Table O.31: Aripiprazole versus placebo in children and young people

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 placebo	With aripiprazole		Risk with placebo	Risk difference with aripiprazole (95% CI)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
308 (2 studies)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[3]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2,3] due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	98	210	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.64 standard deviations lower (0.91 to 0.36 lower)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity, non-improvement) – post-treatment											
308 (2 studies)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[3]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2,3] due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	74/98 (75.5 %)	100/210 (47.6%)	RR 0.65 (0.5 to 0.84)	755 per 1000	264 fewer per 1000 (from 121 fewer to 378 fewer)
Quality of life – post-treatment (Better indicated by higher values)											
243 (2 studies)	serious[1]	very serious[4]	serious[2]	serious[3]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2,3],4 due to risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision	76	167	-		The mean quality of life – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.6 standard deviations higher (0.17 lower to 1.37 higher)

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
Adverse events (elevated prolactin, non-occurrence) – post-treatment											
313 (2 studies)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[3]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2,3] due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	96/101 (95%)	211/212 (99.5%)	RR 1.05 (0.99 to 1.1)	950 per 1000	48 more per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 95 more)
Adverse events (weight gain; kg) – post- treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
216 (1 study)	serious[5]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[6]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[2,5,6] due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	51	165	-		The mean adverse events (weight gain; kg) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.48 standard deviations higher (0.17 to 0.8 higher)
Adverse events (weight gain; clinically sig., non-occurrence)											
313 (2 studies)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[3]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2,3] due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	94/101 (93.1%)	156/212 (73.6%)	RR 0.79 (0.71 to 0.88)	931 per 1000	195 fewer per 1000 (from 112 fewer to 270 fewer)
Adverse events (sedation, non-occurrence) – post-treatment											
313 (2 studies)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[3]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2,3] due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	96/101 (95%)	165/212 (77.8%)	RR 0.83 (0.76 to 0.91)	950 per 1000	162 fewer per 1000 (from 86 fewer to 228 fewer)
Adverse events (seizure, non-occurrence) – post-treatment											
216 (1 study)	serious[5]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[6]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[2,5,6] due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	50/51 (98%)	165/165 (100%)	RR 1.03 (0.98 to 1.08)	980 per 1000	29 more per 1000 (from 20 fewer to 78 more)

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
Adverse events (discontinuation due to adverse events, non-occurrence) – post-treatment											
316 (2 studies)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[3]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2,3] due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	96/103 (93.2%)	191/213 (89.7%)	RR 0.96 (0.89 to 1.04)	932 per 1000	37 fewer per 1000 (from 103 fewer to 37 more)
Adverse events (discontinuation due to other reasons, non-occurrence) – post-treatment											
316 (2 studies)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[3]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2,3] due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	81/103 (78.6%)	201/213 (94.4%)	RR 1.19 (1.07 to 1.33)	786 per 1000	149 more per 1000 (from 55 more to 260 more)

1 Most information is from studies at moderate risk of bias
[2] Applicability – different populations
[3] Optimal information size not met
[4] I^2 > 75%
[5] Crucial limitation for one criterion or some limitations for multiple criteria sufficient to lower ones confidence in the estimate of effect.
[6] Optimal information size not met; small, single study