

Table O.14: Parent training (plus centre based EBI) versus treatment as usual (centre-based EBI)

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 control	With parent training		Risk with control	Risk difference with parent training (95% CI)
Behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
57 (1 study)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ¹	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecision	28	29	-		The mean behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
											was 0.4 standard deviations lower (0.93 lower to 0.12 higher)
Behaviour that challenges (severity) – follow up (Better indicated by lower values)											
117 (2 studies) 26 to 52 weeks	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ³	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW ^{2,3} due to risk of bias, imprecision	58	59	-		The mean behaviour that challenges (severity) – follow up in the intervention groups was 0.37 standard deviations lower (0.79 lower to 0.05 higher)
Adaptive functioning (global) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
58 (1 study)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ¹	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecision	28	30	-		The mean adaptive functioning (global) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.25 standard deviations higher (0.27 lower to 0.77 higher)
Adaptive functioning (global) – follow-up (Better indicated by lower values)											
119 (2 studies) 26 to 52 weeks	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ³	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW ^{2,3} due to risk of bias, imprecision	56	63	-		The mean adaptive functioning (global) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.52 standard deviations higher

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
							(0.15 to 0.88 higher)				
Adaptive functioning (communication) – follow-up (Better indicated by lower values)											
68 (1 study) 26 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ¹	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecision	33	35	-		The mean adaptive functioning (communication) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.75 standard deviations higher (0.26 to 1.25 higher)
¹ Optimal information size not met; small, single study ² Most information is from studies at moderate risk of bias ³ Optimal information size not met											