

**Table O.19: Multisensory room or vibroacoustic chair versus any 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 any control	With sensory intervention		Risk with any control	Risk difference with sensory intervention (95% CI)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (global) – post-treatment (measured with: Change score<sup>1</sup>; Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
89 (1 study)	serious <sup>2</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW <sup>2,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	41	48	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (global) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 1.69 standard deviations higher (1.2 to 2.18 higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (global) – follow-up (measured with: Change score<sup>1</sup>; Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
89 (1 study) 12 weeks	serious <sup>2</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW <sup>2,3</sup>	41	48	-		The mean targeted behaviour that

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
						due to risk of bias, imprecision					challenges (global) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.00 standard deviations higher (0.42 lower to 0.42 higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (self-injurious behaviour, severity) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
20 (1 study)	serious <sup>2</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW <sup>2,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	10	10	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (self-injurious behaviour, severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.2 standard deviations lower (1.08 lower to 0.68 higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (self-injurious behaviour, frequency) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
20 (1 study)	serious <sup>2</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW <sup>2,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	10	10	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (self-injurious behaviour, frequency) – post-treatment in the intervention

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
											groups was 0.25 standard deviations lower (1.14 lower to 0.63 higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (stereotypical behaviour, severity) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
20 (1 study)	serious <sup>2</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>2,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	10	10	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (stereotypical behaviour, severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.33 standard deviations higher (0.55 lower to 1.21 higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (stereotypical behaviour, frequency) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
20 (1 study)	serious <sup>2</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>2,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	10	10	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (stereotypical behaviour, frequency) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.22 standard deviations lower (1.1 lower to 0.66

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
											higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (aggressive/ destructive behaviour, severity) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
20 (1 study)	serious <sup>2</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>2,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	10	10	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (aggressive/ destructive behaviour, severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.15 standard deviations lower (1.03 lower to 0.72 higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (aggressive/ destructive behaviour, frequency) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
20 (1 study)	serious <sup>2</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>2,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	10	10	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (aggressive/ destructive behaviour, frequency) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.22 standard deviations lower (1.1 lower to 0.66 higher)

Quality assessment						Summary of findings					
<b>Adaptive functioning – post-treatment (measured with: Change score<sup>1</sup>; Better indicated by higher values)</b>											
89 (1 study)	serious <sup>2</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>2,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	41	48	-		The mean adaptive functioning – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 1.12 standard deviations lower (1.57 to 0.67 lower)
<b>Adaptive functioning – follow-up (measured with: Change score<sup>1</sup>; Better indicated by higher values)</b>											
89 (1 study) 12 weeks	serious <sup>2</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>2,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	41	48	-		The mean adaptive functioning – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.48 standard deviations lower (0.9 to 0.05 lower)
<p><sup>1</sup> Due to significant baseline differences, standard deviation of change and estimates of mean change were derived using initial and final mean values and utilising <math>r = 0.5</math>. 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.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> Crucial limitation for one criterion or some limitations for multiple criteria sufficient to lower ones confidence in the estimate of effect</p> <p><sup>3</sup> Optimal information size not met; small, single study</p>											