

**Table O.27: Sleep 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 sleep interventions		Risk with any control	Risk difference with sleep interventions (95% CI)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (global problem sleep behaviour, non-improvement) – post-treatment</b>											
69 (1 study)	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	serious <sup>2</sup>	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>1,2,3</sup> due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	21/34 (61.8%)	5/35 (14.3%)	RR 0.23 (0.1 to 0.54)	618 per 1000	476 fewer per 1000 (from 284 fewer to 556 fewer)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (global problem sleep behaviour) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
154 (4 studies)	serious <sup>4</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>5</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW <sup>4,5</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	77	77	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (global problem sleep behaviour) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 1.05 standard deviations lower (1.48 to 0.63 lower)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (global problem sleep behaviour) – follow-up (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
130	serious	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious	serious <sup>5</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖	55	75	-		The mean targeted behaviour

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
(3 studies) 6 to 26 weeks	us <sup>4</sup>		indirectness		ed	VERY LOW <sup>4,5,6</sup> due to risk of bias, inconsistency, imprecision					that challenges (global problem sleep behaviour) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.92 standard deviations lower (1.6 to 0.24 lower)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (total sleep time) – post-treatment (measured with: Actigraph; Better indicated by higher values)</b>											
96 (2 studies)	serious <sup>4</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>5</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW <sup>4,5</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	48	48	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (total sleep time) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.62 standard deviations higher (0.2 to 1.03 higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (sleep efficiency) – post-treatment (measured with: Actigraph; Better indicated by higher values)</b>											
96 (2 studies)	serious <sup>4</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>5</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW <sup>4,5</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	48	48	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (sleep efficiency) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.24 standard deviations higher (0.26 lower to 0.74 higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (total sleep time) – follow-up (measured with: Actigraph; Better indicated by higher values)</b>											
46 (1 study) 26 weeks	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>1,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	23	23	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (total sleep time) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.14 standard deviations higher (0.44 lower to 0.71 higher)

Quality assessment						Summary of findings					
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (sleep efficiency) – follow-up (measured with: Actigraph; Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
46 (1 study) 26 weeks	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW <sup>1,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	23	23	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (sleep efficiency) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.11 standard deviations lower (0.69 lower to 0.46 higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (sleep onset latency) – post-treatment (measured with: Actigraph; Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
69 (1 study)	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	serious <sup>2</sup>	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW <sup>1,2,3</sup> due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	34	35	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (sleep onset latency) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.59 standard deviations lower (1.07 to 0.11 lower)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (wake after sleep onset) – post-treatment (measured with: Actigraph; Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
96 (2 studies)	serious <sup>4</sup>	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>5</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW <sup>4,5,6</sup> due to risk of bias, inconsistency, imprecision	48	48	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (wake after sleep onset) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.31 standard deviations lower (1.13 lower to 0.51 higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (wake after sleep onset) – follow-up (measured with: Actigraph; Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
46 (1 study) 26 weeks	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW <sup>1,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	23	23	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (wake after sleep onset) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.29 standard deviations higher (0.29 lower to 0.88 higher)

Quality assessment						Summary of findings					
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (total sleep time) post-treatment (measured with: Sleep diary; Better indicated by higher values)</b>											
30 (1 study)	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>1,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	15	15	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (total sleep time) post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.3 standard deviations lower (1.02 lower to 0.42 higher)
<b>Targeted behaviour that challenges (activity score) – post-treatment (measured with: Sleep diary; Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
30 (1 study)	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>1,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	15	15	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (activity score) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.28 standard deviations higher (0.44 lower to 1 higher)
<b>Carer Satisfaction (non-satisfied) – post-treatment</b>											
30 (1 study)	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>3</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>1,3</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	2/17 (11.8%)	1/13 (7.7%)	RR 0.65 (0.07 to 6.45)	118 per 1000	41 fewer per 1000 (from 109 fewer to 641 more)
<sup>1</sup> Crucial limitation for one criterion or some limitations for multiple criteria sufficient to lower ones confidence in the estimate of effect <sup>2</sup> Applicability- different populations <sup>3</sup> Optimal information size not met; small, single study <sup>4</sup> Most information is from studies at moderate risk of bias <sup>5</sup> Optimal information size not met <sup>6</sup> I <sup>2</sup> > 40%											