Table O.35: Topiramate (plus risperidone) versus placebo (plus risperidone) in children and young people

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
Participa	Risk of	Inconsisten cy	Indirectn ess	Imprecis ion	Publicati on bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relativ	Anticipated absolute effects	
nts (studies) Follow up	bias						With placebo plus risperido ne	With topiramat e plus risperidon e	e effect (95% CI)	Risk with Placebo plus risperidon e	Risk difference with topiramate plus risperidone (95% CI)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
40 (1 study)	no seriou s risk of bias	no serious inconsistenc y	serious <sup>1</sup>	very serious <sup>2</sup>	undetect ed	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW¹,² due to indirectness , imprecision	20	20			The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post- treatment in the intervention groups was 1.88 standard deviations lower (2.63 to 1.12 lower)
Adverse events (sedation, non-occurrence) – post-treatment											
40 (1 study)	no seriou s risk of bias	no serious inconsistenc y	serious <sup>1</sup>	very serious <sup>2</sup>	undetect ed	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW¹,² due to indirectness , imprecision	16/20 (80%)	19/20 (95%)	RR 1.19 (0.93 to 1.51)	800 per 1000	152 more per 1000 (from 56 fewer to 408 more)
Adverse events (weight at endpoint; kg) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
40 (1 study)	no seriou s risk of bias	no serious inconsistenc y	serious <sup>1</sup>	very serious <sup>2</sup>	undetect ed	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>1,2</sup> due to	20	20	-		The mean adverse events (weight at endpoint; kg) – post-treatment in the

Quality assessment	Summary of findings	Summary of findings		
	indirectness , imprecision	intervention groups was 0.24 standard deviations lower (0.87 lower to 0.38 higher)		
<sup>1</sup> Applicability – different populations <sup>2</sup> Optimal information size not met; small, single study				