Table O.19: Multisensory room or vibroacoustic chair versus any control

Quality ass	Quality assessment								Summary of findings					
Participant s	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecisio n	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relative effect	Anticipated absolute effects				
(studies) Follow up							With any contro I	With sensory intervention	(95% CI)	Risk with any contro I	Risk difference with sensory intervention (95% CI)			
Targeted be	haviour th	nat challenges (global) – post-	-treatment (m	neasured with	n: Change sco	ore ¹ ; Bett	ter indicated k	oy lower va	alues)				
89 (1 study)	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ³	undetecte d	 ⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW^{2,3} 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)			
Targeted be	haviour th	nat challenges (global) – follov	w-up (measu	red with: Cha	ange score ¹ ; E	Better ind	dicated by low	ver values)					
89 (1 study) 12 weeks	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ³	undetecte d	⊕⊖⊝⊖ VERY LOW ^{2,3}	41	48	-		The mean targeted behaviour that			

Quality ass	essment						Summary of findings				
						due to risk of bias, imprecision				challenge (global) – up in the interventio groups wa 0.00 stand deviations (0.42 lowe 0.42 high	follow- on as dard s higher er to
Targeted be	ehaviour th	at challenges (self-injurious	behaviour, se	everity) – pos	st-treatment (E	Better in	dicated by lov	ver values)		
20 (1 study)	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ³	undetecte d	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{2,3} due to risk of bias, imprecision	10	10	_	The mean targeted behaviour challenge injurious behaviour severity) - treatment interventio groups wa 0.2 standa deviations (1.08 lowe 0.68 high	r that es (self- r, - post- in the on as ard s lower er to
Targeted be	ehaviour th	at challenges (self-injurious	behaviour, fr	equency) – p	ost-treatment	(Better	indicated by I	ower values	5)	
20 (1 study)	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ³	undetecte d	 ⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW^{2,3} due to risk of bias, imprecision 	10	10	-	The mear targeted behaviour challenge injurious behaviour frequency post-treat the interve	r that rs (self- r, /) – ment in

Quality ass	essment						Summa	ary of finding	S		
											groups was 0.25 standard deviations lower (1.14 lower to 0.63 higher)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (stereotypical behaviour, severity) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
20 (1 study)	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ³	undetecte d	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{2,3} 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)
Targeted be	ehaviour th	nat challenges (stereotypical	behaviour, fr	equency) – p	ost-treatment	(Better i	ndicated by l	ower value	s)	
20 (1 study)	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ³	undetecte d	 ⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW^{2,3} 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 ass	sessment						Summary of findings				
										higher)	
Targeted b	ehaviour th	nat challenges (aggressive/ de	estructive be	haviour, seve	erity) – post-tr	reatment	t (Better indica	ated by lower value	es)	
20 (1 study)	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ³	undetecte d	 ⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW^{2,3} 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)	
Targeted b	ehaviour th	nat challenges (aggressive/ de	estructive be	haviour, freq	uency) – post	-treatme	ent (Better ind	icated by lower val	ues)	
20 (1 study)	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ³	undetecte d	 ⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW^{2,3} 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 ass	essment						Summary of findings				
Adaptive fu	unctioning -	– post-treatmer	nt (measured v	y higher	higher values)						
89 (1 study)	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ³	undetecte d	 ⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW^{2,3} 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)
Adaptive fu	unctioning -	– follow-up (me	asured with: 0	Change score	¹ ; Better ind	icated by high	ner value	es)			
89 (1 study) 12 weeks	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ³	undetecte d	 ⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW^{2,3} 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)

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

³ Optimal information size not met; small, single study