessment of flumazenil in the management of benzodiazepine overdose. Drug Safety. 1997 Sep 1;17(3):181-96.
90- Baldwin DS, Aitchison K, Bateson A, Curran HV, Davies S, Leonard B, Nutt DJ, Stephens DN, Wilson S. Benzodiazepines: risks and benefits. A reconsideration. Journal of Psychopharmacology. 2013 Nov;27(11):967-71.
91- Salzman C, Fisher J, Nobel K, Glassman R, Wolfson A, Kelley M. Cognitive improvement following benzodiazepine discontinuation in elderly nursing home residents. International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry. 1992 Feb;7(2):89-93.
92- Soyka M. Treatment of benzodiazepine dependence. New England Journal of Medicine. 2017 Mar 23;376(12):1147-57.

93- Tjagvad C, Clausen T, Handal M, Skurtveit S. Benzodiazepine prescription for patients in treatment for drug use disorders: a nationwide cohort study in Denmark, 2000–2010. BMC psychiatry. 2016 Dec;16(1):168.
94- Reeve E, Ong M, Wu A, Jansen J, Petrovic M, Gnjidic D. A systematic review of interventions to deprescribe benzodiazepines and other hypnotics among older people. European journal of clinical pharmacology. 2017 Aug 1;73(8):927-35.
95- Liebrenz M, Gehring MT, Buadze A, Caflisch C. High-dose benzodiazepine dependence: a qualitative study of patients' perception on cessation and withdrawal. BMC psychiatry. 2015 Dec;15(1):116.

Forest plot 1 involves a single drug clustered into a pharmacological class compared with placebo.

5-HT: 5-hydroxytryptamine
BZD: benzodiazepine
GABA: Gamma (gamma)-aminobutyric acid
$GABA_A$-PAM: $GABA_A$ receptor positive allosteric modulators
SERT: serotonin transporter
NET: norepinephrine transporter
SSRI: Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors

Group by Pharmacological class	Std diff in means	Study name	Variance	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value
5HT1a agonist	-0.800	Ashton et al. 1990	0.188	-1.650	0.050	-1.844	0.065
5HT1a agonist	0.882	Delle Chiaie et al. 1995	0.163	0.091	1.673	2.187	0.029
5HT1a agonist	-0.540	Lader et al. 1987	0.380	-1.748	0.668	-0.875	0.381
5HT1a agonist	1.485	Morton et al. 1995	0.425	0.207	2.763	2.277	0.023
5HT1a agonist	0.013	Rickels et al. 2000(B)	0.077	-0.532	0.559	0.049	0.961
5HT1a agonist	-0.273	Rynn et al. 2003(B)	0.185	-1.117	0.570	-0.636	0.525
5HT1a agonist	0.117	Udelman et al. 1990	0.056	-0.345	0.579	0.495	0.620
5HT1a agonist	0.086		0.054	-0.369	0.542	0.370	0.711
5-HT2A antagonist	-0.122	Rickels et al.1999(T)	0.106	-0.759	0.515	-0.375	0.708
5-HT2A antagonist	0.259	Hong-ju et al. 2013	0.106	-0.381	0.898	0.793	0.428
5-HT2A antagonist	0.068		0.053	-0.384	0.519	0.294	0.769
Beta-blocker	-0.054	Cantopher et al. 1990	0.129	-0.759	0.650	-0.151	0.880
Beta-blocker	0.222	Saul et al. 1985	0.092	-0.373	0.818	0.732	0.464
Beta-blocker	0.107		0.054	-0.347	0.562	0.462	0.644
BZD receptor antagonist	0.489	Gerra et al. 1993	0.114	-0.174	1.152	1.446	0.148
BZD receptor antagonist	0.715	Harrison-Read et al. 1996	0.532	-0.715	2.144	0.980	0.327
BZD receptor antagonist	1.289	Saxon et al. 2010	0.242	0.326	2.252	2.623	0.009
BZD receptor antagonist	0.247	Saxon et al. 1997	0.403	-0.997	1.491	0.389	0.697
BZD receptor antagonist	0.671		0.058	0.199	1.143	2.786	0.005
GABAA -PAM	0.172	Cassano et al. 1996	0.028	-0.155	0.499	1.032	0.302
GABAA -PAM	-0.720	Lader et al. 1993	0.251	-1.702	0.263	-1.436	0.151
GABAA -PAM	0.313	Allain et al. 1998	0.110	-0.335	0.962	0.947	0.344
GABAA -PAM	0.048	Declerck et al. 1999	0.208	-0.847	0.942	0.105	0.917
GABAA -PAM	0.108		0.023	-0.190	0.405	0.709	0.479
Glutamate	0.431	Hadley et al. 2012	0.039	0.046	0.817	2.191	0.028
Glutamate	0.613	Di Costanzo et al. 1992	0.145	-0.133	1.358	1.611	0.107
Glutamate	-0.164	Rickels et al.1999(V)	0.149	-0.921	0.592	-0.426	0.670
Glutamate	0.275	Schweizer et al. 1991	0.101	-0.349	0.898	0.864	0.388
Glutamate	0.344		0.020	0.065	0.623	2.418	0.016
Histamine antagonist	-0.153	Avedisova et al. 2007 2007	0.068	-0.664	0.358	-0.588	0.557
Histamine antagonist	0.320	Lemoine et al. 1997	0.051	-0.122	0.761	1.419	0.156
Histamine antagonist	0.787	Mercier-Guyon et al. 2004	0.053	0.335	1.239	3.412	0.001
Histamine antagonist	0.329		0.070	-0.188	0.845	1.247	0.213
L-aspartate	0.070	Hantouche et al. 1998	0.028	-0.257	0.397	0.422	0.673
L-aspartate	0.070		0.028	-0.257	0.397	0.422	0.673
Lithium	-0.047	Lecubier et al. 2005	0.018	-0.310	0.216	-0.347	0.728
Lithium	-0.047		0.018	-0.310	0.216	-0.347	0.728
Melatonin receptor agonist	-0.724	Cardinali et al. 2002	0.095	-1.328	-0.119	-2.347	0.019
Melatonin receptor agonist	-0.053	Baandrup et al. 2016(b)	0.047	-0.476	0.370	-0.244	0.807
Melatonin receptor agonist	0.640	Baandrup et al. 2016(a)	0.076	0.098	1.182	2.315	0.021
Melatonin receptor agonist	0.614	Garfinkel et al.1999	0.345	-0.537	1.766	1.046	0.296
Melatonin receptor agonist	0.477	Peles et al. 2007	0.106	-0.160	1.114	1.468	0.142
Melatonin receptor agonist	-0.423	Lähteenmäki et al.2014	0.044	-0.836	-0.010	-2.007	0.045
Melatonin receptor agonist	-0.619	Vissers et al.2007	0.111	-1.271	0.033	-1.861	0.063
Melatonin receptor agonist	-0.059		0.043	-0.465	0.347	-0.284	0.776
Progesterone	-0.361	Schweitzer et al.1995	0.129	-1.064	0.343	-1.005	0.315
Progesterone	-0.361		0.129	-1.064	0.343	-1.005	0.315
SERT and NET	0.517	Rickels et al. 2000(I)	0.088	-0.065	1.098	1.742	0.081
SERT and NET	-0.434	Rynn et al. 2003(I)	0.159	-1.215	0.347	-1.089	0.276
SERT and NET	0.393	Tyrer et al. 1996	0.052	-0.056	0.842	1.717	0.086
SERT and NET	0.234		0.061	-0.252	0.720	0.944	0.345
SSRI	0.087	Zitman et al. 2001	0.036	-0.285	0.459	0.458	0.647
SSRI	0.087		0.036	-0.285	0.459	0.458	0.647
Overall	0.129		0.003	0.024	0.234	2.405	0.016



Forest plot 2 involves a single drug clustered into a pharmacological class compared with another active drug or a control group(non-placebo).

Group by Pharmacological class	Study name	Std diff in means	Statistics for each study: Variance	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value
5HT1a agonist	Ansseau et al. 1990	-0.400	0.158	-1.178	0.379	-1.006	0.314
5HT1a agonist	Bourin et al. 1995	0.939	0.116	0.272	1.605	2.761	0.006
5HT1a agonist	Busto et al. 1998	0.742	0.179	-0.088	1.572	1.752	0.080
5HT1a agonist	Fontaine et al. 1987	0.127	0.122	-0.557	0.812	0.364	0.716
5HT1a agonist	Murphy et al. 1989	0.403	0.187	-0.445	1.250	0.931	0.352
5HT1a agonist		0.369	0.058	-0.104	0.841	1.530	0.126
BZD receptor antagonist	Gerra et al. 2002	1.373	0.124	0.684	2.062	3.907	0.000
BZD receptor antagonist		1.373	0.124	0.684	2.062	3.907	0.000
Dopamine, serotonin receptor antagonist	Lemoine et al. 2006	0.188	0.025	-0.123	0.499	1.186	0.236
Dopamine, serotonin receptor antagonist		0.188	0.025	-0.123	0.499	1.186	0.236
GABAA -PAM	Frattola et al. 1994	0.188	0.037	-0.187	0.563	0.983	0.326
GABAA -PAM	Pat-Horenczyk et al. 1998	0.801	0.252	-0.182	1.785	1.598	0.110
GABAA -PAM		0.319	0.063	-0.174	0.813	1.269	0.205
Glutamate	Kornowski et al. 2002	0.114	0.100	-0.506	0.734	0.360	0.719
Glutamate	Vorma et al. 2011	0.197	0.139	-0.533	0.927	0.529	0.597
Glutamate		0.149	0.058	-0.324	0.621	0.617	0.537
SSRI	Nakao et al. 2006	0.555	0.095	-0.048	1.157	1.803	0.071
SSRI		0.555	0.095	-0.048	1.157	1.803	0.071
Overall		0.354	0.009	0.165	0.542	3.684	0.000





Funnel plot 1: BZD receptor antagonist versus placebo
Fail-safe N: 7
Observed significance level:0.0033
Target significance level: 0.05
The funnel plot appears to be symmetric. The observed outcome yields a significant p-value. It seems that two small studies lie below the cut off - of 0.365.



Funnel plot 2: glutamate versus placebo
Fail-safe N: 4
Observed significance level:0.0103
Target significance level: 0.05
The funnel plot appears to be symmetric. The observed outcome yields a significant p-value. It seems that three studies lie below the cut off -of 0.193 are small studies. It is more likely that the smaller studies tend to report a higher effect.

Figure 1. **Outline of the search process; included articles as well as excluded articles with reasons for exclusion.**



Table 1

Study name	Pharmacological class Active drug *Versus placebo*	Setting	Participants (allocated)	or completers)	Jada's score	Grade recommen-dations	Risk of bias (Cochrane's adaptation) S	P	D	A	R	O	Measurement of symptoms	Comments
	5-HT1A receptor partial agonist													
Lader et al.1987(31)	Buspirone	Outpatient/UK	5	6	3	Low	(-)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Morton et al.1995(35)	Buspirone	BZD withdrawal clinic/UK	6	6	3	Low	(-)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Rickels et al. 2000(B)(36)	Buspirone	Research Unit/USA	28	24	3	Low	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	PWC	
Rynn et al.2003(B)(33)	Buspirone	Research Unit/USA	7	10	3	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Udelman et al.1990(37)	Buspirone	Multicenter/	36	36	3	Low	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	HAM-A	
Ashton et al.1990(32)	Buspirone	Outpatient/	11	12	3	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(+)	HAM-A	
Delle Chiaie et al. 1995(34)	Buspirone	Outpatient/Italy	13	14	3	Moderate	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	BWSQ	
	5-HT2A antagonist													
Hong-ju et al. 2013(39)	Trazodone	University Hospital/China	20	18	3	Moderate	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-+)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Rickels et al.1999(T)(38)	Trazodone	Research Unit/USA	35	13	3	Low	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-+)	HAM-A	
	Beta adrenergic blocker													
Cantopher et al.1990(40)	Propranolol	Outpatient/UK	15	16	3	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Saul et al.1985(41)	Atenolol	Research center/	24	20	2	Very low	(+)	(+)	(+)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	BWSQ	Unclear randomization
	BZD receptor antagonist													
Gerra et al.1993(45)	Flumazenil	Outpatient/Italy	18	18	3	Low	(-)	(+)	(+)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-D	
Harrison-Read et al.1996(42)	Flumazenil	Research center? /UK	4	4	4	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	BWSQ	
Saxon et al.1997(43)	Flumazenil	Research center/Sweden	5	5	2	Very low	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-+)	(-+)	Self-rating scale	Unclear randomization
Saxon et al.2010(44)	Flumazenil	Research center/Sweden	10	10	2	Very low	(+)	(-)	(-)	(+-)	(+-)	(+-)	HAM-A	Unclear randomization
	$GABA_A$ -PAM													
Cassano et al.1996(46)	Alpidem	Multicenter/Italy	77	68	3	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Lader et al. 1993(47)	Alpidem	Research center? /UK	8	9	3	Low	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Allain et al .1998(48)	Zolpidem	Outpatient/	18	19	3	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	VAS	
Declebck et al.1999(49)	Zolpidem	Research center? /	12	8	3	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	SCL-90	
	Glutamate													
Di et al.1992(52)	Carbamazepine	Ambulatory clinic/Italy	15	14	3	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	HSCL	
Hadley et al.2012(50)	Pregabalin	Twenty sites/Spain, Mexico…	56	50	5	Moderate	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Rickels et al.1999(V)(38)	Valproic acid	Research Unit/USA	18	14	3	Low	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Schweitzer et al.1991(51)	Carbamazepine	Research Unit/USA	19	21	3	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	PWC	
	Histamine receptor antagonist													
Avedisova et al.2007(54)	Hydroxyzine	Research center? /Russia	30	29	3	Low	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Lemoine et al.1997(55)	Hydroxyzine	Multicenter/France	42	38	4	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Mercier-Guyon et al.2004(53)	Captodiamine	Fourteen centers/France	40	41	5	Moderate	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
	Alpha-beta L-aspartate magnesium													
Hantouche et al.1998(56)	α-β- L-aspartate magnesium	Ambulatory/France	69	75	5	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
	Lithium													
Lecubier et al.2005(57)	Lithium	Multicenter? /France	136	94	5	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	

	Melatonin receptor agonist														
Baandrup et al.2016(a)(62)		Melatonin	University hospital research/Denmark	28	27	4	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	PSQI	
Baandrup et al.2016(b)(60)		Melatonin	Research center? /Denmark	42	44	5	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	BWSQ	
Cardinali et al.2002(58)		Melatonin	Research center/Argentina	24	21	5	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	Subjective assessment	
Garfinkel et al.1999(63)		Melatonin	Research center? /Israel	4	12	2	Very low	(+)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-+)	Questionnaire	Unclear randomization
Lähteenmäki et al.2014(61)		Melatonin	Outpatient/Finland	46	46	5	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	BWSQ	
Peles et al.200764)		Melatonin	Methadone program/Israel	20	19	5	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	PSQI	
Vissers et al.2007(59)		Melatonin	Outpatient/Netherlands	20	18	4	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-+)	Questionnaire	
	Progesterone														
Schweitzer et al.1995(65)		Progesterone	Research Unit/USA	23	12	3	Low	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
	SERT and NET														
Rickels et al. 2000(I)(66)		Imipramine	Research Unit/USA	23	24	3	Low	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	PWC	
Rynn et al.2003(I)(33)		Imipramine	Research Unit/USA	18	10	3	Low	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Tyrer et al.1996(67)		Dothiepin	Outpatient/UK	27	41	4	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-D	
	SSRI														
Zitman et al.2001(68)		Paroxetine	Multicenter/Netherlands	46	70	5	Moderate	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-D	
		Versus a non- placebo/another drug													
	5-HT1A receptor partial agonist														
Ansseau et al.1990(69)		Buspirone	Outpatient/Belgium	14	12	3	Low	(+)	(+)	(-+)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Bourin et al.1995(70)		Buspirone	Multicenter/France?	22	17	3	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+-)	HAM-A	
Busto et al.1998(71)		Ipsapirone	Outpatient/Canada	11	13	4	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	CIWA-B	
Fontaine et al.1987(72)		Buspirone	Outpatient/Canada	12	26	3	Moderate	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
Murphy et al.1989(73)		Buspirone	Outpatient/UK	10	12	3	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
	BZD receptor antagonist														
Gerra et al.2002(74)		Flumazenil	Hospital/Italy	20	20	3	Low	(-)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(-)	(-+)	VSA	
	Dopamine, serotonin receptor antagonist														
Lemoine et al.2006(75)		Cyamemazine	Multicenter/France	77	83	5	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	
	$GABA_A$ -PAM														
Frattola et al.1994(76)		Alpidem	Outpatient/Italy	56	54	3	Low	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-+)	CPRS	
Pat-Horenczyk et al.1998(77)		Zopiclone	Sleep Center/	7	11	3	Low	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(+-)	Questionnaires	
	Glutamate														
Kornowski et al.2002(78)		Tianeptine	Neuropsych.center/Poland	20	20	2	Low	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-A	Unclear randomization
Vorma et al.2011(79)		Valproic acid	Hospital/Finland	14	15	3	Low	(-)	(+-)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	(-+)	CIWA-B	
	SSRI														
Nakao et al.2006(80)		Paroxetine	Outpatient/Japan	23	21	2	Low	(-)	(+)	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-+)	HAM-D	Unclear blinding

Table 1 summarizes JADAD (Oxford score) score, GRADE recommendation, and measurement of symptoms. Allocated participants representing the sample size for the effect size calculation. The comments section highlights the main reason why a trial scored two on JADAD.

Measurements (legend)

PWC: Physician Withdrawal Checklist
HAM-D: Hamilton Depression Rating Scale
HAM-A: Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale

Risk of bias signs

(-): low risk
(-+): unclear risk
(+): high risk

Risk of bias (legend)

S: selection
P: performance

Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE)

Quality of evidence and definitions

High quality— Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect

Moderate quality— Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate

Low quality— Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate

SLC-90:	Symptom Checklist-90	D: detection	Very low quality— Any estimate of effect is very uncertain
HDRS	Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression	A: atttion	
BWSQ	Benzodiazepine Withdrawal Symptom Questionnaire	R: reporting	
CIWA-B	Clinical Institute Withdrawal Assessment Scale – Benzodiazepines		
ORQ	Observer-rated questionnaire		
CPRS	Comprehensive Psychopathological Rating Scale		
WSCL	Withdrawal Symptom Check List		
VAS	Visual Analogue Scale		
PSQI	Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index		
HSCL	Hopkins Symptom Checklist		

Questionnaire: participants' self-report

Oxford Quality Scoring System or Jadad score

≥ 3: High range of quality score

≤ 2: Low range of quality score

5: Highest score