### Supplemental Table 1. Summary of Data Extracted for the Three Studies Included in the Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Year</th>
<th>Study Objectives</th>
<th>Level/Design/Participants</th>
<th>Intervention and Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeCarlo &amp; Mann (1985)</td>
<td>Are activity groups more effective than verbal groups at improving self-perceptions of interpersonal communication skills?</td>
<td>Level I&lt;br&gt;Randomized controlled trial&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Participants&lt;br&gt;( N = 19 ) male outpatients attending a psychiatric day treatment center&lt;br&gt;Age range = 26–64 yr&lt;br&gt;( \text{Ethnicity: Not given} )&lt;br&gt;Diagnoses: Schizophrenia, depression&lt;br&gt;Conditions: A, B, and C—further split of demographics not given</td>
<td>Intervention&lt;br&gt;( \text{Condition A: group activity completion} )&lt;br&gt;( \text{Condition B: group verbal discussion} )&lt;br&gt;( \text{Condition C: treatment as usual (milieu therapy)} )&lt;br&gt;Setting: Buffalo Veterans Administration Hospital Day Treatment Center&lt;br&gt;Who Delivered: Same 2 facilitators for each of the experimental groups, a registered occupational therapist and the primary investigator as cotherapist&lt;br&gt;Frequency: ( 1 \times /\text{wk for 60 min} )&lt;br&gt;Duration: 8 wk&lt;br&gt;Outcome Measure&lt;br&gt;The Interpersonal Communication Inventory—measures participants’ perceptions of their own social skills&lt;br&gt;Used before and after intervention</td>
<td>Posteriori comparison found that the only significant improvement difference (( p &lt; .05 )) was between the activity and verbal groups, with those in the activity group reporting a higher level of interpersonal skill improvement than those in the verbal therapy group to a significant level. However, neither the activity group nor the verbal therapy group performed statistically significantly better than the control group.</td>
<td>No inclusion or exclusion criteria given&lt;br&gt;Ethnicity not given&lt;br&gt;All male participants&lt;br&gt;( \text{Subjective measures: Participant self-report} )&lt;br&gt;Small sample size&lt;br&gt;Acknowledges confounding factors, but does not control for these or collect relevant data&lt;br&gt;Randomization not described&lt;br&gt;Demographics not fully given or comparable for groups at baseline&lt;br&gt;No information regarding blinding, and primary investigator is cofacilitator of groups&lt;br&gt;No use of confidence intervals to aid inference&lt;br&gt;No longer-term follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klyczek &amp; Mann (1986)</td>
<td>Do differences in treatment approach relate to differences in symptom reduction, community tenure, and relapse rate? A comparison of 2 day-treatment centers, 1 offering twice as much activity therapy as verbal therapy and the other offering twice as much verbal therapy as activity therapy</td>
<td>Level II&lt;br&gt;Cohort study&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Participants&lt;br&gt;( N = 122 ) outpatients attending 2 psychiatric day-treatment centers&lt;br&gt;Age range = ( \geq 18 ) yr&lt;br&gt;( \text{Ethnicity: White} )&lt;br&gt;Gender: Condition A, 44% men, 56% women; Condition B, 67% men, 33% women&lt;br&gt;Diagnosis: All had a primary diagnosis of chronic schizophrenia.</td>
<td>Intervention&lt;br&gt;( \text{Condition A: Day treatment consisting of twice as much activity therapy as verbal therapy} )&lt;br&gt;( \text{Condition B: Day treatment consisting of twice as much verbal therapy as activity therapy} )&lt;br&gt;Setting: 2 adult psychiatric day-treatment programs in western New York&lt;br&gt;Who Delivered: Day treatment program staff</td>
<td>Mean Symptom Reduction: Activity group = 1.81, verbal group = -0.52&lt;br&gt;Mean Community Tenure (in Days): Activity group = 383.21, verbal group = 374.42&lt;br&gt;Mean Relapse Rate (( x ) Times): Activity group = 0.67, verbal group = 0.18&lt;br&gt;Mean Length of Stay When Hospitalized: Activity group = 9.75 days, verbal group = 26.15 days</td>
<td>Participants’ primary diagnosis of schizophrenia only&lt;br&gt;No control condition&lt;br&gt;Comprehensive Mental Health Assessment administered by participants’ primary therapist; therefore, possible bias&lt;br&gt;Variable time between first and second measurement&lt;br&gt;Comprehensive Mental Health Assessment tool not validated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</table>
| Schindler (1999) | Are groups effective in improving social interaction skills? A study of verbal groups, activity groups, and a control group | Level II Cohort study | Frequency  
- Condition A: Average 4.21 hr/wk activity therapy, 2.17 hr/wk verbal therapy  
- Condition B: Average 1.75 hr/wk activity therapy, 3.16 hr/wk verbal therapy  
Duration: Referred to the 2 centers in a 29-mo period or on the roll at the beginning of study (excluded those who did not receive 10 full days of treatment or who were not on the rolls for ≥30 days).  
Outcome Measures  
- Functioning in 16 life areas using the Comprehensive Mental Health Assessment, a nonstandardized quarterly assessment used in both centers  
- Number of times hospitalized in a psychiatric hospital during length of study  
- Number of days during the period of the study that the individual remained in the community | No further quantitative analysis was used; therefore, statistical inferences cannot be made. | Discrepancy of numbers in each intervention group (A: n = 89, B: n = 33)  
Acknowledges other confounding factors, but does not control for or collect data on these  
Basic descriptive statistics only—no statistical testing or inferential statistics  
No information regarding blinding  
Variety of data collectors and variety of group facilitators  
No details of attrition  
No longer-term follow-up |

| Intervention | | | | | |
| Condition A: Verbally based group | | | | | |
| Condition B: Activity-based group | | | | | |
| Condition C: Provided with facilities and given free choice | | | | | |
| Setting: A metropolitan day hospital center | | | | | |
| Who Delivered: The same experienced occupational therapist facilitated both experimental groups and monitored the control group periodically. | | | | | |

The author of the study and the occupational therapist discussed one-way analysis of variance showed significant difference between the groups.  
Post hoc Scheffé test (p = .05) showed that the significant difference occurred between the activity group and both the discussion and control groups in terms of outcome.  
Paired t test showed significant improvement in scores for activity group (t = 6.22, p = .002) but no significant changes for discussion group (t = 1.47, p = .179) or control group (t = 1.93, p = .085) in terms of outcome. |

Small sample  
Variation in number of participants allocated to each group (A: n = 9, B: n = 6, C: n = 10)  
Acknowledges confounding factors, but does not control for these or collect relevant data  
Demographics not fully given or comparable for groups at baseline  
Pretest procedures not fully described—potential for time lapse between inclusion scoring and beginning the intervention to be variable
and decided group topics together for both experimental groups.

**Frequency:** 45 min/day, 5 days/wk, for each condition

**Duration:** 2 wk

**Outcome Measures**
- Global Assessment Scale (GAS) completed when participants were put forward for study; no information on how long before the study this was done and no information given about any retest using GAS
- Adapted Social Functioning Index (completed at Session 1 and Session 10)

Mean improvement in skills calculated for all groups (where negative results identify improvement) in terms of outcome were as follows:
- Activity group = −0.9446 (significant).
- Discussion group = −0.2308 (not significant).
- Control group = 0.3525 (not significant)

Raw figures for attrition given but not explored further (A [structured discussion]: 75% completed the course, B [activity]: 50% completed the course, C [free choice]: 83.3% completed the course)

Short study (2 wk)
No use of confidence intervals to aid inference
No longer-term follow-up

---
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