

Table O.12: EIBI (UCLA model) versus parent training

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 parent training	With EIBI		Risk with parent training	Risk difference with EIBI (95% CI)

Challenging behaviour and learning disabilities

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
Behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (measured with: Parent-rated; Better indicated by lower values)											
28 (1 study)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ¹	very serious ²	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2} due to indirectness, imprecision	13	15	-		The mean behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.36 standard deviations lower (1.1 lower to 0.39 higher)
Behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (measured with: Teacher-report; Better indicated by lower values)											
28 (1 study)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ¹	very serious ²	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2} due to indirectness, imprecision	13	15	-		The mean behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.47 standard deviations higher (0.28 lower to 1.23 higher)
Adaptive functioning (communication) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
28 (1 study)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ¹	very serious ²	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2} due to indirectness, imprecision	13	15	-		The mean adaptive functioning (communication) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.63 standard deviations higher (0.13 lower to 1.39 higher)

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
Adaptive functioning (global) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
28 (1 study)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ¹	very serious ²	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2} due to indirectness, imprecision	13	15	-		The mean adaptive functioning (global) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.11 standard deviations higher (0.64 lower to 0.85 higher)
¹ Applicability concerns: autism population; no information reported concerning learning disability ² Optimal information size not met; small, single study											