

Table O.21: Parent training 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 parent training		Risk with any control	Risk difference with parent training (95% CI)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
841 (14 studies)	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE <sup>1</sup> due to risk of bias	390	451	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.41 standard deviations lower (0.58 to 0.24 lower)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – follow-up (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
342 (3 studies) 26- 52 weeks	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	serious <sup>2</sup>	serious <sup>3</sup>	reporting bias strongly suspected <sup>4</sup>	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>1,2,3,4</sup> due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision, publication bias	156	186	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.13 standard deviations lower (0.34 lower to 0.08 higher)

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity, non-improvement) – post-treatment</b>											
428 (8 studies)	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE <sup>1</sup> due to risk of bias	174/197 (88.3%)	131/231 (56.7%)	RR 0.67 (0.59 to 0.77)	883 per 1000	291 fewer per 1000 (from 203 fewer to 362 fewer)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (frequency) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
633 (9 studies)	serious <sup>1</sup>	serious <sup>5</sup>	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW <sup>1,5</sup> due to risk of bias, inconsistency	294	339	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (frequency) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.54 standard deviations lower (0.8 to 0.28 lower)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (frequency) – follow-up (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
258 (12 studies) 26 weeks	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>7</sup>	reporting bias strongly suspected <sup>4</sup>	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>4,6,7</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision, publication bias	123	135	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (frequency) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.23 standard deviations lower (0.47 lower to 0.02 higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (frequency, non-improvement) – post-treatment</b>											
343 (6 studies)	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	serious <sup>2</sup>	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW <sup>1,2</sup> due to risk of bias, indirectness	147/155 (94.8%)	105/188 (55.9%)	RR 0.63 (0.55 to 0.73)	948 per 1000	351 fewer per 1000 (from 256 fewer to 427 fewer)
<b>Adaptive functioning (communication) – post-treatment (Better indicated by higher values)</b>											
124 (1 study)	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistency	serious <sup>2</sup>	very serious <sup>7</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>2,6,7</sup>	49	75	-		The mean adaptive functioning

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
		cy				due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision					(communication) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.47 standard deviations higher (0.11 to 0.84 higher)
<b>Adaptive functioning (total) – post-treatment (Better indicated by higher values)</b>											
135 (2 studies)	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	serious <sup>2</sup>	serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>1,2,3</sup> due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	53	82	-		The mean adaptive functioning (total) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.51 standard deviations higher (0.15 to 0.86 higher)
<p>1 Most information is from studies at moderate risk of bias</p> <p>2 Concerns with applicability – different populations</p> <p>3 Optimal information size not met</p> <p>4 Publication bias strongly suspected</p> <p>5 I<sup>2</sup> &gt; 40%</p> <p>6 Crucial limitation for one criterion or some limitations for multiple criteria sufficient to lower ones confidence in the estimate of effect</p> <p>7 Optimal information size not met; small, single study</p>											