

ized clinical trial reporting has been described in the CONSORT statement (1); one of its recommendations is to describe the flow of the subjects in the study (number screened, proportion randomly assigned, etc.). Dr. Wagner and colleagues did not report the proportion of subjects who were excluded from the random assignment after the single-blind period. This information is critical because a placebo run-in period might help to “wash out” nonspecific responders, allowing sharper evaluation of treatment-specific effects as shown in some pharmacotherapy studies (2).

An additional concern is the elicitation method used for adverse events at a time when the safety of SSRIs in youth has been called into question (3). The adverse events were: “reported by patients or observed by investigators” (Wagner et al., p. 1080). The reliability of this practice is questionable because some adverse events, even very severe ones, could neither be reported by the patient nor observed by the investigator and would need to be specifically assessed (4).

Finally, it is somewhat surprising that the authors do not compare their results with those of another trial, involving 244 adolescents (13–18-year-olds), that showed no evidence of efficacy of citalopram compared to placebo and a higher level of self-harm (16 [12.9%] of 124 versus nine [7.5%] of 120) in the citalopram group compared to the placebo group (5). Although these data were not available to the public until December 2003, one would expect that the authors, some of whom are employed by the company that produces citalopram in the United States and financed the study, had access to this information.

References

1. Begg C, Cho M, Eastwood S, Horton R, Moher D, Olkin I, Pitkin R, Rennie D, Schulz KF, Simel D, Stroup DF: Improving the quality of reporting of randomized controlled trials: the CONSORT statement. *JAMA* 1996; 276:637–639
2. Emslie GJ, Rush AJ, Weinberg WA, Kowatch RA, Hughes CW, Carmody T, Rintelmann J: A double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of fluoxetine in children and adolescents with depression. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1997; 54:1031–1037
3. US Food and Drug Administration: Antidepressant Use in Children, Adolescents, and Adults, 2004. <http://www.fda.gov/cder/drug/antidepressants/default.htm>
4. Greenhill LL, Vitiello B, Riddle MA, Fisher P, Shockey E, March JS, Levine J, Fried J, Abikoff H, Zito JM, McCracken JT, Findling RL, Robinson J, Cooper TB, Davies M, Varipatis E, Labellarte MJ, Scahill L, Walkup JT, Capasso L, Rosengarten J: Review of safety assessment methods used in pediatric psychopharmacology. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2003; 42:627–633
5. Whittington CJ, Kendall T, Fonagy P, Cottrell D, Cotgrove A, Bodington E: Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors in childhood depression: systematic review of published versus unpublished data. *Lancet* 2004; 363:1341–1345

RÉMY P. BARBE, M.D.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

TO THE EDITOR: We read with interest the study by Dr. Wagner et al. We have a number of concerns about this study. In the Method section, it is not clear how the patients were recruited. One is also left in the dark about the method of random assignment and if the random assignment list was concealed. The authors also give no indication of how they

arrived at the sample size and if a power calculation was done. Given the recent concerns about the risk of suicidal thoughts and behaviors in children treated with SSRIs, this study could have attempted to shed additional light on the subject. The authors called the analysis of data an intent-to-treat analysis, although four patients who were lost to follow-up were excluded. In a true intent-to-treat analysis, all patients are analyzed in the groups to which they were initially assigned, regardless of whether they received the treatment or not. We consider the use of the term “intent-to-treat” in this context misleading.

Dropouts from the study have been accounted for by using the last observation carried forward. Treatment response in depression is frequently followed by a subsequent return to original or baseline values on a scale such that the last observation carried forward may be an unduly optimistic estimate. The classification of dropouts as treatment failures is based on safer assumptions than the last observation carried forward.

Our greatest concern is with the results and conclusions drawn. There is no table showing the results in detail. The authors have only stated that 36% of citalopram-treated patients met the criteria for response, compared to 24% of patients receiving placebo. This response rate, while in itself marginal compared to other studies of antidepressants, does not in itself show that citalopram is better than placebo.

We calculated the absolute benefit increase of using citalopram as 0.12 (95% confidence interval [CI]=−0.015 to 0.255). The relative benefit increase that could be attributed to citalopram was 50% (95% CI=−135% to 6%). The odds ratio, i.e., the odds of improving while taking citalopram compared to placebo was 1.75 (95% CI 0.92 to 3.43). The number needed to treat, i.e., the number of children who need to be treated with citalopram for one additional positive outcome was eight (95% CI=4 to infinity). None of these shows that citalopram is any better than placebo.

We would argue that the authors did not provide sufficient evidence to support their claim that “citalopram produces a statistically and clinically significant reduction in depressive symptoms in children and adolescents” (p. 1082). We are surprised that the most respected psychiatric journal in the world published a study that is misleading to its readers in the extreme.

MAJU MATHEWS, M.D., M.R.C.Psych.
BABATUNDE ADETUNJI, M.D., F.A.S.A.M.
JOANNE MATHEWS, M.D.
BIJU BASIL, M.D.
VINU GEORGE, M.D.
Philadelphia, Pa.
MANU MATHEWS, M.D.
KUMAR BUDUR, M.D.
Cleveland, Ohio
SHINY ABRAHAM, M.D.
Kottayam, India

Dr. Wagner and Colleagues Reply

TO THE EDITOR: Dr. Mathews and colleagues request further information about the randomized, placebo-controlled trial of citalopram for treatment of depression in children and adolescents. Randomization was on a 1:1 basis and was stratified by age group. The random assignment list was concealed from the investigators, which is fundamental to the claim that