Table O.10: Learning Experiences and Alternative Program for Pre-schoolers and Their Parents (LEAP) – full replication condition versus manual-only attention control

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
Participants (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 attention control	With educational intervention		Risk with attention control	Risk difference with educational intervention (95% CI)
Behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (measured with: Change score[1]; Better indicated by lower values)											
294 (1 study)	serious [2]	no serious inconsistency	serious[3]	serious[4]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[2,3,4] due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	117	177	-		The mean behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.19 standard deviations lower (0.42 lower to 0.04 higher)
Adaptive functioning (social) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
294 (1 study)	serious [2]	no serious inconsistency	serious[3]	serious[4]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[2,3,4] due to risk of bias,	117	177	-		The mean adaptive functioning (social) – post-treatment in the

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
						indirectness, imprecision					intervention groups was 0.76 standard deviations higher (0.52 to 1 higher)
Adaptive functioning (communication) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
294 (1 study)	serious [2]	no serious inconsistency	serious[3]	serious[4]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[2,3,4] due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	117	177	-		The mean adaptive functioning (communication) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.94 standard deviations higher (0.7 to 1.19 higher)

[1] Due to significant baseline differences, standard deviation of change and estimates of mean change were derived using initial and final mean values and utilising r = 0.5. Sensitivity analyses were used to explore the impact of altering assumptions about the calculation of the effect size, but this resulted in no change to conclusions.

[2] Crucial limitation for one criterion or some limitations for multiple criteria sufficient to lower ones confidence in the estimate of effect