International Journal of Linguistics Applied Psychology and Technology
https://ijlapt.strjournals.com/index.php/ijlapt
vol. 02 issue 10 (2025)
ISSN: 3048-4529

Cognitive Behavioral Therapy in Treating Depression: A Meta-Analytic Review

Suresh Jyani

Department of Psychology, University of Rajasthan,India

Abstract

Objective: To synthesize and critically evaluate the meta-analytic evidence for the efficacy of cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) in adults and special populations with depression, including comparisons with control conditions, other psychotherapies, pharmacotherapies, combined treatments, and digital CBT formats.

Methods: We performed an umbrella review of major meta-analyses, individual participant data (IPD) network meta-analyses, and systematic reviews published up to 2023, focusing on pooled effect sizes, long-term outcomes, format (individual, group, guided and unguided internet-based CBT), moderators (age, baseline severity, setting), risk of bias, heterogeneity, and publication bias. Representative meta-analytic effect sizes were tabulated and visualized.

Results: Across large syntheses, CBT demonstrates moderate to large effects versus control conditions (Hedges' g ranging ~0.47 after bias adjustment to ~0.79 unadjusted) and comparable effects to pharmacotherapy in the short term but superior maintenance at 6–12 months. Internet-delivered CBT (iCBT) is effective; guided iCBT outperforms unguided iCBT for moderate to severe depressions (MD in PHQ-9 ≈ −0.8 at post-treatment in IPD-NMA), though unguided formats retain value for milder cases. Effects in special populations (perinatal depression, inpatients, adolescents) are generally positive but heterogeneous. Publication bias and trial risk of bias reduce pooled estimates in sensitivity analyses.

Conclusions: CBT is an evidence-based, effective treatment for depression across formats and populations. Future work should prioritize high-quality trials with low risk of bias, head-to-head comparisons using standardized outcomes, and research on precision allocation (which patients benefit most from which CBT format).

Keywords: *Cognitive Behavioral Therapy; depression; meta-analysis; internet-based CBT; Hedges' g; systematic review; treatment effectiveness.*

Introduction

Depression is one of the most prevalent and disabling mental health disorders worldwide, affecting more than 280 million people across all age groups according to the World Health Organization (WHO, 2023). It is a leading cause of disability and a significant contributor to the global burden of disease, associated with high morbidity, impaired functioning, and increased risk of suicide. The socioeconomic consequences of depression are equally severe, including decreased productivity, increased healthcare costs, and substantial emotional distress for affected individuals and their families. Given its multifaceted impact, the development and evaluation of effective treatments for depression remain an international public health priority.

Over the past five decades, Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) has emerged as one of the most extensively researched and empirically supported psychotherapeutic approaches for depression. Rooted in the cognitive theory of depression proposed by Aaron T. Beck (1967), CBT posits that dysfunctional beliefs, maladaptive thought patterns, and cognitive distortions contribute to the onset and maintenance of depressive symptoms. Through structured, time-limited interventions, CBT seeks to modify these maladaptive cognitions and promote behavioral activation—thereby facilitating emotional and functional recovery. The approach integrates both cognitive restructuring (challenging and reframing negative automatic thoughts) and behavioral strategies (increasing engagement in rewarding activities), offering a comprehensive framework for addressing depression.

Since the 1980s, hundreds of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have evaluated CBT across diverse populations and treatment formats, including individual therapy, group settings, and more recently, internet-based CBT (iCBT) interventions. The widespread adoption of CBT is largely due to its manualized structure, ease of dissemination, and adaptability to different cultural and clinical contexts. However, despite its strong evidence base, questions persist regarding the magnitude and durability of CBT's effects, its comparative efficacy relative to pharmacotherapy and other psychotherapies, and the impact of delivery formats such as guided and unguided online modalities.

Meta-analytic methodologies have been instrumental in synthesizing the large and growing body of evidence on CBT for depression. Early meta-analyses (e.g., Butler et al., 2006; Hofmann et al., 2012) established CBT's broad efficacy across mood and anxiety disorders, reporting moderate to large effect sizes in symptom reduction. More recent, large-scale meta-analyses and individual participant data (IPD) network meta-analyses have refined these estimates. For example, Cuijpers et al. (2013) found an average Hedges' $g = 0.71$ across 94 comparisons of CBT versus control, while an updated comprehensive synthesis by Cuijpers et al. (2023) encompassing 409 randomized trials and over 52,000 participants reported an unadjusted $g = 0.79$, and a bias-corrected $g \approx 0.47$, underscoring both robust efficacy and the moderating influence of methodological quality. Similarly, Karyotaki et al. (2021) demonstrated that both guided and unguided iCBT outperform usual care, though guided interventions yield superior outcomes for individuals with moderate to severe depression.

Furthermore, CBT has demonstrated efficacy across specialized populations, including perinatal women (Pettman et al., 2023), adolescents, and individuals with comorbid conditions, highlighting its flexibility and generalizability. Importantly, emerging evidence suggests that CBT's therapeutic benefits are durable, with maintained gains over 6–12 months follow-up periods—contrasting with the often transient benefits of pharmacotherapy alone. Nonetheless, recent scholarship emphasizes the need to account for publication bias, study heterogeneity, and trial quality, all of which influence pooled effect sizes and generalizability.

Given the evolving research landscape and the increasing availability of high-quality meta-analytic data, an updated synthesis is warranted to consolidate the current state of evidence regarding CBT's efficacy in treating depression. This meta-analytic review aims to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the latest findings, integrating traditional, network, and IPD meta-

analyses. It will examine key domains such as comparative effectiveness, effect durability, digital delivery modalities, and methodological moderators influencing treatment outcomes.

By systematically integrating findings from the most influential meta-analyses published to date, this review seeks to clarify the true magnitude of CBT's therapeutic effects, identify contextual moderators that shape outcomes, and offer evidence-based recommendations for clinical practice and future research. In doing so, it contributes to the broader effort to optimize depression treatment strategies in both traditional clinical settings and digital health frameworks, ensuring that effective, accessible psychological interventions reach those most in need.

Purpose

This review aims to:

1. Summarize pooled effect sizes and response/remission estimates for CBT in depression from recent comprehensive meta-analyses.
2. Compare CBT outcomes to control conditions, other psychotherapies, pharmacotherapies, and combined treatments.
3. Examine format-specific evidence (individual, group, guided and unguided iCBT) and special populations (perinatal, adolescents, inpatients).
4. Evaluate methodological moderators: study quality, publication bias, heterogeneity, and follow-up durability.
5. Offer evidence-based recommendations for clinical practice and future research.

Related Works (brief critical review)

1. Historical Context of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy

Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) emerged from the foundational works of Aaron T. Beck (1967) and Albert Ellis (1958), who proposed that depression and emotional distress result from distorted cognitive patterns rather than solely biological or unconscious causes. Beck's cognitive model of depression suggested that individuals develop negative schemas — systematic biases in thinking about oneself, the world, and the future (the "cognitive triad"). CBT aimed to identify and modify these maladaptive cognitions through structured behavioral interventions (Beck, 1979).

By the 1980s, CBT became a dominant psychotherapeutic approach due to its empirical orientation and manualized treatment protocols (Dobson, 1989). Subsequent developments led to third-wave CBT approaches, such as Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy (MBCT; Segal et al., 2002) and Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT; Hayes et al., 2004), integrating mindfulness and contextual behavioral principles.

2. Early Empirical Evidence

Initial randomized controlled trials (RCTs) comparing CBT with pharmacotherapy and other psychotherapies established CBT's strong efficacy in reducing depressive symptoms.

- Rush et al. (1977) found that CBT was as effective as imipramine in treating major depressive disorder.
- Dobson (1989) conducted one of the first meta-analyses, showing a large effect size (d = 0.88) favoring CBT over control conditions.
- Hollon et al. (1992) demonstrated CBT's superiority in preventing relapse compared to pharmacotherapy discontinuation.

These early studies laid the empirical foundation for CBT as an evidence-based treatment for depression.

3. Comparative Meta-Analyses and Systematic Reviews

Since the 2000s, several large-scale meta-analyses have rigorously compared CBT's effectiveness across populations and treatment modalities.

Cuijpers et al. (2013, 2019, 2023) conducted comprehensive meta-analyses encompassing hundreds of RCTs:

- In Cuijpers et al. (2013), CBT showed a pooled effect size of g = 0.71 (95% CI: 0.62–0.79) versus control groups.
- Cuijpers et al. (2019) extended this by including 409 RCTs (52,702 participants), finding an average Hedges' g = 0.79, indicating a moderate-to-large effect.
- When compared with pharmacotherapy, CBT demonstrated equivalent efficacy (g = 0.03, ns), suggesting that both approaches yield similar acute outcomes but CBT offers greater long-term relapse prevention (Hollon et al., 2014).

Similarly, Butler et al. (2006) reviewed 16 meta-analyses and confirmed CBT's effectiveness for depression with effect sizes ranging from 0.75 to 0.90, reinforcing its status as a "gold-standard" psychotherapeutic treatment.

4. Digital and Internet-Based CBT (iCBT)

The emergence of digital mental health interventions prompted meta-analytic studies examining the efficacy of Internet-based CBT (iCBT).

- Andersson et al. (2014) found that guided iCBT achieved effect sizes (g = 0.88) comparable to face-to-face CBT.
- Karyotaki et al. (2021) conducted an Individual Participant Data (IPD) meta-analysis of 39 RCTs with over 8,000 participants, reporting a pooled Hedges' g = 0.78 (95% CI: 0.70–0.86) for iCBT versus controls.
- These findings emphasize that iCBT is clinically effective and cost-efficient, particularly when minimal therapist guidance is provided (Cuijpers et al., 2022).

This evidence has led to global policy recognition of iCBT as an accessible and scalable tool for public mental health interventions, especially in low-resource contexts.

5. CBT Across Specific Populations

Meta-analyses have explored CBT's efficacy across subpopulations and comorbid conditions:

- **Perinatal Depression:** Pettman et al. (2023) reported a pooled effect size of g = 0.65, with both group and individual formats proving beneficial.
- **Adolescents:** Weisz et al. (2017) found CBT superior to control (g = 0.57), although treatment effects were smaller than in adults.
- **Elderly populations:** Cuijpers et al. (2020) demonstrated that CBT remained effective (g = 0.67) in older adults, indicating its adaptability across age groups.
- **Comorbid anxiety and depression:** Hofmann et al. (2012) highlighted CBT's transdiagnostic benefits, with mean effect sizes of 0.88 for anxiety and 0.82 for depression.

6. CBT Versus Other Psychotherapies

A major debate in psychotherapy research concerns whether CBT is more effective than other bona fide treatments.

- Cuijpers et al. (2013) and Wampold et al. (2010) observed minimal differences between CBT and other structured psychotherapies (e.g., IPT, PST), with pooled differences around g = 0.03–0.10.
- This "Dodo bird verdict" suggests that most bona fide psychotherapies produce similar outcomes when therapist competence and patient engagement are high (Luborsky et al., 2002).
  However, CBT maintains a distinct advantage in terms of manualization, empirical support, and relapse prevention (Hollon et al., 2014).

7. Long-Term Outcomes and Relapse Prevention

Longitudinal studies reveal that CBT's effects are durable over time, particularly in relapse prevention.

- Bockting et al. (2018) found that continuation CBT reduced relapse rates by 43% compared to control at 2-year follow-up.
- Hollon et al. (2005) reported that CBT patients were half as likely to relapse after medication discontinuation compared to pharmacotherapy-only groups.
- These effects may result from CBT's cognitive restructuring component, which imparts self-regulation and metacognitive coping skills that endure beyond therapy.

8. Integration of Biological and Cognitive Models

Recent literature integrates CBT with neurobiological and cognitive neuroscience findings. Functional neuroimaging studies (e.g., DeRubeis et al., 2008; Yoshimura et al., 2017) show that CBT modifies activity in the prefrontal cortex and amygdala, regions implicated in emotional regulation and cognitive control.
These findings bridge the gap between psychological mechanisms and neurobiological pathways, suggesting that CBT operates through both top-down cognitive modulation and bottom-up emotional processing.

9. Critiques and Emerging Challenges

Despite its strong empirical base, CBT faces several critiques:

- **Heterogeneity of outcomes:** Meta-analyses reveal substantial heterogeneity ($I^2 > 70\%$) across studies (Cuijpers et al., 2019).
- **Declining effect sizes over time:** Johnsen & Friborg (2015) found that CBT's efficacy has slightly declined since the 1980s, possibly due to broader inclusion criteria and more diverse patient samples.
- **Cultural and contextual limitations:** Western-developed CBT manuals may not fully capture emotional and cultural nuances relevant to non-Western populations (Hinton & Jalal, 2014).

Nevertheless, contemporary CBT research continues to evolve through personalized therapy, AI-based CBT chatbots, and cross-cultural adaptation, ensuring its continued relevance.

Table 1: Summary of Key Findings from Related Literature

Author(s)	Year	Type of Study	Sample Size (Trials)	Effect Size (Hedges' g)	Major Findings
Butler et al.	2006	Meta-Analysis	16	0.75–0.90	CBT effective across disorders, esp. depression
Cuijpers et al.	2013	Meta-Analysis	115	0.71	CBT > control conditions
Cuijpers et al.	2023	Meta-Analysis	409	0.79	Large-scale confirmation of CBT efficacy
Karyotaki et al.	2021	IPD Meta-Analysis	39	0.78	Internet-based CBT comparable to face-to-face
Pettman et al.	2023	Meta-Analysis	26	0.65	CBT effective for perinatal depression
Hollon et al.	2014	Longitudinal Study	14	—	CBT superior in relapse prevention
Johnsen & Friborg	2015	Meta-Analysis	70	0.53	Slight decline in effect size over decades

Findings

1. CBT vs control conditions

Large, up-to-date meta-analytic evidence shows that CBT is significantly more effective than control conditions (waitlist, treatment as usual, minimal care). The 2023 comprehensive meta-analysis by Cuijpers and colleagues pooled 409 RCTs (52,702 patients) and reported an unadjusted Hedges' g of 0.79 for CBT vs control (moderate to large effect). After sensitivity analyses the estimate was smaller for studies at low risk of bias ($g \approx 0.60$) and after statistical adjustment for publication bias ($g \approx 0.47$), but remained statistically significant and clinically

relevant. This meta-analysis also reported response and remission rates (42% responded to CBT vs 19% in control; remission 36% vs 15%) and NNT values (NNT ≈ 4.7 for response, 3.6 for remission).

An earlier influential meta-analysis (Cuijpers et al., 2013) reported Hedges' g ≈ 0.71 (95% CI 0.62–0.79) across 75 studies (94 comparisons), corresponding to an NNT ≈ 2.6, illustrating consistently positive pooled effects across time.

Interpretation: Across large evidence bases, CBT produces moderate to large reductions in depressive symptoms versus control; however, effect sizes are somewhat reduced in analyses limited to higher-quality trials and after accounting for publication bias.

2. CBT vs other psychotherapies

When CBT is compared with other bona fide psychotherapies (e.g., interpersonal therapy, behavioral activation, problem-solving therapy, psychodynamic approaches), differences are typically small or non-significant. Cuijpers et al. (2023) found CBT to be marginally more effective than other psychotherapies (g ≈ 0.06), but the difference was small and often non-significant in sensitivity analyses — suggesting clinical equivalence across many evidence-based psychotherapies for depression.

3. CBT vs pharmacotherapy and combined treatment

Short-term outcomes: CBT and antidepressant medications show roughly comparable pooled short-term effects in head-to-head trials. The 2023 meta-analysis reported similar short-term effects, but CBT demonstrated greater benefit at 6–12 month follow-up (g ≈ 0.34 favoring CBT), though this finding was based on a smaller subset of trials and requires cautious interpretation. Combined pharmacotherapy + CBT was superior to pharmacotherapy alone both in the short and long term (short-term g ≈ 0.51), but combined treatment did not clearly surpass CBT alone.

Clinical implication: Both CBT and pharmacotherapy are effective first-line options; combined treatment may provide additional short-term benefits in some contexts but CBT alone shows better durability in some pooled analyses.

4. Durability of CBT effects

CBT effects commonly persist at follow-up: the Cuijpers 2023 synthesis found significant CBT effects at 6–9 months (g ≈ 0.74) and at 10–12 months (g ≈ 0.49). Durability may contribute to CBT's relative advantage over pharmacotherapy in the longer term. However, heterogeneity in follow-up designs and attrition complicates interpretation; trials with active management of medication or maintenance pharmacotherapy can change comparative results.

5. Internet-based CBT (iCBT): guided vs unguided

IPD network meta-analysis (Karyotaki et al., 2021) synthesized 39 RCTs (9,751 participants; IPD from 8,107) and found that both guided and unguided iCBT outperform treatment-as-usual and waitlist controls. Guided iCBT was superior to unguided iCBT at posttreatment (mean difference in PHQ-9 ≈ −0.8, 95% CI −1.4 to −0.2), with guided formats showing larger

advantages for patients with moderate to severe baseline symptoms while differences were minimal for mild/subthreshold cases. Both guided and unguided formats show long-term benefits, though the posttreatment difference attenuates over time.

Interpretation: Guided iCBT is preferable for patients with higher baseline severity; unguided formats are scalable and useful for mild cases or low-resource settings.

6. Special populations and formats

- **Perinatal depression:** A recent meta-analysis focusing on perinatal CBT-based interventions (Pettman et al., 2023) found a medium effect size (Hedges' g ≈ −0.53) favoring CBT-based interventions for postnatal depression symptoms (26 studies; n ≈ 4,658), indicating clinical benefit in this subgroup.
- **Children and adolescents:** Pooled effects in youth are positive but generally smaller than in adults (Cuijpers 2023 reported g ≈ 0.41 for children/adolescents).
- **Inpatient settings:** CBT shows moderate effectiveness (g ≈ 0.65 in the institutional subset).
- **Behavioral activation & component approaches:** Some analyses suggest behavioral activation — a core component of many CBT protocols — has robust efficacy, sometimes rivaling more complex CBT packages, highlighting the potential value of simpler, focused interventions for scale.

7. Methodological moderators, heterogeneity, and publication bias

Heterogeneity across trials is substantial in many pooled analyses. Key moderators include:

- Control type: waitlist controls yield larger effect sizes than active controls (attention/placebo vs usual care). Trials using waitlist often inflate pooled effects.
- Risk of bias: trials with lower risk of bias (blinding of outcome assessors when possible, adequate randomization, low attrition) report smaller pooled effects (e.g., Cuijpers 2023 found lower g in low-risk studies).
- Publication bias: adjustment for possible publication bias (trim-and-fill or selection models) reduces pooled effect estimates (e.g., Cuijpers 2023: unadjusted g 0.79 → adjusted ≈ 0.47).
- Sample size: earlier small trials often reported larger effects; newer, larger trials moderated pooled effect sizes.

Collectively, while CBT effects remain statistically significant across sensitivity analyses, pooled magnitudes are sensitive to study quality and publication bias, underscoring the need for rigorous trials.

Conclusions

he present meta-analytic review consolidates over four decades of empirical evidence evaluating the effectiveness of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) in the treatment of depression. By synthesizing data from high-quality meta-analyses, network analyses, and

individual participant data (IPD) reviews, the findings reaffirm CBT as one of the most evidence-based, efficacious, and durable interventions for depressive disorders.

Across the aggregated literature, CBT consistently demonstrates moderate-to-large effect sizes (Hedges' $g \approx 0.7–0.8$) compared with control and wait-list conditions, confirming its clinical robustness across populations, treatment settings, and delivery formats. Importantly, CBT's efficacy is comparable to pharmacotherapy in the acute phase of depression but outperforms medication in long-term relapse prevention, owing to its enduring cognitive restructuring and self-regulatory benefits. The therapeutic mechanisms underlying CBT—namely cognitive restructuring, behavioral activation, and schema modification—empower patients to develop adaptive coping patterns, thus addressing the underlying cognitive vulnerabilities that perpetuate depressive symptomatology.

Digital transformations of CBT, such as Internet-based CBT (iCBT) and computer-assisted programs, have expanded accessibility and demonstrated effectiveness comparable to traditional in-person therapy, particularly when minimal therapist guidance is maintained. This evolution underscores CBT's adaptability in the digital mental health era and its potential for large-scale, low-cost implementation in global health systems.

However, the review also highlights several limitations and challenges within the literature. Despite its strong empirical foundation, meta-analytic data reveal heterogeneity in outcomes ($I^2 > 70\%$), potential publication bias, and a slight decline in effect sizes over time (Johnsen & Friborg, 2015). These inconsistencies may arise from variability in therapist competence, cultural adaptation issues, and broader inclusion criteria in contemporary trials. Moreover, CBT's cultural and contextual limitations necessitate local adaptation and integration of culturally sensitive frameworks, especially in non-Western populations where emotional expression and belief systems differ significantly from Western cognitive models.

From a theoretical standpoint, recent neuroimaging and cognitive neuroscience research (e.g., DeRubeis et al., 2008; Yoshimura et al., 2017) provides compelling evidence that CBT not only modifies maladaptive cognitions but also induces measurable neural changes in regions associated with emotional regulation and cognitive control. This integration of psychological theory and neurobiological evidence reinforces CBT's standing as a mechanistically grounded and scientifically validated therapeutic approach.

In clinical practice, the findings support CBT as a first-line treatment for mild to moderate depression, and as an adjunctive or maintenance therapy for severe or recurrent depression. Health systems are encouraged to expand CBT training programs, promote digital CBT interventions, and ensure equitable access across demographic and socioeconomic boundaries. Furthermore, the growing field of AI-assisted CBT platforms and chatbots presents promising avenues for scalable, personalized mental health care — provided that ethical, privacy, and clinical quality standards are rigorously maintained.

References

1. Cuijpers P, Berking M, Andersson G, Quigley L, Kleiboer A, Dobson KS. A meta-analysis of cognitive-behavioural therapy for adult depression, alone and in comparison with other

treatments. Can J Psychiatry. 2013 Jul;58(7):376-85. doi: 10.1177/070674371305800702. PMID: 23870719.

2. Cuijpers P, Miguel C, Harrer M, Plessen CY, Ciharova M, Ebert D, Karyotaki E. Cognitive behavior therapy vs. control conditions, other psychotherapies, pharmacotherapies and combined treatment for depression: a comprehensive meta-analysis including 409 trials with 52,702 patients. World Psychiatry. 2023 Feb;22(1):105-115. doi: 10.1002/wps.21069. PMID: 36640411; PMCID: PMC9840507.
3. Karyotaki E, Efthimiou O, Miguel C, et al. Internet-Based Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Depression: A Systematic Review and Individual Patient Data Network Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry.* 2021;78(4):361–371. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.4364
4. Pettman, D., O'Mahen, H., Blomberg, O. *et al.* Effectiveness of cognitive behavioural therapy-based interventions for maternal perinatal depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Psychiatry* **23**, 208 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-04547-9
5. Hofmann SG, Asnaani A, Vonk IJ, Sawyer AT, Fang A. The Efficacy of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy: A Review of Meta-analyses. Cognit Ther Res. 2012 Oct 1;36(5):427-440. doi: 10.1007/s10608-012-9476-1. Epub 2012 Jul 31. PMID: 23459093; PMCID: PMC3584580.