



*Methods*

Search Strategy

internal validity of the original study are also present here; however, conclusions based on retrospective studies are by nature less compelling than those based on prospective studies. Additionally, since no raw data is provided, it is difficult to independently analyze their conclusions.

The statistical analysis for this study was appropriate for normally distributed data, although evidence of normality was not provided. As well, the relationship of the treatment with improved quality of life was greater for the control than the treatment group. Although not

statistical manipulations and conclusions appear valid.

The main limitation of the study is its small sample size. Because of this, power was insufficient which may have led to a type II statistical error. This may be especially true of quality of life measures, which were significant for the original CST sessions, but non-

