Table O.46: Withdrawal of zuclopenthixol versus continuation of zuclopenthixol in adults

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 continuation of zuclopenthixol	With withdrawal of zuclopenthixol		Risk with continuation of zuclopenthixol	Risk difference with withdrawal of zuclopenthixol (95% CI)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (relapse) – post-treatment											
39 (1 study)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	12/19 (63.2%)	19/20 (95%)	RR 1.5 (1.05 to 2.15)	632 per 1000	316 more per 1000 (from 32 more to 726 more)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (measured with: End-point score; Better indicated by lower values)											
39 (1 study)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	19	20	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.56 standard deviations higher

											(0.08 lower to 1.2 higher)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment (measured with: Change score; Better indicated by lower values)											
85 (1 study)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	45	40	-		The mean targeted behaviour that challenges (severity) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.68 standard deviations higher (0.24 to 1.11 higher)
Targeted behaviour that challenges (problems in management) – post-treatment											
43 (1 study)	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[2,3] due to risk of bias, imprecision	5/24 (20.8%)	7/19 (36.8%)	RR 1.77 (0.67 to 4.7)	208 per 1000	160 more per 1000 (from 69 fewer to 771 more)
Adaptive functioning (social) – post-treatment (Better indicated by higher values)											
85 (1 study)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	45	40	-		The mean adaptive functioning (social) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.47 standard deviations lower (0.9 to 0.04 lower)
Adverse events (weight gain; kg) – post- treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
39 (1 study)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	19	20	-		The mean adverse events (weight gain; kg) – post- treatment in the intervention groups was 0.55 standard

											deviations lower (1.19 lower to 0.09 higher)
Adverse events (drowsiness, non-occurrence) – post-treatment											
42 (1 study)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	19/20 (95%)	21/22 (95.5%)	RR 1 (0.88 to 1.15)	950 per 1000	0 fewer per 1000 (from 114 fewer to 142 more)
Adverse events (discontinuation due to adverse events, non-occurrence) – post-treatment											
204 (3 studies)	serious[4]	serious[5]	no serious indirectness	serious[6]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[4,5,6] due to risk of bias, inconsistency, imprecision	98/103 (95.1%)	80/101 (79.2%)	RR 0.86 (0.71 to 1.04)	951 per 1000	133 fewer per 1000 (from 276 fewer to 38 more)
Adverse events (discontinuation due to other reasons, non-occurrence) – post-treatment											
91 (2 studies)	serious[4]	very serious[7]	no serious indirectness	serious[6]	undetected	⨁⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[4,6,7] due to risk of bias, inconsistency, imprecision	38/46 (82.6%)	29/45 (64.4%)	RR 0.73 (0.33 to 1.64)	826 per 1000	223 fewer per 1000 (from 553 fewer to 529 more)

[1] Crucial limitation for one criterion or some limitations for multiple criteria sufficient to lower ones confidence in the estimate of effect
[2] Optimal information size not met; small, single study
[3] Crucial limitation for one or more criteria sufficient to substantially lower ones confidence in the estimate of effect
[4] Most information is from studies at moderate risk of bias
[5] $I^2 > 40\%$
[6] Optimal information size not met
[7] $I^2 > 75\%$