Table O.25: Cognitive behaviour interventions 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 cognitive behavioural interventions		Risk with any control	Risk difference with cognitive behavioural interventions (95% CI)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (measured with: Family carer rated; Better indicated by lower values)											
103	no serious	no serious inconsistenc	no serious indirectnes	very	undetect	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW[1]	58	45	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
(1 study)	risk of bias	y	s	serious[1]	ed	due to imprecision					(severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.24 standard deviations lower (0.63 lower to 0.15 higher)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – follow-up (measured with: Family carer rated; Better indicated by lower values)											
83 (1 study) 31 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW[1] due to imprecision	41	42	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.03 standard deviations lower (0.46 lower to 0.4 higher)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity, non-improvement) – post-treatment (assessed with: Paid carer rated)											
38 (1 study)	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	15/20 (75%)	9/18 (50%)	RR 0.67 (0.39 to 1.13)	750 per 1000	247 fewer per 1000 (from 458 fewer to 97 more)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (measured with: Paid carer rated; Better indicated by lower values)											
194 (2 studies)	no serious risk of bias	serious[3]	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW[3,4] due to inconsistency, imprecision	102	92	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.03 standard deviations lower (0.48 lower to 0.42 higher)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – follow-up (measured with: Paid carer rated; Better indicated by lower values)											
176	no	serious[3]	no serious	serious[4]	undetect	⊕⊕⊖⊖	86	90	-		The mean targeted

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
(2 studies) 17- 31 weeks	serious risk of bias		indirectnes s		ed	LOW[3,4] due to inconsistency , imprecision			-		behaviour that challenges (severity) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.13 standard deviations lower (0.58 lower to 0.33 higher)
Adaptive functioning – post-treatment (measured with: Paid carer rated; Better indicated by higher values)											
28 (1 study)	serious [2]	no serious inconsistenc y	no serious indirectnes s	very serious[1]	undetect ed	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	10	18	-		The mean adaptive functioning – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 1.32 standard deviations higher (0.46 to 2.18 higher)
Quality of life – post-treatment (measured with: Self rated; Better indicated by higher values)											
129 (1 study)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistenc y	no serious indirectnes s	very serious[1]	undetect ed	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW[1] due to imprecision	67	62	-		The mean quality of life – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.16 standard deviations lower (0.5 lower to 0.19 higher)
Quality of life – follow-up (measured with: Self rated; Better indicated by lower values)											
140 (1 study) 31 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistenc y	no serious indirectnes s	very serious[1]	undetect ed	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW[1] due to imprecision	70	70	-		The mean quality of life – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.02 standard deviations lower (0.35 lower to 0.32 higher)

[1] Optimal information size not met; small, single study
[2] Crucial limitation for one criterion or some limitations for multiple criteria sufficient to lower ones confidence in the estimate of effect
[3] $I^2 > 40\%$
[4] Optimal information size not met