Quality assessment						Summary of findings					
Participant s (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecisio n	Publicatio n bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relative effect	Anticipated absolute effects	
							With unstructure d activity	With structure d activity	(95% CI)	Risk with unstructure d activity	Risk difference with structured activity (95% CI)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (measured with: Change score ¹ ; Better indicated by lower values)											
26 (1 study)	2 2	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectnes s	very serious ³	undetecte d	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{2,3} due to risk of bias, imprecisio n	13	13	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post- treatment in the interventio n groups was 0.87 standard deviations lower (1.68 to 0.06 lower)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – follow-up (measured with: Change score ¹ ; Better indicated by lower values)											
26	serious	no serious	no serious	very	undetecte	$\oplus \Theta \Theta \Theta$	13	13	-		The mean

Challenging behaviour and learning disabilities

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
(1 study) 6 weeks	2	inconsistency	indirectnes s	serious ³	d	VERY LOW ^{2,3} due to risk of bias, imprecisio n					targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – follow-up in the interventio n groups was 0.95 standard deviations lower (1.77 to 0.13 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