

Table O.8: Mobility impairment versus no mobility impairment 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 no impairmen t	With mobility impairment		Risk with no impairmen t	Risk difference with mobility impairment (95% CI)
All aggression (physical, verbal and destructive) (assessed with: Validated questionnaire)											
1023 (1 study)	no seriou s risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ¹ due to imprecision	78/775 (10.1%)	22/248 (8.9%)	OR 0.87 (0.53 to 1.43)	101 per 1000	12 fewer per 1000 (from 45 fewer to 37 more)
Self-injury- adult population (assessed with: Validated questionnaire)											
1023 (1 study)	no seriou s risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ¹ due to imprecision	78/775 (10.1%)	22/248 (8.9%)	OR 0.87 (0.53 to 1.43)	101 per 1000	12 fewer per 1000 (from 45 fewer to 37 more)
Self-injury- children and young people population (assessed with: Validated questionnaire)											
147 (1 study)	no seriou s risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ¹ due to imprecision	64/134 (47.8%)	9/13 (69.2%)	OR 2.46 (0.72 to 8.38)	478 per 1000	215 more per 1000 (from 81 fewer to 407 more)
¹ Optimal information size not met; single study											