

**Table O.9: Visual impairment versus no visual impairment as a risk factor for challenging behaviour**

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
Participant s (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 No impairmen t	With Visual impairmen t		Risk with No impairmen t	Risk difference with Visual impairment (95% CI)
<b>All aggression (physical, verbal and destructive) (assessed with: Validated questionnaire)</b>											
1938 (2 studies)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	349/1422 (24.5%)	66/516 (12.8%)	OR 1.22 (0.78 to 1.92)	245 per 1000	39 more per 1000 (from 43 fewer to 139 more)
<b>Self-injury (assessed with: Validated questionnaire)</b>											
2086 (3 studies)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	384/1564 (24.6%)	73/522 (14%)	OR 1.45 (1.02 to 2.06)	246 per 1000	75 more per 1000 (from 4 more to 156 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	356/880 (40.5%)	22/35 (62.9%)	OR 2.49 (1.24 to 5.01)	405 per 1000	224 more per 1000 (from 53 more to 368 more)
<sup>1</sup> Optimal information size; single study											