

Table O.23: Parent training plus optimism training versus parent training alone

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 parent training alone	With parent training plus optimism training		Risk with parent training alone	Risk difference with parent training plus optimism training (95% CI)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
35 (1 study)	very serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ²	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2} due to risk	17	18	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups

Quality assessment						Summary of findings					
						of bias, imprecision					was 0.8 standard deviations lower (1.49 to 0.11 lower)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity, non-improvement) – post-treatment											
35 (1 study)	very serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ²	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2} due to risk of bias, imprecision	11/17 (64.7%)	5/18 (27.8%)	RR 0.43 (0.19 to 0.98)	647 per 1000	369 fewer per 1000 (from 13 fewer to 524 fewer)
Carer satisfaction – post-treatment (Better indicated by higher values)											
35 (1 study)	very serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ²	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2} due to risk of bias, imprecision	17	18	-		The mean carer satisfaction – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.22 standard deviations higher (0.44 lower to 0.89 higher)
¹ Crucial limitation for one or more criteria sufficient to substantially lower ones confidence in the estimate of effect											
² Optimal information size not met; small, single study											