



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Efficacy of imagery rescripting in treating mental disorders associated with aversive memories

An updated meta-analysis

Kip, A.; Schoppe, L.; Arntz, A.; Morina, N.

DOI

[10.1016/j.janxdis.2023.102772](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2023.102772)

Publication date

2023

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Journal of Anxiety Disorders

License

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/policies/open-access-in-dutch-copyright-law-taverne-amendment>)

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kip, A., Schoppe, L., Arntz, A., & Morina, N. (2023). Efficacy of imagery rescripting in treating mental disorders associated with aversive memories: An updated meta-analysis. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 99, Article 102772. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2023.102772>


General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (<https://dare.uva.nl>)



Review

Efficacy of imagery rescripting in treating mental disorders associated with aversive memories – An updated meta-analysis

Ahlke Kip^{a,*}, Luisa Schoppe^a, Arnoud Arntz^b, Nexhmedin Morina^a

^a Institute of Psychology, University of Münster, Fliegerstraße 21, 48149 Münster, Germany

^b Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Nieuwe Achtergracht 129, 1018 WS Amsterdam, the Netherlands



ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Imagery rescripting
Aversive memories
Meta-analysis

ABSTRACT

Imagery rescripting (ImRs) is frequently applied to treat different psychological complaints. We conducted an updated meta-analysis based on randomised controlled trials on the efficacy of ImRs for mental disorders associated with aversive memories. Medline, PsycInfo, and Web of Science were searched up to May 2023. Seventeen trials were included with a total of 908 participants (417 in the ImRs condition), suffering from posttraumatic stress disorder, anxiety disorders, depression, or eating disorders. Random effect models yielded an overall effect of $g = 0.68$ (95 % CI 0.18 to 1.18; $k = 7$) compared to passive controls (mostly waitlist). The effect compared to (prolonged) exposure, cognitive restructuring, and EMDR was non-significant ($g = -0.01$; 95 % CI -0.18 to 0.15; $k = 11$). Follow-up assessments indicated a long-term treatment effect. Results suggest that ImRs can effectively treat a variety of psychological disorders and produce similar treatment effects as evidence-based interventions. Limitations include the bounded number of included trials for each mental disorder. The meta-analysis was registered on PROSPERO (CRD4202202696) and received no funding.

1. Introduction

Imagery rescripting (ImRs) is frequently used to treat psychological complaints related to aversive memories (Strachan et al., 2020). In ImRs, patients are first instructed to imagine the beginning of an aversive memory including sensory impressions, bodily sensations, cognitions, and emotions. Thereupon they are guided to imagine changing the course of events in a way that would satisfy current basic needs (Arntz, 2012). The main goal of ImRs is the transformation of meaning associated with strong aversive memories (Edwards, 2007). Aversive memories not only influence other memories but also decisively guide current and future behaviour (Lane et al., 2015) and play a crucial role in the development and maintenance of many mental disorders (Beckers & Kindt, 2017). Various studies have found both adverse childhood (Hughes et al., 2017; Merrick et al., 2017) and adult life experiences (Howarth et al., 2020; Kraaij et al., 2002) to be non-specific risk factors for the development of psychopathology. Maladaptive processing and representation of aversive experiences may lead to intrusive memories, avoidant behaviour, or dysfunctional memory appraisals, thus contributing to the maintenance of psychological symptoms (Seinsche et al., 2023). While this appears apparent for posttraumatic stress disorder

(PTSD), similar processes have been found for a range of disorders such as depression (Mihailova & Jobson, 2018) or social anxiety disorder (Seinsche et al., 2023).

Following the reconsolidation hypothesis (Schwabe et al., 2014), previously consolidated memories can return into an active state, which then allows for a reinforcement, reduction, or update of memory content and linked emotions. The rationale of ImRs does not involve the replacement of original memories with false memories but rather the creation of more functional meanings. Because patients recall the original event, ImRs may improve encoding of trauma information and create associations with different emotions and responses. In fact, studies have shown consistent trauma reporting before and after ImRs (Spinhoven et al., 2012) and improved memory of factual trauma details compared to a control task (Hagenaars & Arntz, 2012). A positive change in meaning and valence of memories is proposed to lead to a reduction of negative self-beliefs (Mancini & Mancini, 2018) and an increase in perceptions of mastery and self-efficacy (Kunze et al., 2019).

ImRs may either be applied as a stand-alone intervention or in combination with other treatments. While it may be integrated in different cognitive behavioural interventions (Arntz, 2012), it is a standard technique in schema therapy (Arntz & van Genderen, 2020;

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: a.kip@uni-muenster.de (A. Kip).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2023.102772>

Received 21 May 2023; Received in revised form 9 August 2023; Accepted 3 September 2023

Available online 6 September 2023

0887-6185/© 2023 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Jacob & Arntz, 2013). Overall, two types of application of ImRs have been developed and tested. In one, the rescripting is prepared by using cognitive therapy techniques to challenge the dysfunctional interpretation of the (traumatic) memory. The alternative, more functional interpretation that follows from this process is then used to develop a new script that is subsequently imagined after the aversive memory has been activated in imagery. In the other approach, there is no such preparation. Rather, the patient imagines the aversive event and the rescripting is based on the needs and action tendencies that the patient experiences during the imagery. Thus, the first approach combines imagery rescripting with Beckian cognitive therapy (Beck, 2010), whereas the second approach is more experiential and here the new script is based on needs and action tendencies that spontaneously emerge during the imagery. To our knowledge, no study has directly compared the two approaches.

Several trials have investigated the efficacy of ImRs in the treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder (e.g., Arntz, 2014), social anxiety disorder (e.g., Wild et al., 2008), personality disorders (e.g., Arntz, 2011), bulimia nervosa (e.g., Cooper et al., 2007), body dysmorphic disorder (e.g., Ritter & Stangier, 2016), obsessive-compulsive disorder (e.g., Veale et al., 2015), or major depressive disorder (e.g., Brewin et al., 2009). To the best of our knowledge, only one meta-analysis (Morina et al., 2017) has been published on the efficacy of ImRs on psychopathology related to aversive memories. Morina et al. (2017) found significant treatment effects in comparison with control conditions, however, results were limited by the small number of available controlled trials ($k = 7$). Since 2017, several new randomised controlled trials (RCTs) have been published on the efficacy of ImRs for different mental disorders (Botelho de Haan et al., 2020; Dugué et al., 2019; Hyett et al., 2018; Knutsson et al., 2020; Langkaas et al., 2017; Ma & Lo, 2022; Moritz et al., 2018; Ovanesian et al., 2019; Pile et al., 2021; Raabe et al., 2022). Given that RCTs are regarded as the highest standard of trials, we aimed at conducting an updated meta-analysis including only RCTs that investigated the efficacy of ImRs compared to passive control conditions, active control conditions, or other psychological treatments. According to recommendations by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) group (Page et al., 2021), the main research question was outlined as “In individuals with a mental disorder (P), does imagery rescripting (I), compared to any control condition (C), reduce psychological complaints (O) in RCTs (S)?”. A post-hoc aim was to explore the possible benefits of cognitive preparation before rescripting.

2. Method

The aims and methods of this meta-analysis were registered with the PROSPERO database (CRD42020220696) and were based on our previous meta-analysis (Morina et al., 2017). The current meta-analysis was conducted in accordance with the PRISMA 2020 guidelines (Page et al., 2021).

2.1. Identification and selection of studies

Systematic database searches were conducted in Medline, PsycInfo (through EBSCOhost), and Web of Science, covering all literature from January 2016 (as earlier literature was reviewed in Morina et al., (2017) to May 21st, 2023. In line with our previous search strategy, the following terms were used for searching titles, abstracts, and key words: “*imagery rescripting*” OR “*updating memor**” OR “*imagery modification*” OR “*imaginal reliving*”. Title and abstract screening was completed using Rayyan (Ouzzani et al., 2016), a web-tool for systematic reviews. After resolution of duplicates, titles and abstracts were screened for eligibility by two blinded reviewers. Afterwards, presumably eligible studies were viewed in full-text leading to in- or exclusion. Disagreements between the two reviewers were resolved through discussion with a third investigator. Furthermore, reference lists of included studies and

relevant reviews were hand-searched for additional eligible studies.

Inclusion criteria were: 1) study was an RCT; 2) participants were diagnosed with a mental disorder based on ICD or DSM; 3) treatment targeted psychological complaints reported as a result of aversive memories and at least 50 % of the applied treatment consisted of ImRs; 4) ImRs was compared to any passive or active control condition or to another treatment; 5) a minimum of ten participants were treated with ImRs. The last criterion displays a deviation from the protocol (see the [supplementary material](#)), which noted a minimum of five participants based on the previous meta-analysis (Morina et al., 2017). This criterion was originally motivated by the consideration of case studies in Morina et al. (2017). However, given that small samples pose a higher risk of bias (Lin, 2018) and in line with other meta-analyses (e.g., Hoppen, Kip et al., 2023), a minimum of ten participants was implemented in the current meta-analysis. This decision was made before the study selection process. No restrictions were made concerning age of participants, treatment modality, publication language, or publication status. Unpublished trials were included to prevent inflated effect sizes that tend to appear in meta-analyses that only include published data (McAuley et al., 2000). However, studies were excluded if they exclusively focused on the treatment of nightmares as this was the focus of several previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses (Casement & Swanson, 2012; Gill et al., 2023; Hansen et al., 2013; Yücel et al., 2020).

2.2. Coding of trial characteristics

Data on sample, study, and intervention characteristics were extracted by two independent reviewers. All measures of symptoms associated with aversive memories in patients were regarded as potential outcome measures. We distinguished between primary and secondary outcomes as reported in the primary studies, imagery-related outcomes (i.e., image vividness or distress), and belief outcomes (i.e., encapsulated beliefs) defined as variables that express thoughts and beliefs participants have about their images and how strong these beliefs are (Knutsson et al., 2020; Lee & Kwon, 2013; Reimer & Moscovitch, 2015). Control conditions were further coded as passive control condition (e.g., waitlist or minimal attention tasks), active control conditions (e.g., treatment as usual or supportive counselling), and active treatments (e.g., cognitive behavioural approaches or eye movement desensitization and reprocessing [EMDR]). In case of several instruments assessing one outcome, we considered the one most frequently reported (e.g., the Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale [LSAS] for social anxiety disorder; Heimberg et al., 1999). Authors were contacted twice for any missing information. For analyses on long-term treatment effects, follow-up assessments were divided into short-term follow-ups (i.e., < 6 months post-treatment) and long-term follow-ups (i.e., ≥ 6 months).

2.3. Quality assessment

Quality coding of the included studies was conducted using a tool by Cuijpers et al. (2010) that was adapted by Smit et al. (2012). These guidelines were developed based on recommendations by Chambless and Hollon (1998) as well as on Cochrane guidelines for systematic reviews (Higgins & Green, 2009). The assessment includes nine items and is displayed in the [supplementary material](#). Two blinded reviewers completed quality assessment based on information provided in publications and additional published material. Disagreements were resolved through discussion with a third investigator. The overall quality of studies was determined as sum score of all ratings.

2.4. Statistical analysis

All analyses were conducted using RStudio (version 2022.7.1.554; RStudio Team, 2022) and the metafor package (Viechtbauer, 2010; version 3.8–1). All effect sizes represent Hedges’ g , which is more precise

for small samples (Field & Gillett, 2010). Hedges' g was based on the differences between means at post-treatment or follow-up assessments divided by the pooled standard deviation at that assessment. Intent-to-treat data was preferred over completer data. Assuming heterogeneity between trials, we applied random effects models using the inverse-variance method for effect size calculation and the restricted maximum likelihood for estimating between-study heterogeneity (Field & Gillett, 2010; Thompson & Sharp, 1999; Viechtbauer et al., 2015). The inverse-variance method in random effects models assigns weights to studies according to their sampling variances and the estimated between-study variance. Larger studies with smaller variance are generally assigned more weight in the calculation of aggregated effects (Borenstein et al., 2010). Between-study heterogeneity was investigated using Cochran's test of heterogeneity and Higgins' I^2 , and further considered by calculating 95 % prediction intervals (PI; Cochran, 1954; Higgins & Thompson, 2002). These are presented for all results alongside the 95 % confidence interval (CI) as they cover different relevant information regarding the application of results in clinical practice (Riley et al., 2011). While the CIs of effect sizes display the uncertainty in the estimates, PIs display the range of likely effects in individual settings. A CI not covering the null value provides confidence in the aggregated effect across studies, whereas a PI (by including an estimate of the true heterogeneity of effects between studies) not covering the null value provides confidence in beneficial treatment effects in an individual future setting. To investigate possible sources of heterogeneity, subgroup analyses and mixed-model meta-regression analyses were conducted. All analyses were calculated with a minimum of four trials to reduce risk of bias. The influence of each included trial on the overall effect size was evaluated by sensitivity analyses using the leave-one-out approach (Patsopoulos et al., 2008). Outlying studies were furthermore defined as estimates with 95 % CIs not overlapping with the 95 % CI of the aggregated effect (Harrer et al., 2022). For all significant results, we

tested for potential publication bias through visual assessment of funnel plots (for analyses including more than nine trials; Sterne et al., 2011). Furthermore, Egger's test and the trim- and fill procedure (Duval & Tweedie, 2000; Egger et al., 1997) were applied.

3. Results

The systematic database search revealed 229 unique studies of which eleven appeared eligible (see Fig. 1 for a flow chart of the study selection process and the supplementary material for a list of excluded studies after full-text review with reasons for exclusion). Six RCTs included in Morina et al. (2017) were also included in the current meta-analysis, resulting in a total of 17 included trials. Introducing a minimum number of individuals being treated with ImRs led to the exclusion of one trial that was included in the previous meta-analysis (Nilsson et al., 2012). Unpublished raw data were used from Boterhoven de Haan et al. (2020) for all analyses because of the skewed distribution of data.

3.1. Characteristics of included studies

A total of 17 RCTs were included with 908 patients (417 in the ImRs condition). One study was published in German (Alliger-Horn et al., 2015), the remaining were published in English. The mean age of patients was 34.9 years and 70.8 % were female. Most trials focussed on individuals suffering from PTSD (6 trials) or social anxiety (5 trials), followed by major depressive disorder (3 trials), eating disorders (2 trials), and generalised anxiety disorder (1 trial). Only one RCT reported no comorbidities, the remaining trials reported mainly comorbid depressive and anxiety disorders. On average, 31.7 % of patients received concurrent psychopharmacological medication. One trial applied ImRs in a group setting (Hyett et al., 2018), one trial in a self-help format (Moritz et al., 2018), the remaining trials were




Fig. 1. PRISMA flow chart of the study selection process. Note. DSM = Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders; ICD = International Classification of Diseases; ImRs = Imagery rescripting.

conducted in individual settings (of which one trial applied individual writing sessions; Ovanessian et al., 2019). The trial by Moritz et al. (2018) included a brief as well as a long ImRs trial arm. To take account of the dependency of data, only the long ImRs trial arm was included in the meta-analysis. The average number of sessions was 4.3 ($SD = 4.6$; range 1–16) with a mean duration of 79.6 min ($SD = 20.7$; range 37.5–105). Nine RCTs assessed the long-term efficacy of ImRs compared to control conditions with a mean follow-up duration of almost 9 weeks (range 4–12). One RCT conducted a second follow-up assessment after 52 weeks (Boterhoven de Haan et al., 2020). All but three trials applied ImRs as a stand-alone interventions, the remaining applied ImRs as enhancement for written exposure (Ovanessian et al., 2019), imaginal exposure (Økstedalen et al., 2015), and memory specificity training (Pile et al., 2021). Extensive cognitive preparation before the rescripting phase was applied in 29.4 % of studies. It should be noted, however, that cognitive restructuring before the rescripting phase could be regarded as both independent intervention or cognitive preparation for rescripting. Details of included trials are presented in Table 1. The majority of publications (70.6 %) reported on their funding sources, if applicable.

3.2. Short-term treatment effects of ImRs on primary outcomes

Seven trials compared ImRs with a passive control condition yielding an overall effect of $g = 0.68$ (95 % CI 0.18 to 1.18; 95 % PI –0.57 to 1.93). Six of these trials included symptom severity of the mental disorder in focus as primary outcome, indicating that a greater symptom reduction was achieved in the ImRs condition. The effect was non-significant, however, when focusing only on anxiety disorders ($k = 4$; $g = 0.82$; 95 % CI –0.08 to 1.72; 95 % PI –1.07 to 2.71). A forest plot presenting the results is displayed in Fig. 2. Two trials compared ImRs with an active control condition, namely non-directive supportive therapy (Pile et al., 2021) and supportive counselling (Lee & Kwon, 2013). Both trials found significant treatment effects of $g = 0.88$ for depressive symptoms (95 % CI 0.33 to 1.43) and $g = 1.36$ for social anxiety symptoms (95 % CI 0.45 to 2.28), respectively.

Eleven trials compared ImRs with another active psychological treatment (i.e., cognitive or exposure-based approaches and EMDR), yielding an overall effect of $g = -0.01$ (95 % CI –0.18 to 0.15; 95 % PI –0.18 to 0.15, see Fig. 3). Ten of these trials included symptom severity of the mental disorder in focus as primary outcome. Trim and fill analyses suggested two missing studies on the left side with an adjusted effect size of $g = -0.09$ (95 % CI –0.25 to 0.08). Egger's test, however, did not indicate funnel plot asymmetry ($p = .151$). Considering only PTSD symptoms as primary outcome ($k = 4$), analysis revealed a non-significant effect of $g = -0.15$ (95 % CI –0.38 to 0.08; 95 % PI –0.38 to 0.08) compared to EMDR and exposure. Similar findings were obtained for anxiety outcomes compared to cognitive restructuring and exposure with $g = 0.12$ (95 % CI –0.19 to 0.43; 95 % PI –0.19 to 0.43). No significant differences in treatment efficacy were found for comorbid depressive symptoms compared to other treatments ($k = 5$) with $g = -0.20$ (95 % CI –0.43 to 0.02; 95 % PI –0.43 to 0.02).

3.3. Long-term treatment effects on primary outcomes

Trials that compared ImRs with a passive or active control condition at follow-up were limited ($k = 2$ and $k = 1$, respectively). Whereas Jung and Steil (2013) found a significant treatment effect compared to a waitlist condition of $g = 1.74$ (95 % CI 0.87 to 2.61) regarding contamination fear, Ovanessian et al. (2019) found no significant difference between written exposure with rescripting and a neutral control writing task regarding symptoms of generalised anxiety disorder ($g = -0.25$; 95 % CI –0.79 to 0.30). Pile et al. (2021) found a significant effect of ImRs compared to non-directive supportive therapy for depressive symptoms ($g = 0.57$; 95 % CI 0.03 to 1.10). The effect when comparing ImRs to other treatments remained non-significant after a mean follow-up duration of eight weeks following treatment (range

4–12 weeks; $k = 6$; $g = 0.07$; 95 % CI –0.14 to 0.28; 95 % PI –0.14 to 0.28). Primary outcomes included symptoms of PTSD, depression, social anxiety disorder as well as generalised anxiety disorder (see Fig. 4). In the only trial that included a later follow-up (Boterhoven de Haan et al., 2020), reduction in PTSD symptoms did not differ between ImRs and EMDR after one year post-treatment ($g = -0.04$; 95 % CI –0.42 to 0.35).

3.4. Treatment effects on imagery-related and belief outcomes

Only two studies with different control conditions reported controlled effects for imagery-related outcomes. Lee and Kwon (2013) found a superiority of ImRs compared to supportive counselling regarding imagery distress ($g = 3.74$; 95 % CI 2.38 to 5.10), imagery vividness ($g = 1.81$; 95 % CI 0.83 to 2.78), and memory distress ($g = 2.40$; 95 % CI 1.32 to 3.47). Norton and Abbott (2016) found no significant effects of ImRs compared to cognitive restructuring regarding imagery distress ($g = 0.61$; 95 % CI –0.03 to 1.24) or imagery vividness ($g = 0.49$; 95 % CI –0.14 to 1.12). Similarly, the authors found no significant effects of ImRs on imagery distress and vividness compared to a puzzle task ($g = 0.58$; 95 % CI –0.06 to 1.21 and $g = 0.52$; 95 % CI –0.11 to 1.15, respectively).

Four studies with different control conditions reported controlled effects for encapsulated belief outcomes. Both Reimer and Moscovitch (2015) and Lee and Kwon (2013) found a large treatment effect of ImRs compared to a waitlist condition ($g = 0.92$; 95 % CI 0.10 to 1.75) or supportive counselling ($g = 2.01$; 95 % CI 1.00 to 3.02), respectively. Dugué et al. (2019) differentiated between ratings of rational core beliefs (i.e., how much patients intellectually believed the meaning of their mental image was true) and emotional core beliefs (i.e., how much patients felt the meaning was true). Results at post-treatment indicate a non-significant effect of ImRs compared to cognitive restructuring regarding rational core beliefs ($g = -0.58$; 95 % CI –1.24 to 0.09) and an inferiority of ImRs regarding emotional core beliefs ($g = -0.82$; 95 % CI –1.50 to 0.14). Yet, individuals in the ImRs condition reported higher scores on the emotional core belief outcome at baseline, which is why ImRs displayed a larger uncontrolled effect size compared to cognitive restructuring. Finally, Cooper et al. (2007) included negative self-beliefs as their primary outcome and reported a similar efficacy of imagery rescripting compared to discussion of cognitions ($g = 0.20$; 95 % CI –0.60 to 1.01).

3.5. Sensitivity and moderator analyses

Sensitivity analyses were conducted to examine whether effect sizes were driven by individual studies. Regarding controlled effect sizes, heterogeneity was substantial ($I^2 = 77\%$). The aggregated effect size for ImRs vs. passive control conditions was mainly driven by one study (Hyett et al., 2018), whose elimination from analyses reduced the heterogeneity to $I^2 = 15\%$ and the aggregated effect size to $g = 0.39$ (95 % CI 0.12 to 0.66). No outliers were detected for comparisons against other treatments or comparisons at follow-up. One RCT reported violation of the randomisation procedure (Alliger-Horn et al., 2015), which is why the influence of this particular study on results was investigated. Analyses revealed no significant changes in overall results.

Moderator analyses were conducted for comparisons with passive controls and other treatments and for demographic as well as treatment-related moderators. Effect sizes were not influenced by the percentage of female participants in trials ($p = .603$ and $p = .556$ for passive controls and other treatment controls, respectively) or by the age of participants ($p = .819$ and $p = .610$). Results further revealed that the number of applied ImRs sessions did not explain heterogeneity among effect sizes ($p = .703$ and $p = .097$). Only a minority of trials applied extensive cognitive preparation before the start of ImRs. The application of extensive cognitive preparation, however, did not affect effect sizes ($p = .763$ and $p = .521$). There was moreover no significant difference between effect sizes from trials applying ImRs as a stand-alone

Table 1
Overview of the included studies.

Disorder	Study, type of treatment (# of sessions, duration)	N*	Primary outcome	Secondary outcome	Imagery-related and belief outcome	Follow-up	Extensive cognitive preparation?	ImRs as stand-alone intervention?	Mean age (SD)	% female	ITT vs. Comp
PTSD	Alliger-Horn et al. (2015) ImRs (3, 90-100min) ^a	18	PDS	BDI	n.a.	3 months	No	Yes	38.1	9.1	ITT
	EMDR (3, 90-100min) ^a	22							(8.0)		
	Boterhoven de Haan et al. (2020) ImRs (12, 90min)	66	CAPS	BDI	n.a.	2 months,	No	Yes	38.5	76.8	ITT
	EMDR (12, 90min)	68				1 year			(11.2)		
	Jung and Steil (2013) ImRs (2, 90min)	14	FBC	BDI	n.a.	1 month	Yes	Yes	37.2	100	ITT
	Waitlist (n.a.)	14		PDS					(10.9)		
	Langkaas et al. (2017) ImRs (10, 90-120min)	34	PSS-I	BDI	n.a.	3 months	Yes	Yes	45.2	58.0	ITT
	Prolonged exposure (10, 90-120min)	31							(9.7)		
	Øktedalen et al. (2015) ImRs (7 + 3 IE, 40-60min)	32	PSS-I	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	Yes	No	45.2	56.9	Comp
	Imaginal exposure (10, 40-60min)	29							(9.7)		
	Raabe et al. (2022) ImRs (16, 90min)	17	CAPS	BDI	n.a.	n.a.	No	Yes	35.5	88.0	Comp
	Waitlist (n.a.)	20							(n.r.)		
SAD	Hyett et al. (2018) ImRs (1, 90min, group)	17	SIPS	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	No	Yes	35.2	67.0	ITT
	Verbal restructuring (1, 90min, group)	22							(15.0)		
	Waitlist (n.a.)	19									
	Knutsson et al. (2020) ImRs (1, 90min)	14	LSAS-SR	n.a.	r.b.i.	1 month	No	Yes	25.0	59.3	ITT
	Exposure (1, 90min)	13							(3.8)		
	Lee and Kwon (2013) ImRs (3, 60-120min)	13	K-BFNE		encapsulated beliefs, imagery distress, imagery vividness, memory distress	3 months	Yes	Yes	23.9	61.5	ITT
	Supportive counselling (3, 60min)	10							(3.4)		
	Norton and Abbott (2016) ImRs (1, 30-45min)	20 [§]	SIAS	DASS-21-D	imagery distress, imagery vividness	n.a.	No	Yes	20.8	85.0	n.r.
Cognitive restructuring (1, 30-45min)	20 [§]							(4.0)			
Puzzle task (1, 30-45min)	20 [§]										
Reimer and Moscovitch (2015)											

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Disorder	Study, type of treatment (# of sessions, duration)	N*	Primary outcome	Secondary outcome	Imagery-related and belief outcome	Follow-up	Extensive cognitive preparation?	ImRs as stand-alone intervention?	Mean age (SD)	% female	ITT vs. Comp
MDD	ImRs (1, 90min)	13	LSAS-SR	n.a.	encapsulated beliefs	n.a.	No	Yes	19.5	70.0	ITT
	Waitlist (n.a.)	12							(1.3)		
	Ma and Lo (2022)										
	ImRs (3, 60-90min)	20	BDI	n.a.	n.a.	2 months	No	Yes	44.6	90.2	Comp
	Cognitive restructuring (3, n.r.)	21							(12.0)		
	Moritz et al. (2018)										
	ImRs – long (self-help)	42	BDI	GAD-7	n.a.	n.a.	No	Yes	43.1	67.7	ITT
BN / BED	Waitlist (n.a.)	42							(n.r.)		
	Pile et al. (2021)										
	ImRs (4, 90min)	29	MFQ	SCARED	n.a.	4 months	Yes	No	17.0	60.7	ITT
	Non-directive supportive therapy (4, 90min)	27							(0.6)		
	Cooper et al. (2007)										
	ImRs (1, n.r.)	12	Negative self-beliefs [†]	Depression, Anxiety Urge to binge/restrict [†]	n.a.	n.a.	n.r.	Yes	25.6	100	n.r.
	Discussion of cognitions (1, n.r.)	12							(n.r.)		
GAD	Dugué et al. (2019)										
	ImRs (1, 41min)	18	EDE-Q	n.a.	rational and emotional core beliefs	n.a.	No	Yes	43.1	75.0	ITT
	Cognitive restructuring (1, 41min)	18							(10.6)		
	Ovanessian et al. (2019)										
	Written exposure + ImRs (3, 30min)	26	GAD-Q-IV	n.a.	n.a.	1 month	No	No	27.3	82.3	Comp
	Written exposure (3, 30min)	27							(7.6)		
	Neutral control writing (3, 30min)	26									

Note. BDI= Beck Depression Inventory; BN= Bulimia nervosa; CAPS= Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale; Comp = completer data; DASS-21-D= Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale; EDE-Q= Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire; EMDR= Eye movement desensitization and reprocessing; FBC= Feeling of being contaminated; GAD= Generalised anxiety disorder; K-BFNE= Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale; ImRs= Imagery rescripting; ITT = intent-to-treat data; LSAS-SR= Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale and Self Report; MDD= Major depressive disorder; MFQ= Mood and Feelings Questionnaire; n.a.= not applicable; n.r.= not reported; PDS= Posttraumatic Diagnostic Scale; PSS-I= The PTSD Symptom Scale Interview; PTSD= Posttraumatic stress disorder; r.b.i. = reported, but irrelevant; SAD= Social anxiety disorder; SCARED= Screen for Child Anxiety Related Disorders; SIAS= Social Interaction Anxiety Scale; SIPS= Social Interaction Phobia Scale; SPS= Social Phobia Scale.

* as used for post-treatment analyses for their primary outcome.

§ no information provided in publication on how many participants were randomised to each condition (information could not be obtained from authors).

† Likert scales 0–100 developed for the purpose of the study.

° both groups received an additional three sessions (50 min each) of stabilisation.

intervention compared to those applying combined interventions ($p = .558$ and $p = .924$). Finally, effect sizes were not influenced by the type of the treated mental disorder ($p = .817$ and $p = .369$).

3.6. Study quality

The intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) for all studies combined among the two raters of study quality was 0.96, 95 % CI = 0.95 to 0.97, indicating excellent inter-rater reliability. Overall, study quality was mixed (see Table 2). The majority of included studies used (semi-) structured interviews to obtain a diagnosis for study inclusion (82 %).

Information on the independence of randomisation procedures were not provided in 59 % of the studies. Treatments were manualised in the majority of studies (88 %) and provided by trained therapists (80 %, whereby this criterion did not apply for self-help interventions). No information was provided in 27 % of studies on treatment integrity checks (excluding self-help interventions). Study and treatment drop-outs were adequately reported in most studies (82 %) and 63 % of the studies provided data for intent-to-treat analyses. Finally, most trials applied self-report assessments to measure primary outcomes (65 %)




Fig. 2. Forest plot of treatment effects compared to passive control conditions at post-treatment. Note. CI = confidence interval; GAD = generalised anxiety disorder; PI = prediction interval; PTSD = posttraumatic stress disorder; SAD = social anxiety disorder.




Fig. 3. Forest plot of treatment effects compared to other active psychological treatments at post-treatment. Note. CI = confidence interval; EMDR = eye movement desensitization and reprocessing; GAD = generalised anxiety disorder; PI = prediction interval; PTSD = posttraumatic stress disorder; SAD = social anxiety disorder.

while the remaining employed blinded interviews.

Sensitivity analyses revealed that study quality had no impact on results ($p = .374$ and $p = .376$ for comparisons with passive controls and other treatments, respectively). To estimate whether missing data in primary trials had an influence on results, analyses were calculated to compare studies that provided intent-to-treat data with those that only provided completer data. Results showed no significant difference between the two forms of trial ($p = .311$ and $p = .692$).

4. Discussion

We conducted a meta-analysis of 17 trials that investigated the efficacy of ImRs compared to control conditions for individuals suffering from mental disorders associated with aversive memories. Results indicate that ImRs can significantly reduce different mental health complaints and that both short- and long-term treatment effects are

comparable to those of other evidence-based psychological interventions. Most trials were conducted with individuals suffering from PTSD and social anxiety disorder, yet the overall number of RCTs remains limited.

Established psychological interventions that were compared to ImRs included (prolonged) exposure, cognitive restructuring, and EMDR. Notably, (prolonged) exposure and cognitive restructuring represent psychological interventions with a strong evidence base, whereas the evidence-base for long-term effects of EMDR is still thin (Hoppen, Jehn et al., 2023). Results from our meta-analysis suggest no differences in the treatment efficacy between ImRs and the treatment controls. While this suggests that ImRs is as effective as other established treatments, several putative advantages of ImRs may be taken into account. Considering that some PTSD patients refuse to (extensively) relive the most aversive parts of traumatic events (as often applied in imaginal exposure), the necessity to elaborate the whole traumatic event has been




Fig. 4. Forest plot of treatment effects compared to other active psychological treatments at follow-up. Note. CI = confidence interval; EMDR = eye movement desensitization and reprocessing; GAD = generalised anxiety disorder; PI = prediction interval; PTSD = posttraumatic stress disorder; SAD = social anxiety disorder.

Table 2
Quality ratings of the included studies.

Study	1. Diagnosis	2. Manual	3. Therapist Training	4. Treatment Integrity	5. ITT Analyses	6. Randomisation	7. Independent Randomisation	8. Blinding*	9. Drop-Outs	Overall Score [§]
Alliger-Horn et al. (2015)	2	3	3	2	3	2	0	n.a.	3	18
Boterhoven de Haan et al. (2020)	2	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	24
Cooper et al. (2007)	2	3	0	0	0	3	0	n.a.	0	8
Dugué et al. (2019)	2	3	0	0	3	3	0	n.a.	1	9
Hyett et al. (2018)	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	24
Jung and Steil (2013)	3	1	3	2	2	3	0	3	3	20
Knutsson et al. (2020)	1	3	3	2	3	3	1	n.a.	3	19
Langkaas et al. (2017)	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	26
Lee and Kwon (2013)	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	n.a.	3	22
Ma and Lo (2022)	2	3	3	0	1	3	3	n.a.	3	18
Moritz et al. (2018)	0	2	n.a.	n.a.	3	3	3	n.a.	3	14
Norton and Abbott (2016)	3	3	3	3	0	3	3	n.a.	3	21
Øktedalen et al. (2015)	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	n.a.	3	24
Ovanessian et al. (2019)	2	1	n.a.	n.a.	1	3	0	n.a.	3	10
Pile et al. (2021)	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24
Raabe et al. (2022)	2	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	26
Reimer and Moscovitch (2015)	2	3	0	0	3	3	0	n.a.	3	14

Note. ITT = intent-to-treat; n.a. = not applicable.

* n.a.'s were given if self-report data was used.

§ for moderator analyses, n.a.'s were treated as 3 given that no shortage of quality can be assumed if items are not applicable.

debated. While research on this is scarce, existing results indicate that ImRs may be favoured by some patients. In a study by Dibbets and Arntz (2016), individuals who received ImRs reported less distress during the intervention compared to individuals who received imaginal exposure. In line with this, Arntz et al. (2007) reported a lower drop-out rate for ImRs compared to imaginal exposure, suggesting that ImRs might be more acceptable for some patients. However, while several studies and meta-analyses have investigated the drop-out rates for different psychological interventions and for different groups of patients (Fernandez et al., 2015; Hoppen et al., 2022; Varker et al., 2021), treatment attrition from ImRs has not yet been systematically investigated. Previous studies have reported rates of 4.2 % (Reiss et al., 2017), 8.1 % (Boterhoven de Haan et al., 2020), 19 % (Raabe et al., 2022), or 25 % (Arntz et al., 2007; note however that here the majority of the treatment consisted of imaginal exposure). Further research is needed to directly compare attrition rates between ImRs and other interventions. An additional hypothesis includes the superiority of ImRs regarding the reduction of secondary emotions such as anger, guilt, or disgust. Until now, findings on this are both limited as well as mixed and additional studies are required (Boterhoven de Haan et al., 2020; Dibbets & Arntz, 2016; Dugué et al., 2019; Kuck et al., 2023; Langkaas et al., 2017). Finally, considering the heterogeneity of psychological complaints in our meta-analysis, ImRs appears to be a promising transdiagnostic approach

for a variety of mental disorders that are associated with aversive memories.

Secondary or comorbid depressive disorders are common among individuals with anxiety disorders (Lamers et al., 2011), PTSD (Stander et al., 2014), or eating disorders (Keski-Rahkonen & Mustelin, 2016) and are associated with chronicity of symptoms and increased symptom severity. Treatment efficacy beyond the primary diagnosis, but also regarding comorbid depressive symptoms is therefore of high relevance. Our results suggest that the effectiveness of ImRs in treating comorbid depressive symptoms is equivalent to that of other treatments, namely EMDR, cognitive restructuring, or prolonged exposure. This is a promising finding considering the significant treatment effects that were found in meta-analyses for the mentioned interventions in patients with PTSD (Ronconi et al., 2015) or social anxiety disorder (Kindred et al., 2022).

Trials on ImRs differ in terms of the degree to which extensive cognitive preparation is applied. It has been argued that the use of cognitive restructuring before the rescripting phase might be helpful, given that patients might not be aware of their dysfunctional interpretation of key memories (Arntz, 2012). Our moderator analysis found no influence of extensive cognitive preparation on the treatment efficacy, suggesting that ImRs does not require a preceding cognitive preparation. In line with this, a recent trial comparing cognitive restructuring and

imagery rescripting with a therapist attention placebo and imagery rescripting found no differences in the reduction of believability in encapsulated beliefs (Voncken et al., 2023). Similarly, treatment effects did not appear to differ between applications of ImRs as a stand-alone intervention or in combination with other treatment approaches.

Previous research suggests that the working mechanisms of ImRs compared to imagery exposure differ (Kunze et al., 2019). Changing the meaning of aversive memories is at the core of ImRs, suggesting that changes in memory-derived erroneous beliefs might be one possible underlying process. Encapsulated beliefs about the self, others, and the world may lead to perceived threat and thus contribute to the maintenance of mental disorders. Pre-existing results from RCTs indicate large effects of ImRs on changes in encapsulated beliefs compared to passive or active control conditions and similar effects compared to cognitive restructuring (Dugué et al., 2019; Knutsson et al., 2020; Lee & Kwon, 2013; Reimer & Moscovitch, 2015; Romano et al., 2020). Yet, opposing results exist that yield null findings for an effect of ImRs on core beliefs (Kadriu et al., 2023). While most theories on working mechanisms underlying ImRs focus on changes in meaning and encapsulated beliefs, other possible mechanisms include changes in memory vividness or distress that might underly treatment effects. These theories are supported by different studies showing that ImRs effectively influences these memory aspects (Lee & Kwon, 2013; Lloyd & Marczak, 2022). However, due to the limited number of studies including encapsulated belief or imagery-related outcomes, we were not able to run meta-analyses on possible working mechanisms. Thus, future research needs to further investigate the distinct working mechanisms of ImRs.

4.1. Strengths and limitations

By including only RCTs, this update meta-analysis provides reliable estimates on the efficacy of ImRs for different psychological complaints. Nonetheless, we note several limitations. Most importantly, the number of RCTs investigating the efficacy of ImRs is still limited. This applies especially to trials on ImRs as a stand-alone intervention. This results in an increased impact of individual studies on the aggregated effect sizes. Excluding one outlying study from the analysis on the efficacy of ImRs compared to passive control conditions at post-treatment resulted in a decrease of the effect size. Yet, the remaining heterogeneity between studies diminished to a negligible size, underlining the consensus of the remaining studies on the efficacy of ImRs. Furthermore, the significance of results did not appear to be grounded on studies that reported completer data only (i.e., reporting data only on patients who completed treatment and the assessments). Overall, however, studies were very heterogeneous in terms of implementation of ImRs (i.e., group vs. individual settings vs. self-help, single-session vs. multiple sessions, stand-alone vs. combined), choice of control conditions (i.e., passive control conditions, active control conditions, or other treatments), or targeted psychological complaints or mental disorders. That way, only subgroup analyses on primary PTSD symptoms, overall anxiety symptoms, and comorbid depressive symptoms were possible. The quality of included RCTs was mixed whereby major shortcomings were noted regarding independent randomisation, treatment integrity checks, and the use of intent-to-treat data for analyses. Given the limited number of studies, insufficient analyses on potential risk of bias (e.g., publication bias) could be calculated, which limits the certainty in results.

4.2. Implications for clinical practice and research

From a clinical perspective, the equivalence of treatment efficacy of ImRs relative to other established interventions displays the most important finding. Findings from the calculated PIs suggest that there may be just as many settings in which ImRs is slightly more beneficial than other interventions as there are settings in which other established interventions are slightly more beneficial than ImRs. As such, ImRs appears to be a suitable alternative for patients with aversive memories

who are not willing to undergo exposure or do not benefit enough from exposure. Future research should investigate which approach is most effective for whom, whereby our results indicate that gender and age are no significant moderators of treatment efficacy. People moreover differ in their general tendency and ability to recall or create vivid images. Previous studies on phobias (Hunt & Fenton, 2007) or social anxiety (Lee & Kwon, 2013) did not find mental imagery ability to be a predictor of treatment efficacy. However, in these studies imagery ability was only assessed using self-report measures. Future studies should incorporate more objective measures of imagery ability and capacity to further investigate the relationship between imagery ability and efficacy of ImRs.

The mean number of ImRs sessions in the included studies was only 4.3, suggesting that clinically relevant improvements of symptoms can be reached after only a few sessions. In light of common comorbidities among mental disorders, the efficacy of ImRs across different psychological complaints appears moreover beneficial. However, many mental disorders were only covered by a very limited number of studies, which highlights the need for future research. A non-significant effect was found for anxiety symptoms when compared to passive controls. The smallest effect was thereby contributed by the only study investigating generalised anxiety disorder. More trials are needed to draw conclusions on the efficacy of ImRs for distinct anxiety disorders. Additional trials are further needed to investigate the efficacy of ImRs as a stand-alone intervention for different psychological complaints. Future trials may furthermore investigate the processes underlying ImRs. Given that ImRs appears as effective as exposure and previous results on differences in the treatment of non-fear-related emotions are both limited and inconclusive, the added value of ImRs should be the focus of future research. Related to this, further study of extensive cognitive preparation of the rescripting is necessary. Direct comparisons are needed to investigate what the most effective approach is and whether similar mechanisms of change are involved.

4.3. Conclusions

The results of our meta-analysis suggest that ImRs is a promising transdiagnostic treatment approach for psychological complaints associated with aversive memories. Significant symptom reduction was achieved despite a limited number of applied sessions and effects appeared to be stable over time. Results further suggest that ImRs achieves comparable treatment effects as other established interventions such as (prolonged) exposure, cognitive restructuring, and EMDR and appears to be a suitable alternative to these interventions. Future research needs to further examine treatment efficacy and mechanisms of ImRs.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration of Competing Interest

None.

Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

Appendix A. Supporting information

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version at [doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2023.102772](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2023.102772).

References

- Alliger-Horn, C., Zimmermann, P., & Mitte, K. (2015). Vergleichende Wirksamkeit von IRRT und EMDR bei kriegstraumatisierten deutschen Soldaten. *Trauma Und Gewalt*, 9(3), 204–215.
- Arntz, A. (2011). Imagery rescripting for personality disorders. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 18(4), 466–481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpra.2011.04.006>
- Arntz, A. (2012). Imagery rescripting as a therapeutic technique: review of clinical trials, basic studies, and research agenda. *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology*, 3(2), 189–208. <https://doi.org/10.5127/jep.024211>
- Arntz, A. (2014). Imagery rescripting for posttraumatic stress disorder. In N. C. Thoma, & D. McKay (Eds.), *Working with emotion in cognitive-behavioral therapy: Techniques for clinical practice* (pp. 203–215). Guilford Publications.
- Arntz, A., Tiesema, M., & Kindt, M. (2007). Treatment of PTSD: A comparison of imaginal exposure with and without imagery rescripting. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 38(4), 345–370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2007.10.006>
- Arntz, A., & van Genderen, H. (2020). *Schema therapy for borderline personality disorder* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119101161>
- Beck, J. S. (2010). Cognitive therapy. In I. B. Weiner, W. E. Craighead, & R. J. Corsini (Eds.), *The Corsini encyclopedia of psychology* (4th ed., pp. 1–3). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470479216.corpsy0198>
- Beckers, T., & Kindt, M. (2017). Memory reconsolidation interference as an emerging treatment for emotional disorders: Strengths, limitations, challenges and opportunities. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 13, 99–121. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032816-045209>
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., & Rothstein, H. R. (2010). A basic introduction to fixed-effect and random-effects models for meta-analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 1(2), 97–111. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.12>
- Boterhoven de Haan, K. L., Lee, C. W., Fassbinder, E., van Es, S. M., Menninga, S., Meewisse, M.-L., Rijkeboer, M., Kousemaker, M., & Arntz, A. (2020). Imagery rescripting and eye movement desensitisation and reprocessing as treatment for adults with post-traumatic stress disorder from childhood trauma: Randomised clinical trial. *The British Journal of Psychiatry The Journal of Mental Science*, 217(5), 609–615. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2020.158>
- Brewin, C. R., Wheatley, J., Patel, T., Fearon, P., Hackmann, A., Wells, A., Fisher, P., & Myers, S. (2009). Imagery rescripting as a brief stand-alone treatment for depressed patients with intrusive memories. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 47(7), 569–576. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2009.03.008>
- Casement, M. D., & Swanson, L. M. (2012). A meta-analysis of imagery rehearsal for post-trauma nightmares: Effects on nightmare frequency, sleep quality, and posttraumatic stress. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 32(6), 566–574. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2012.06.002>
- Chambless, D. L., & Hollon, S. D. (1998). Defining empirically supported therapies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66(1), 7–18. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.66.1.7>
- Cochran, W. G. (1954). The combination of estimates from different experiments. *Biometrics*, 10(1), 101. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3001666>
- Cooper, M. J., Todd, G., & Turner, H. (2007). The effects of using imagery to modify core emotional beliefs in bulimia nervosa: An experimental pilot study. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 21(2), 117–122. <https://doi.org/10.1891/088983907780851577>
- Cuijpers, P. [P.], van Straten, A., Bohlmeijer, E., Hollon, S. D., & Andersson, G. (2010). The effects of psychotherapy for adult depression are overestimated: A meta-analysis of study quality and effect size. *Psychological Medicine*, 40(2), 211–223. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291709006114>
- Dibbets, P., & Arntz, A. (2016). Imagery rescripting: Is incorporation of the most aversive scenes necessary. *Memory*, 24(5), 683–695. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2015.1043307>
- Dugué, R., Renner, F., Austermann, M., Tuschen-Caffier, B., & Jacob, G. A. (2019). Imagery rescripting in individuals with binge-eating behavior: An experimental proof-of-concept study. *The International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 52(2), 183–188. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22995>
- Duval, S., & Tweedie, R. (2000). Trim and fill: A simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics*, 56(2), 455–463. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0006-341X.2000.00455.x>
- Edwards, D. (2007). Restructuring implicational meaning through memory-based imagery: Some historical notes. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 38(4), 306–316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2007.10.001>
- Egger, M., Smith, G. D., Schneider, M., & Minder, C. (1997). Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ*, 315(7109), 629–634.
- Fernandez, E., Salem, D., Swift, J. K., & Ramtahal, N. (2015). Meta-analysis of dropout from cognitive behavioral therapy: Magnitude, timing, and moderators. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 83(6), 1108–1122. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ccp0000044>
- Field, A. P., & Gillett, R. (2010). How to do a meta-analysis. *The British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 63(3), 665–694. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000711010X502733>
- Gill, P., Fraser, E., Tran, T. T. D., Sena Collier, G., de Jago, A., Losinno, J., & Ganci, M. (2023). Psychosocial treatments for nightmares in adults and children: A systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry*, 23(1), 283. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-04703-1>
- Hagenaars, M. A., & Arntz, A. (2012). Reduced intrusion development after post-trauma imagery rescripting: an experimental study. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 43(2), 808–814. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2011.09.005>
- Hansen, K., Höfling, V., Kröner-Borowik, T., Stangier, U., & Steil, R. (2013). Efficacy of psychological interventions aiming to reduce chronic nightmares: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 33(1), 146–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2012.10.012>
- Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., [Pim], Furukawa, T. A., & Ebert, D. (2022). *Doing meta-analysis in R: A hands-on guide* (1st ed.). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.2551803>
- Heimberg, R. G., Horner, K. J., Juster, H. R., Safren, S. A., Brown, E. J., Schneier, F. R., & Liebowitz, M. R. (1999). Psychometric properties of the Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale. *Psychological Medicine*, 29(1), 199–212. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291798007879>
- Higgins, J. P. T., & Green, S. (2009). *Cochrane book series. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions (Repr. with corr.)*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Higgins, J. P. T., & Thompson, S. G. (2002). Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics in Medicine*, 21(11), 1539–1558. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.1186>
- Hoppen, T. H., Jehn, M., Holling, H., Mutz, J., Kip, A., & Morina, N. (2023). The efficacy and acceptability of psychological interventions for adult PTSD: A network and pairwise meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 91(8), 445–461. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ccp0000809>
- Hoppen, T. H., Kip, A., & Morina, N. (2023). Are psychological interventions for adult PTSD more efficacious and acceptable when treatment is delivered in higher frequency? A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 95, Article 102684. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2023.102684>
- Hoppen, T. H., Lindemann, A. S., & Morina, N. (2022). Safety of psychological interventions for adult post-traumatic stress disorder: meta-analysis on the incidence and relative risk of deterioration, adverse events and serious adverse events. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 221, 658–667. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2022.111>
- Howarth, E. J., O'Connor, D. B., Panagioti, M., Hodkinson, A., Wilding, S., & Johnson, J. (2020). Are stressful life events prospectively associated with increased suicidal ideation and behaviour? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 266, 731–742. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.01.171>
- Hughes, K., Bellis, M. A., Hardcastle, K. A., Sethi, D., Butchart, A., Mikton, C., Jones, L., & Dunne, M. P. (2017). The effect of multiple adverse childhood experiences on health: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Public Health*, 2(8), e356–e366. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(17\)30118-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(17)30118-4)
- Hunt, M., & Fenton, M. (2007). Imagery rescripting versus in vivo exposure in the treatment of snake fear. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 38(4), 329–344. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2007.09.001>
- Hyett, M. P., Bank, S. R., Lipp, O. V., Erceg-Hurn, D. M., Alvares, G. A., Maclaine, E., Puckridge, E., Hayes, S., & McEvoy, P. M. (2018). Attenuated psychophysiological reactivity following single-session group imagery rescripting versus verbal restructuring in social anxiety disorder: Results from a Randomized Controlled Trial. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 87(6), 340–349. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000493897>
- Jacob, G. A., & Arntz, A. (2013). Schema therapy for personality disorders—a review. *International Journal of Cognitive Therapy*, 6(2), 171–185. <https://doi.org/10.1521/ijct.2013.6.2.171>
- Jung, K., & Steil, R. (2013). A randomized controlled trial on cognitive restructuring and imagery modification to reduce the feeling of being contaminated in adult survivors of childhood sexual abuse suffering from posttraumatic stress disorder. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 82(4), 213–220. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000348450>
- Kadriu, F., Claes, L., Wittman, C., Woelk, M., & Krans, J. (2023). The effect of imagery rescripting on core beliefs and eating disorder symptoms in a subclinical population. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 78, Article 101804. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2022.101804>
- Keski-Rahkonen, A., & Mustelin, L. (2016). Epidemiology of eating disorders in Europe: Prevalence, incidence, comorbidity, course, consequences, and risk factors. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 29(6), 340–345. <https://doi.org/10.1097/YCO.0000000000000278>
- Kindred, R., Bates, G. W., & McBride, N. L. (2022). Long-term outcomes of cognitive behavioural therapy for social anxiety disorder: A meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 92, Article 102640.
- Knutsson, J., Nilsson, J.-E., Eriksson, Å., & Järild, L. (2020). Imagery rescripting and exposure in social anxiety: A Randomized Trial comparing treatment techniques. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 50(3), 233–240. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10879-019-09448-1>
- Kraaij, V., Arensman, E., & Spinhoven, P. (2002). Negative life events and depression in elderly persons: A meta-analysis. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, 57(1), P87–94. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/57.1.P87>
- Kuck, S., Arntz, A., Rameckers, S. A., Lee, C. W., Boterhoven de Haan, K. L., Fassbinder, E., & Morina, N. (2023). Intraindividual variability and emotional change as predictors of sudden gains in imagery rescripting and EMDR for PTSD in adult survivors of childhood abuse. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/c>
- Kunze, A. E., Lancee, J., Morina, N., Kindt, M., & Arntz, A. (2019). Mediators of change in imagery rescripting and imaginal exposure for nightmares: Evidence from a Randomized Wait-List Controlled Trial. *Behavior Therapy*, 50(5), 978–993. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2019.03.003>
- Lamers, F., van Oppen, P., Comijs, H. C., Smit, J. H., Spinhoven, P., van Balkom, A. J. L. M., Nolen, W. A., Zitman, F. G., Beekman, A. T. F., & Penninx, B. W. J. H. (2011). Comorbidity patterns of anxiety and depressive disorders in a large cohort study: The Netherlands Study of Depression and Anxiety (NESDA). *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 72(3), 341–348. <https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.10m06176blu>

- Lane, R. D., Ryan, L., Nadel, L., & Greenberg, L. (2015). Memory reconsolidation, emotional arousal, and the process of change in psychotherapy: New insights from brain science. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 38, Article e1. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X14000041>
- Langkaas, T. F., Hoffart, A., Øktedalen, T., Ulvenes, P. G., Hembree, E. A., & Smucker, M. (2017). Exposure and non-fear emotions: A randomized controlled study of exposure-based and rescripting-based imagery in PTSD treatment. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 97, 33–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2017.06.007>
- Lee, S. W., & Kwon, J.-H. (2013). The efficacy of imagery rescripting (IR) for social phobia: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 44(4), 351–360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2013.03.001>
- Lin, L. (2018). Bias caused by sampling error in meta-analysis with small sample sizes. *PLoS One*, 13(9), Article e0204056. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0204056>
- Lloyd, J., & Marczak, M. (2022). Imagery rescripting and negative self-imagery in social anxiety disorder: A systematic literature review. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S135246582200008X>
- Ma, O. Y. T., & Lo, B. C. Y. (2022). Is it magic? An exploratory randomized controlled trial comparing imagery rescripting and cognitive restructuring in the treatment of depression. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 75, Article 101721. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2021.101721>
- Mancini, A., & Mancini, F. (2018). Rescripting memory, redefining the self: A meta-emotional perspective on the hypothesized mechanism(s) of imagery rescripting. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 581. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00581>
- McAuley, L., Pham, B., Tugwell, P., & Moher, D. [Ed.] (2000). Does the inclusion of grey literature influence estimates of intervention effectiveness reported in meta-analyses. *Lancet*, 356(9237), 1228–1231. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(00\)02786-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(00)02786-0)
- Merrick, M. T., Ports, K. A., Ford, D. C., Afifi, T. O., Gershoff, E. T., & Grogan-Kaylor, A. (2017). Unpacking the impact of adverse childhood experiences on adult mental health. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 69, 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.03.016>
- Mihailova, S., & Jobson, L. (2018). Association between intrusive negative autobiographical memories and depression: A meta-analytic investigation. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/c>
- Morina, N., Lancee, J., & Arntz, A. (2017). Imagery rescripting as a clinical intervention for aversive memories: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 55, 6–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2016.11.003>
- Moritz, S., Ahlf-Schumacher, J., Hottenrott, B., Peter, U., Franck, S., Schnell, T., Peter, H., Schneider, B. C., & Jelinek, L. (2018). We cannot change the past, but we can change its meaning: A randomized controlled trial on the effects of self-help imagery rescripting on depression. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 104, 74–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2018.02.007>
- Nilsson, J.-E., Lundh, L.-G., & Viborg, G. (2012). Imagery rescripting of early memories in social anxiety disorder: An experimental study. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 50(6), 387–392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2012.03.004>
- Norton, A. R., & Abbott, M. J. (2016). The efficacy of imagery rescripting compared to cognitive restructuring for social anxiety disorder. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 40, 18–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2016.03.009>
- Øktedalen, T., Hoffart, A., & Langkaas, T. F. (2015). Trauma-related shame and guilt as time-varying predictors of posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms during imagery exposure and imagery rescripting—A randomized controlled trial. *Psychotherapy Research Journal of the Society for Psychotherapy Research*, 25(5), 518–532. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2014.917217>
- Ouzzani, M., Hammady, H., Fedorowicz, Zbys, & Ahmed, Elmagarmid (2016). Rayyan - a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews*, 5(210). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4>
- Ovanessian, M. M., Koerner, N., Antony, M. M., & Dugas, M. J. (2019). A preliminary test of the therapeutic potential of written exposure with rescripting for generalized anxiety disorder (204380871984152). *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043808719841529>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., Moher, D., & [David]. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews*, 10(1), 89. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-021-01626-4>
- Patsopoulos, N. A., Evangelou, E., & Ioannidis, J. P. (2008). Sensitivity of between-study heterogeneity in meta-analysis: proposed metrics and empirical evaluation. *International journal of epidemiology*, 37(5), 1148–1157. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyn065>
- Pile, V., Smith, P., Leamy, M., Oliver, A., Bennett, E., Blackwell, S. E., Meiser-Stedman, R., Stringer, D., Dunn, B. D., Holmes, E. A., & Lau, J. Y. F. (2021). A feasibility randomised controlled trial of a brief early intervention for adolescent depression that targets emotional mental images and memory specificity (IMAGINE). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 143, Article 103876. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2021.103876>
- Raabe, S., Ehring, T., Marquenie, L., Arntz, A., & Kindt, M. (2022). Imagery Rescripting as a stand-alone treatment for posttraumatic stress disorder related to childhood abuse: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 77, Article 101769. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2022.101769>
- Reimer, S. G., & Moscovitch, D. A. (2015). The impact of imagery rescripting on memory appraisals and core beliefs in social anxiety disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 75, 48–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2015.10.007>
- Reiss, N., Warnecke, I., Tolgou, T., Krampen, D., Luka-Krausgrill, U., & Rohrmann, S. (2017). Effects of cognitive behavioral therapy with relaxation vs. Imagery rescripting on test anxiety: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 208, 483–489. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2016.10.039>
- Riley, R. D., Higgins, J. P. T., & Deeks, J. J. (2011). Interpretation of random effects meta-analyses. *BMJ*, 342, d549. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d549>
- Ritter, V., & Stangier, U. (2016). Seeing in the Mind's eye: Imagery rescripting for patients with body dysmorphic disorder. A single case series. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 50, 187–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2015.07.007>
- Romano, M., Moscovitch, D. A., Huppert, J. D., Reimer, S. G., & Moscovitch, M. (2020). The effects of imagery rescripting on memory outcomes in social anxiety disorder. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 69, Article 102169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2019.102169>
- Ronconi, J. M., Shiner, B., & Watts, B. V. (2015). A meta-analysis of depressive symptom outcomes in randomized, controlled trials for PTSD. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 203(7), 522–529. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NMD.0000000000000322>
- RStudio Team. (2022). *RStudio: Integrated Development (Computer software)*. Boston, MA: RStudio, PBC. Retrieved from (<http://www.rstudio.com/>).
- Schwabe, L., Nader, K., & Pruessner, J. C. (2014). Reconsolidation of human memory: Brain mechanisms and clinical relevance. *Biological Psychiatry*, 76(4), 274–280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.03.008>
- Seinsche, R. J., Fricke, S., Neudert, M. K., Zehntner, R. I., Walter, B., Stark, R., & Hermann, A. (2023). Memory representation of aversive social experiences in Social Anxiety Disorder. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 94, Article 102669. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2023.102669>
- Smit, Y., Huijbers, M. J. H., Ioannidis, J. P. A., van Dyck, R., van Tilburg, W., & Arntz, A. (2012). The effectiveness of long-term psychoanalytic psychotherapy—a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 32(2), 81–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2011.11.003>
- Spinhoven, P., Bamelis, L., Haringsma, R., Molendijk, M., & Arntz, A. (2012). Consistency of reporting sexual and physical abuse during psychological treatment of personality disorder: An explorative study. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 43(Suppl 1), S43–S50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2011.02.005>
- Stander, V. A., Thomsen, C. J., & Highfill-McRoy, R. M. (2014). Etiology of depression comorbidity in combat-related PTSD: A review of the literature. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 34(2), 87–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2013.12.002>
- Strachan, L. P., Hyett, M. P., & McEvoy, P. M. (2020). Imagery rescripting for anxiety disorders and obsessive-compulsive disorder: Recent advances and future directions. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, 22(4), 17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-020-1139-4>
- Thompson, S. G., & Sharp, S. J. (1999). Explaining heterogeneity in meta-analysis: A comparison of methods. *Statistics in Medicine*, 18(20), 2693–2708. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0258\(19991030\)18:20<2693::AID-SIM235>3.0.CO;2-V](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0258(19991030)18:20<2693::AID-SIM235>3.0.CO;2-V)
- Varker, T., Jones, K. A., Arjmand, H.-A., Hinton, M., Hiles, S. A., Freijah, I., Forbes, D., Kartal, D., Phelps, A., Bryant, R. A., McFarlane, A., Hopwood, M., & O'Donnell, M. (2021). Dropout from guideline-recommended psychological treatments for posttraumatic stress disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders Reports*, 4, Article 100093. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadr.2021.100093>
- Veale, D., Page, N., Woodward, E., & Salkovskis, P. (2015). Imagery rescripting for obsessive compulsive disorder: A single case experimental design in 12 cases. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 49(Pt B), 230–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2015.03.003>
- Viechtbauer, W. (2010). Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 36(3), 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v036.i03>
- Viechtbauer, W., López-López, J. A., Sánchez-Meca, J., & Marín-Martínez, F. (2015). A comparison of procedures to test for moderators in mixed-effects meta-regression models. *Psychological Methods*, 20(3), 360–374. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000023>
- Voncken, M. J., Janssen, I., Keijsers, G. P. J., & Dibbets, P. (2023). Should cognitive restructuring precede imagery rescripting? An experimental pilot study. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 78, Article 101800. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2022.101800>
- Wild, J., Hackmann, A., & Clark, D. M. (2008). Rescripting early memories linked to negative images in social phobia: A pilot study. *Behavior Therapy*, 39(1), 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2007.04.003>
- Yücel, D. E., van Emmerik, A. A. P., Souama, C., & Lancee, J. (2020). Comparative efficacy of imagery rehearsal therapy and prazosin in the treatment of trauma-related nightmares in adults: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Sleeping Medicine Reviews*, 50, Article 101248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smrv.2019.101248>