## Table 0.34: Olanzapine versus haloperidol in children and young people

Quality assessment						Summary of findings					
nts	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecis ion	Publicati on bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relativ e effect	Anticipated absolute effects	
							With haloper idol	With olanza pine	(95% CI)	Risk with haloperi dol	Risk difference with olanzapine (95% CI)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
12 (1 study)	very seriou s <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	no serious indirectnes s	very serious <sup>2</sup>	undetect ed	$\begin{array}{c} \bigoplus \bigcirc \bigcirc \\ \lor \\ VERY \\ LOW^{1,2} \\ due \text{ to risk} \\ of bias, \\ imprecision \end{array}$	6	6	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 1.4 standard deviations lower (2.73 to 0.08 lower)
Adverse events (drowsiness, non-occurrence) – post-treatment											
12	very	no serious	no serious	very	undetect	$\oplus \Theta \Theta \Theta$	4/6	1/6	RR	667 per	500 fewer per 1000

Challenging behaviour and learning disabilities

s <sup>1</sup> y s LOW <sup>1,2</sup> ) (0.55 1000 due to risk to	(1 study)	seriou S <sup>1</sup>	inconsistenc y	indirectnes s	serious <sup>2</sup>	ed	VERY LOW <sup>1,2</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	(66.7% )	(16.7% )	0.25 (0.04 to 1.63)	1000	(from 640 fewer to 420 more)
$            \begin{array}{c} (1 \ \text{study}) \\ \text{s}^{1} \\ \text{s}^{1}$												
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		seriou		indirectnes			VERY LOW <sup>1,2</sup> due to risk of bias,	6	6	-		(weight gain; kg) – post- treatment in the intervention groups was 1.26 standard deviations higher
(1 study) seriou inconsistenc indirectnes s s <sup>1</sup> y s s s serious <sup>2</sup> ed $VERY$ (100%) (83.3% 0.85 (0.55 to to to the serious of the series of the	Adverse events (weight gain) – post-treatment											
imprecision		seriou		indirectnes			VERY LOW <sup>1,2</sup> due to risk of bias,			0.85 (0.55	per	150 fewer per 1000 (from 450 fewer to 310 more)

<sup>2</sup> Optimal information size not met; small, single study