

Table O.1: Auditory impairment versus no auditory impairment as a risk factor for challenging behaviour

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
Participant s (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated absolute effects	
							With no impairment	With auditory impairment		Risk with no impairment	Risk difference with auditory impairment (95% CI)
All aggression (physical, verbal and destructive) (assessed with: Validated questionnaire)											
1938 (2 studies)	no serious risk of bias	serious ¹	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW ¹ due to inconsistency	380/1628 (23.3%)	35/310 (11.3%)	OR 0.97 (0.42 to 2.23)	233 per 1000	5 fewer per 1000 (from 120 fewer to 171 more)
Self-injury (assessed with: Validated questionnaire)											
2086 (3 studies)	no serious risk of bias	serious ¹	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW ¹ due to inconsistency	419/1770 (23.7%)	37/316 (11.7%)	OR 1.05 (0.49 to 2.29)	237 per 1000	9 more per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 179 more)
Stereotypy (assessed with: Validated questionnaire)											
915 (1 study)	no serious risk	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW ² due to	362/881 (41.1%)	16/34 (47.1%)	OR 1.27 (0.64 to 2.53)	411 per 1000	59 more per 1000 (from 102

Quality assessment						Summary of findings					
	of bias					imprecision					fewer to 227 more)
¹ I ² > 40% ² Optimal information size not met; single study											