

**Table O.6: Male gender versus female gender as a risk factor for challenging behaviour**

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
Participant s (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publicatio n bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated absolute effects	
							With female gender	With male gender		Risk with female gender	Risk difference with male gender (95% CI)
<b>All aggression (physical, verbal and destructive) (assessed with: Validated questionnaire and observation)</b>											
2046 (3 studies)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	237/898 (26.4%)	238/1148 (20.7%)	OR 0.63 (0.51 to 0.79)	264 per 1000	80 fewer per 1000 (from 43 fewer to 109 fewer)
<b>Challenging behaviour (global) (assessed with: Validated survey)</b>											
816 (1 study)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>1</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>1</sup> due to imprecision	34/370 (9.2%)	56/446 (12.6%)	OR 1.42 (0.9 to 2.23)	92 per 1000	34 more per 1000 (from 8 fewer to 92 more)
<b>Destruction of property (assessed with: Validated questionnaire)</b>											
3461 (2 studies) 0 to 12 months	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	0/3461 (0%) <sup>2</sup>	-2	Not estimable	See comment <sup>2</sup>	-
<b>Inappropriate sexual behaviour (assessed with: Questionnaire)</b>											
3160	no	no serious	no serious	serious <sup>1</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖	116/1527	194/1633	OR 1.64	76 per	43 more

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
(1 study) 12 months	serious risk of bias	inconsistency	indirectness		d	VERY LOW <sup>1</sup> due to imprecision	(7.6%)	(11.9%)	(1.29 to 2.09)	1000	per 1000 (from 20 more to 71 more)
<b>Physical aggression (assessed with: Validated questionnaires, interviews, observations and medical records)</b>											
6925 (5 studies) 0 to 12 months	no serious risk of bias	serious <sup>3</sup>	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>3</sup> due to inconsistency	0/6925 (0%) <sup>2</sup>	-2	Not estimable	See comment <sup>2</sup>	-
<b>Self-injury – mixed settings (assessed with: Questionnaire and survey)</b>											
6174 (6 studies) 0 to 12 months	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	827/2820 (29.3%)	879/3354 (26.2%)	OR 0.81 (0.69 to 0.96)	293 per 1000	42 fewer per 1000 (from 8 fewer to 71 fewer)
<b>Self-injury- inpatient setting (assessed with: Non-validated questionnaire, survey and interview )</b>											
18227 (5 studies) 0 to 3 years	no serious risk of bias	very serious <sup>4</sup>	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>4</sup> due to inconsistency	1008/8246 (12.2%)	1220/9981 (12.2%)	OR 0.97 (0.76 to 1.23)	122 per 1000	3 fewer per 1000 (from 27 fewer to 24 more)
<b>Stereotypy (assessed with: Validated questionnaire)</b>											
915 (1 study)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>1</sup>	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW <sup>1</sup> due to imprecision	169/411 (41.1%)	209/504 (41.5%)	RR 1.01 (0.86 to 1.18)	411 per 1000	4 more per 1000 (from 58 fewer to 74 more)
<b>Verbal aggression (assessed with: Validated questionnaire)</b>											
3461 (2 studies) 0 to 12 months	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	See comment	0/3461 (0%) <sup>2</sup>	-2	Not estimable	See comment <sup>2</sup>	-

Quality assessment	Summary of findings
1 Optimal information size not met; single study 2 N/A; Generic inverse variance 3 $I^2 > 40\%$ 4 $I^2 > 75\%$	