

Table O.24: Enhanced parent training versus standard parent training

| 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 standard parent training | With enhanced parent training | | Risk with standard parent training | Risk difference with enhanced parent training (95% CI) |
| Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 (1 study) | no serious risk of bias | no serious inconsistency | no serious indirectness | very serious ¹ | undetected | ⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecision | 26 | 24 | - | | The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.06 standard deviations lower (0.62 lower to 0.49 higher) |
| Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – follow-up (Better indicated by lower values) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 (1 study) 52 weeks | no serious risk of bias | no serious inconsistency | no serious indirectness | very serious ¹ | undetected | ⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecision | 19 | 23 | - | | The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.56 standard deviations lower (1.18 lower to 0.06 higher) |
| Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity, non-improvement) – post-treatment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 (1 study) | no serious risk of bias | no serious inconsistency | no serious indirectness | very serious ¹ | undetected | ⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecision | 10/26 (38.5%) | 13/24 (54.2%) | RR 1.41 (0.77 to | 385 per 1000 | 158 more per 1000 (from 88 fewer to 612 more) |

| Quality assessment | | | | | | | Summary of findings | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|---|---------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | | | n | | | 2.59) | | |
| Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity, non-improvement) – follow-up | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 (1 study) 52 weeks | no serious risk of bias | no serious inconsistenc y | no serious indirectnes s | very serious ¹ | undetect ed | ⊕⊕⊕⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecisio n | 11/19 (57.9%) | 12/23 (52.2%) | RR 0.9 (0.52 to 1.56) | 579 per 1000 | 58 fewer per 1000 (from 278 fewer to 324 more) |
| Targeted behaviour that challenges (frequency) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 (1 study) | no serious risk of bias | no serious inconsistenc y | no serious indirectnes s | very serious ¹ | undetect ed | ⊕⊕⊕⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecisio n | 26 | 24 | - | | The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (frequency) – post- treatment in the intervention groups was 0.04 standard deviations higher (0.52 lower to 0.59 higher) |
| Targeted behaviour that challenges (frequency) – follow-up (Better indicated by lower values) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 (1 study) 52 weeks | no serious risk of bias | no serious inconsistenc y | no serious indirectnes s | very serious ¹ | undetect ed | ⊕⊕⊕⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecisio n | 19 | 23 | - | | The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (frequency) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.04 standard deviations higher (0.56 lower to 0.65 higher) |
| Targeted behaviour that challenges (frequency, non-improvement) – post-treatment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 (1 study) | no serious risk of bias | no serious inconsistenc y | no serious indirectnes s | very serious ¹ | undetect ed | ⊕⊕⊕⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecisio n | 11/26 (42.3%) | 8/24 (33.3%) | RR 0.79 (0.38 to 1.62) | 423 per 1000 | 89 fewer per 1000 (from 262 fewer to 262 more) |
| Targeted behaviour that challenges (frequency, non-improvement) – follow-up | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | no | no serious | no serious | very | undetect | ⊕⊕⊕⊖ | 4/19 | 8/23 | RR | 211 per | 137 more per 1000 |

| Quality assessment | | | | | | | Summary of findings | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------|--|---------------------|---------|---------------------|------|--|
| (1 study) 52 weeks | serious risk of bias | inconsistency | indirectness | serious ¹ | undetected | LOW ¹ due to imprecision | (21.1%) | (34.8%) | 1.65 (0.59 to 4.65) | 1000 | (from 86 fewer to 768 more) |
| Carer satisfaction- post-treatment (Better indicated by higher values) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 (1 study) | no serious risk of bias | no serious inconsistency | no serious indirectness | very serious ¹ | undetected | ⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecision | 26 | 24 | - | | The mean carer satisfaction- post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.18 standard deviations higher (0.38 lower to 0.74 higher) |
| ¹ Optimal information size not met; small, single study | | | | | | | | | | | |