#### APPENDIX 16: COMPLETED METHODOLOGY CHECKLISTS

1.1	Case identification instruments	4
1.	1.1 Studies of diagnostic test accuracy	4
	ALLISON2001	
	BARONCOHEN2001	5
	BERUMENT1999	6
	KRAIJER2005	7
	KURITA2005	8
	VOLKMAR1988	9
	WAKABAYASHI2005	10
	WOODBURYSMITH2005	
1.2	Assessment instruments	12
1	2.1 Studies of diagnostic test accuracy	12
1.	BARONCOHEN2005	
	DZIOBEK2006	
	GARFIN1988	
	GILLBERG2001	
	LORD1997	
	LORD2000	
	MATSON2007A	
	MATSON2007B	
	MATSON2008	
	RITVO2008	
	RITVO2011	
1.3	Psychosocial interventions	23
1.	3.1 Randomised controlled trials	23
	BOTSFORD2004	
	GARCIAVILLAMISAR2010	26
	GARCIAVILLAMISAR2011	29
	GOLAN2006	32
	KHEMKA2000	35
	KHEMKA2005	38
	LAUGESON2009	41
	LEE1977	44
	MATSON1981	47
1	3.2 Observational studies (cohort studies)	50
1.	ELLIOTT1991	
	ERGUNERTEKINALP2004	
	GARCIAVILLAMISAR2000	
	GARCIAVILLAMISAR2002	
	GARCIAVILLAMISAR2007	
	HARRIS1984	

LINDSAY2004	68
MAWHOOD1999	71
MAZZUCCHELLI2001	74
ROSE2005	77
RUSSELL2009	80
TAYLOR2005	
1.3.3 Observational studies (before-and-after studies)	86
BATHAEE2001	
BENSON1986	
FELDMAN1999	92
HERBRECHT2009	95
HILLIER2007	
HOWLIN1999	
HOWLIN2005	
KING1999	107
MYLES1996A	
POLIRSTOK2003	
TSE2007	116
WEBB2004	
1.4 Biomedical Interventions	
1.4.1 Randomised controlled trials	
BELSITO2001	
GAGIANO2005	
HAESSLER2007	
HELLINGS2005	
HELLINGS2006	
HOLLANDER2010	
IZMETH1988	
KARSTEN1981	141
MCDOUGLE1996	144
MCDOUGLE1998A	147
MCKENZIE1966	
REMINGTON2001	
SINGH1992	
1.4.2	
TYRER2008	
VANDENBORRE1993	
VANHEMERT1975	
HARDAN2004	
1.4.3 Observational studies (before-and-after)	
СООК1992	
HANDEN2006	
MCDOUGLE1998B	

<b>1.5</b> Organisation and delivery of care: Settings for care	
1.5.1 Randomised controlled trials	
HASSIOTIS2009	
RAGHAVAN2009	
1.5.2 Observational studies (cohort studies)	
BARLOW1991	
CHOU2008	
CULLEN1995	
DAGNAN1994A	
HOLBURN2004	
KEARNEY1995	
MCCONKEY2007	
MOLONY1990	
SCHALOCK1984	
SCHWARTZ2003	
SPREAT1998	219
1.5.3 Observational studies (before-and-after studies)	
BHAUMIK2009	
BOURAS1993	
CHOU2011	
DAGNAN1998	
DONNELLY1996	
GASKELL1995	
HEMMING1983	
SIAPERAS2006	
SPREAT2002	
WEHMEYER2001	

# **1.1 CASE IDENTIFICATION INSTRUMENTS**

### **1.1.1** Studies of diagnostic test accuracy

Study ID	ALLISON2001			
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Allison, C. & Baron-Cohen, S. Towards brief 'red flags' for autism screening: the short AQ and the short Q-CHAT in 1000 cases and 3000 controls. Unpublished.				
Guideline topic: Autism in adults	•	<b>Review question no:</b> A2		
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku				
Was the spectrum of participants representation who will receive the test in practice?	tive of the patients	Yes		
Were selection criteria clearly described?		Yes		
Was the reference standard likely to classify condition correctly?	the target	Yes		
Was the period between performance of the and the index test short enough to be reason target condition did not change between the	ably sure that the two tests?	Unclear		
Did the whole sample or a random selection of the sample receive verification using the reference standard?		Yes		
Did participants receive the same reference of the index test result?	standard regardless	Yes		
Was the reference standard independent of is, the index test did not form part of the refe		Unclear		
Was the execution of the index test described to permit its replication?		Yes		
Was the execution of the reference standard sufficient detail to permit its replication?	described in	Yes		
Were the index test results interpreted withe the results of the reference standard?	out knowledge of	Unclear		
Were the reference standard results interpreknowledge of the results of the index test?	ted without	Unclear		
Were the same clinical data available when the interpreted as would be available when the practice?		Yes		
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or inter results reported?	rmediate test	Unclear		
Were withdrawals from the study explained	!?	Unclear		

Study ID	BARONCOHEN20	01
Bibliographic reference:		
Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Skinner, I		
(AQ): evidence from asperger syndrome/hi	0	
scientists and mathematicians. Journal of Aut	tism and Developmenta	
Guideline topic: Autism in adults		<b>Review question no:</b> A2
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representa	tive of the patients	N
who will receive the test in practice?	-	Yes
Were selection criteria clearly described?		Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify	the target	Yes
condition correctly?	unformer of stars david	
Was the period between performance of the		Unclear
and the index test short enough to be reason	5	Unclear
target condition did not change between the		No
Did the whole sample or a random selection receive verification using the reference stand	-	Of the control groups
		(Group 1 & 2) only group 3
		(students) received
		verification. Group 1
		completed AQ anonymously so this was not possible
Did participants receive the same reference	standard regardless	
of the index test result?	standard regulatess	Yes
Was the reference standard independent of	the index test? (that	
is, the index test did not form part of the refe		Yes
Was the execution of the index test describe	1	
to permit its replication?		Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard	described in	
sufficient detail to permit its replication?	debellbed III	Yes
Were the index test results interpreted with	out knowledge of	
the results of the reference standard?		Yes
Were the reference standard results interpre	ted without	
knowledge of the results of the index test?		Yes
Were the same clinical data available when	the test results were	
interpreted as would be available when the		Yes
practice?		
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or inte	rmediate test	1
results reported?		Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained	1?	TT1
		Unclear

Study ID	BERUMENT1999	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Berument, S.K., Rutter, M., Lord, C., <i>et al.</i> (19)	-	g questionnaire:
diagnostic validity. <i>British Journal of Psychiat</i> Guideline topic: Autism in adults	ry, 175, 444-451.	<b>Review question no:</b> A2
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representa who will receive the test in practice?	tive of the patients	Yes Population included both adults and children
Were selection criteria clearly described?		Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify condition correctly?	the target	Yes
Was the period between performance of the and the index test short enough to be reason target condition did not change between the	ably sure that the	No Participants tested with reference standard before index test several years previously
Did the whole sample or a random selection receive verification using the reference stand	-	Yes
Did participants receive the same reference s of the index test result?	standard regardless	Yes
Was the reference standard independent of tis, the index test did not form part of the refe		No ASQ is based on the ADI-R
Was the execution of the index test described to permit its replication?	,	Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard sufficient detail to permit its replication?	described in	Yes
Were the index test results interpreted with the results of the reference standard?	out knowledge of	Unclear
Were the reference standard results interpre knowledge of the results of the index test?	ted without	Unclear
Were the same clinical data available when t interpreted as would be available when the practice?		Yes
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or inter results reported?	rmediate test	Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained	1?	Unclear

Study ID	KRAIJER2005	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Kraijer, D. & de Bildt A. (2005) The PDD-MRS spectrum disorders in persons with mental re		
<i>Developmental Disorders, 35,</i> 499-513. <b>Guideline topic:</b> Autism in adults		<b>Review question no:</b> A2
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representati who will receive the test in practice?	ive of the patients	Yes Participants also had intellectual disability
Were selection criteria clearly described?		Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify t condition correctly?	he target	Yes
Was the period between performance of the r and the index test short enough to be reasona target condition did not change between the t	bly sure that the	Unclear
Did the whole sample or a random selection or receive verification using the reference standard	of the sample	Yes
Did participants receive the same reference st of the index test result?	andard regardless	Unclear
Was the reference standard independent of the is, the index test did not form part of the reference to the reference of the r		Yes
Was the execution of the index test described to permit its replication?	in sufficient detail	Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard d sufficient detail to permit its replication?	lescribed in	Unclear Only states diagnosis made via clinical classification but no specifics given
Were the index test results interpreted without the results of the reference standard?	ıt knowledge of	Unclear
Were the reference standard results interprete knowledge of the results of the index test?	ed without	Unclear
Were the same clinical data available when th interpreted as would be available when the tepractice?		Yes
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or interr results reported?	nediate test	Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained?		Unclear

Bibliographic reference:			
Kurita, H., Koyama, T. & Osada H. (2005) Autism-spectrum	n quotient-Japanese version		
and its short forms for screening normally intelligent persons with pervasive			
developmental disorders. Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscien	-		
Guideline topic: Autism in adults	Review question no: A2		
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku	<u>.</u>		
Was the spectrum of participants representative of the pati who will receive the test in practice?	ents Yes		
Were selection criteria clearly described?	Yes		
Was the reference standard likely to classify the target condition correctly?	Yes		
Was the period between performance of the reference stand and the index test short enough to be reasonably sure that target condition did not change between the two tests?			
Did the whole sample or a random selection of the sample receive verification using the reference standard?	No Control group was not formally diagnosed as they completed the AQ anonymously by post		
Did participants receive the same reference standard regard of the index test result?	dless Yes		
Was the reference standard independent of the index test? is, the index test did not form part of the reference standard	Y OC		
Was the execution of the index test described in sufficient c to permit its replication?	letail Yes		
Was the execution of the reference standard described in sufficient detail to permit its replication?	Yes		
Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge the results of the reference standard?	of Unclear		
Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test?	Unclear		
Were the same clinical data available when the test results interpreted as would be available when the test is used in practice?	were Yes		
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or intermediate test results reported?	Unclear		
Were withdrawals from the study explained?	Unclear		

Study ID	VOLKMAR1988	
Bibliographic reference:		
Volkmar, F.R., Cicchetti, D.V., Dykens, E., et a	<i>ıl.</i> (1988) An evaluat	ion of the autism
behavior checklist. Journal of Autism and Devel		
Guideline topic: Autism in adults	, , ,	Review question no:
I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I		A2
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representat	ive of the patients	• /
who will receive the test in practice?	1	Yes
Were selection criteria clearly described?		Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify t	he target	Yes
condition correctly?	_	ies
Was the period between performance of the r	eference standard	
and the index test short enough to be reasona		Unclear
target condition did not change between the t	two tests?	
Did the whole sample or a random selection	of the sample	Vac
receive verification using the reference standa	ard?	Yes
Did participants receive the same reference st		Vac
of the index test result?	_	Yes
Was the reference standard independent of th	ne index test? (that	Yes
is, the index test did not form part of the refer	rence standard)	165
Was the execution of the index test described	in sufficient detail	Yes
to permit its replication?		Tes
Was the execution of the reference standard of	lescribed in	Yes
sufficient detail to permit its replication?		165
Were the index test results interpreted without	ut knowledge of	Yes
the results of the reference standard?		165
Were the reference standard results interprete	ed without	Yes
knowledge of the results of the index test?		Although teachers and
		parents were obviously
		aware of previous diagnosis they were not aware of the
		purpose of the checklist and
		that the checklist related to
		diagnosis of autism
Were the same clinical data available when the	ne test results were	
interpreted as would be available when the te	est is used in	Yes
practice?		
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or interr	mediate test	Unclear
results reported?		Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained?	)	Unclear
· · ·		Unclear

Study ID	WAKABAYASHI20	005
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Wakabayashi, A., Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwri quotient (AQ) in Japan: a cross-cultural comp	0	-
<i>Disorders, 36, 263-270.</i> <b>Guideline topic:</b> Autism in adults		<b>Review question no:</b> A2
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representat who will receive the test in practice?	ive of the patients	Yes
Were selection criteria clearly described?		Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify t condition correctly?	he target	Yes
Was the period between performance of the r and the index test short enough to be reasona target condition did not change between the	bly sure that the	Unclear
Did the whole sample or a random selection of the sample receive verification using the reference standard?		Unclear
Did participants receive the same reference st of the index test result?	andard regardless	No Only Group1 received a diagnosis
Was the reference standard independent of the index test did not form part of the reference test did not form part of the reference test.		Yes
Was the execution of the index test described to permit its replication?	in sufficient detail	Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard c sufficient detail to permit its replication?	lescribed in	Yes
Were the index test results interpreted without the results of the reference standard?	ut knowledge of	Unclear
Were the reference standard results interpret knowledge of the results of the index test?	ed without	Unclear
Were the same clinical data available when the interpreted as would be available when the tepractice?		Yes
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or intern results reported?	mediate test	Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained?		Unclear

Study ID	WOODBURYSMIT	H2005
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Woodbury-Smith, M.R., Robinson, J., Wheelv		
Asperger syndrome using the AQ: a prelimin		•
practice. <i>Journal of Autism and Developmental L</i> Guideline topic: Autism in adults	Disorders, 35, 331-335	Review question no:
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representat who will receive the test in practice?	ive of the patients	Yes
Were selection criteria clearly described?		Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify t condition correctly?	he target	Yes
Was the period between performance of the r and the index test short enough to be reasona target condition did not change between the	bly sure that the	Unclear
Did the whole sample or a random selection or receive verification using the reference stands	of the sample	Yes
Did participants receive the same reference st of the index test result?		Yes
Was the reference standard independent of the index test did not form part of the reference test did not form part of the reference test did not form part of the reference test.	•	Yes
Was the execution of the index test described to permit its replication?	,	Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard c sufficient detail to permit its replication?	lescribed in	Yes
Were the index test results interpreted without the results of the reference standard?	ut knowledge of	No AQ score is used as part of clinical practice, but diagnosis was made regardless of AQ score
Were the reference standard results interpret knowledge of the results of the index test?	ed without	Unclear
Were the same clinical data available when the interpreted as would be available when the tepractice?		Yes
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or intern results reported?	mediate test	Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained?		Unclear

## **1.2 ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS**

### **1.2.1** Studies of diagnostic test accuracy

Study ID	BARONCOHEN20	05
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Robinson	, J., <i>et al</i> . (2005) The A	dult Asperger
Assessment (AAA): a diagnostic method. <i>Jou</i> 807-819.		
Guideline topic: Autism in adults		<b>Review question no:</b> B1
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representa who will receive the test in practice?	tive of the patients	Yes
Were selection criteria clearly described?		Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify condition correctly?		Yes
Was the period between performance of the and the index test short enough to be reason target condition did not change between the	ably sure that the	Unclear
Did the whole sample or a random selection receive verification using the reference stand		Yes
Did participants receive the same reference s of the index test result?	standard regardless	Yes
Was the reference standard independent of is, the index test did not form part of the refe		Yes
Was the execution of the index test described to permit its replication?	d in sufficient detail	Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard sufficient detail to permit its replication?	described in	Unclear Components of clinical interview not stated
Were the index test results interpreted with the results of the reference standard?	out knowledge of	No Same clinician completed the reference standard and the AAA
Were the reference standard results interpreknowledge of the results of the index test?	ted without	Unclear
Were the same clinical data available when the interpreted as would be available when the practice?		Yes
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or inter results reported?	rmediate test	Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained	!?	Unclear

Study ID DZ	OBEK2006
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Dziobek, I., Fleck, S., Kalbe, E., <i>et al</i> . (2006) Introd	ucing MASC: a Movie for the
Assessment of Social Cognition. <i>Journal of Autism</i> <b>Guideline topic:</b> Autism in adults	Review question no: B1
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku	
Was the spectrum of participants representative who will receive the test in practice?	of the patients Yes
Were selection criteria clearly described?	Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify the t condition correctly?	arget Yes
Was the period between performance of the refer and the index test short enough to be reasonably target condition did not change between the two	sure that the Unclear
Did the whole sample or a random selection of the receive verification using the reference standard?	e sample Ves
Did participants receive the same reference stand of the index test result?	
Was the reference standard independent of the ir is, the index test did not form part of the reference	Y DC
Was the execution of the index test described in s to permit its replication?	ufficient detail Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard desc sufficient detail to permit its replication?	ribed in Unclear Components of clinical interview not stated
Were the index test results interpreted without keets the results of the reference standard?	nowledge of Yes
Were the reference standard results interpreted v knowledge of the results of the index test?	vithout Yes
Were the same clinical data available when the te interpreted as would be available when the test is practice?	
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or intermed results reported?	iate test Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained?	Yes

Study ID	GARFIN1988	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Garfin, D. & McCallon, D. (1988) Validity ar Scale with autistic adolescents. <i>Journal of Au</i>		
Guideline topic: Autism in adults	iism unu Deoelopmenti	Review question no: B1
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representa who will receive the test in practice?	tive of the patients	Yes Although age range goes into adulthood, mean age is adolescent
Were selection criteria clearly described?		Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify condition correctly?	the target	No AAPEP was used
Was the period between performance of the reference standard and the index test short enough to be reasonably sure that the target condition did not change between the two tests?		Unclear
Did the whole sample or a random selection of the sample receive verification using the reference standard?		Yes
Did participants receive the same reference of the index test result?	standard regardless	Yes
Was the reference standard independent of is, the index test did not form part of the refe		Yes
Was the execution of the index test described to permit its replication?	d in sufficient detail	Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard sufficient detail to permit its replication?	described in	Yes
Were the index test results interpreted with the results of the reference standard?	out knowledge of	Yes
Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test?		Yes
Were the same clinical data available when the interpreted as would be available when the practice?		Unclear
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or inter results reported?	rmediate test	Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained	!?	Yes

Study ID (	GILLBERG2001	
Bibliographic reference:		
Gillberg, C., Gillberg, C., Rastam, M., et al. (2001) The Asperger Syndrome (and High		
Functioning Autism) Diagnostic Interview (ASDI): a preliminary study of a new		
structured clinical interview. Autism, 5, 57-66.		
Guideline topic: Autism in adults	<b>Review question no:</b> B1	
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representative who will receive the test in practice?	ve of the patients Yes	
Were selection criteria clearly described?	Yes	
Was the reference standard likely to classify th condition correctly?	e target Yes	
Was the period between performance of the re and the index test short enough to be reasonable		
target condition did not change between the tw		
Did the whole sample or a random selection or receive verification using the reference standard	f the sample	
Did participants receive the same reference sta of the index test result?		
	ainday tost? (that	
Was the reference standard independent of the is, the index test did not form part of the reference of the r	ence standard)	
Was the execution of the index test described i to permit its replication?	n sufficient detail Yes	
Was the execution of the reference standard de sufficient detail to permit its replication?	escribed in Yes	
Were the index test results interpreted withou the results of the reference standard?	t knowledge of Yes	
Were the reference standard results interprete knowledge of the results of the index test?	d without Yes	
Were the same clinical data available when the interpreted as would be available when the test practice?		
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or interm results reported?	nediate test Unclear	
Were withdrawals from the study explained?	Unclear	

Study ID	LORD1997

#### **Bibliographic reference:**

Lord, C., Pickles, A., McLennan, J., *et al.* (1997) Diagnosing autism: analyses of data from the Autism Diagnostic Interview. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 27, 501-517.

Guideline topic: Autism in adults	<b>Review question no:</b> B1
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku	
Was the spectrum of participants representative of the patients who will receive the test in practice?	Yes
Were selection criteria clearly described?	Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify the target condition correctly?	Yes
Was the period between performance of the reference standard and the index test short enough to be reasonably sure that the target condition did not change between the two tests?	Unclear
Did the whole sample or a random selection of the sample receive verification using the reference standard?	Yes
Did participants receive the same reference standard regardless of the index test result?	Yes
Was the reference standard independent of the index test? (that is, the index test did not form part of the reference standard)	Yes
Was the execution of the index test described in sufficient detail to permit its replication?	Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard described in sufficient detail to permit its replication?	Yes
Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard?	Yes
Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test?	Yes
Were the same clinical data available when the test results were interpreted as would be available when the test is used in practice?	Yes
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or intermediate test results reported?	Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained?	Unclear

Study ID	LORD2000	
Bibliographic reference:		
Lord, C., Risi, S., Lambrecht, L., et al. (2000) Th	he Autism Diagnost	ic Observation Schedule-
Generic: a standard measure of social and con	nmunication deficits	s associated with the
spectrum of autism. Journal of Autism and Deve	elopmental Disorders,	30, 205-223.
Guideline topic: Autism in adults		<b>Review question no:</b> B1
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representati who will receive the test in practice?	ive of the patients	Yes
Were selection criteria clearly described?		Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify the condition correctly?	he target	Yes
Was the period between performance of the reasonal and the index test short enough to be reasonal target condition did not change between the t	bly sure that the	Unclear
Did the whole sample or a random selection of the sample receive verification using the reference standard?		Yes
Did participants receive the same reference st of the index test result?		Yes
Was the reference standard independent of th is, the index test did not form part of the refer		Yes
Was the execution of the index test described to permit its replication?	,	Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard d sufficient detail to permit its replication?	lescribed in	Yes
Were the index test results interpreted without the results of the reference standard?	ıt knowledge of	Yes
Were the reference standard results interprete knowledge of the results of the index test?	ed without	Yes
Were the same clinical data available when th interpreted as would be available when the te practice?		Yes
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or interr results reported?	nediate test	Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained?		Unclear

Study ID	MATSON2007A	
Bibliographic reference:		
Matson, J. L., Boisjoli, J. A., Gonzalez, M. L., et		
autism spectrum disorders diagnosis for adult	. ,	ity.
Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders, 1, 330-3		
Guideline topic: Autism in adults	<b>Review question</b> B1	n no:
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representative who will receive the test in practice?	ve of the patients Yes	
Were selection criteria clearly described?	Yes	
Was the reference standard likely to classify th condition correctly?	ne target Yes	
Was the period between performance of the re and the index test short enough to be reasonal target condition did not change between the t	bly sure that the Unclear	
Did the whole sample or a random selection or receive verification using the reference standa	f the sample Ves	
Did participants receive the same reference sta of the index test result?		
Was the reference standard independent of th is, the index test did not form part of the reference	Y DC	
Was the execution of the index test described to permit its replication?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Was the execution of the reference standard d sufficient detail to permit its replication?	escribed in Yes	
Were the index test results interpreted withou the results of the reference standard?	t knowledge of Unclear	
Were the reference standard results interprete knowledge of the results of the index test?	d without Unclear	
Were the same clinical data available when the interpreted as would be available when the terpractice?		
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or intern results reported?	nediate test Unclear	
Were withdrawals from the study explained?	Unclear	

Study ID N	AATSON2007B
Bibliographic reference:	
Matson, J. L. & Wilkins, J. (2007) Reliability and	
Disorders – Diagnosis Scale for Intellectually I	
Developmental and Physical Disabilities, 19, 565-5	
Guideline topic: Autism in adults	<b>Review question no:</b> B1
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku	
Was the spectrum of participants representative who will receive the test in practice?	ve of the patients Yes
Were selection criteria clearly described?	Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify th condition correctly?	e target Yes
Was the period between performance of the re and the index test short enough to be reasonab	
target condition did not change between the tw	vo tests?
Did the whole sample or a random selection of receive verification using the reference standar	- YAS
Did participants receive the same reference sta of the index test result?	
Was the reference standard independent of the is, the index test did not form part of the reference	Y OC
Was the execution of the index test described i to permit its replication?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Was the execution of the reference standard de sufficient detail to permit its replication?	escribed in Yes
Were the index test results interpreted without the results of the reference standard?	t knowledge of Unclear
Were the reference standard results interpreter knowledge of the results of the index test?	d without Unclear
Were the same clinical data available when the interpreted as would be available when the test practice?	
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or interm results reported?	ediate test Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained?	Unclear

Study ID	MATSON2008	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Matson, J. L., Wilkins, J., Boisjoli, J. A., <i>et al.</i> (2 disorders-diagnosis for intellectually disabled <i>Disabilities</i> , 29, 537-546.	,	-
<b>Guideline topic:</b> Autism in adults		<b>Review question no:</b> B1
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representat who will receive the test in practice?	ive of the patients	Yes
Were selection criteria clearly described?		Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify t condition correctly?	the target	Yes
Was the period between performance of the reference standard and the index test short enough to be reasonably sure that the target condition did not change between the two tests?		Unclear
Did the whole sample or a random selection of the sample receive verification using the reference standard?		Yes
Did participants receive the same reference standard regardless of the index test result?		Yes
Was the reference standard independent of the index test? (that is, the index test did not form part of the reference standard)		Yes
Was the execution of the index test described in sufficient detail to permit its replication?		Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard described in sufficient detail to permit its replication?		Yes
Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard?		Yes
Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test?		Yes
Were the same clinical data available when the test results were interpreted as would be available when the test is used in practice?		Yes
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or interpretable, results reported?	mediate test	Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained?	2	Unclear

Study ID	RITVO2008	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Ritvo, R. A., Ritvo, E. R., Guthrie, D., <i>et al.</i> (20 and asperger's disorder in adults (RAADS): a		
<i>Developmental Disorders, 38,</i> 213-223. <b>Guideline topic:</b> Autism in adults		<b>Review question no:</b> B1
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku		
Was the spectrum of participants representat who will receive the test in practice?	tive of the patients	Yes
Were selection criteria clearly described?		Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify condition correctly?	the target	Yes
Was the period between performance of the and the index test short enough to be reasonated target condition did not change between the	ably sure that the	Unclear
Did the whole sample or a random selection of the sample receive verification using the reference standard?		Yes
Did participants receive the same reference s of the index test result?		Yes
Was the reference standard independent of t is, the index test did not form part of the refe		Yes
Was the execution of the index test described to permit its replication?	,	Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard sufficient detail to permit its replication?	described in	Yes
Were the index test results interpreted witho the results of the reference standard?	out knowledge of	No Clinicians not blind to participants prior diagnosis
Were the reference standard results interpret knowledge of the results of the index test?	ted without	Yes
Were the same clinical data available when the interpreted as would be available when the t practice?		Yes
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or inter results reported?	mediate test	Unclear
Were withdrawals from the study explained	?	Unclear

Study ID	RITVO2011

#### **Bibliographic reference:**

Ritvo, R. A., Ritvo, E. R., Gutherie, D., *et al.* (2011) The Ritvo Autism Asperger Diagnostic Scale-Revised (RAADS-R): a scale to assist the diagnosis of autism spectrum disorder in adults: an international validation study. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *41*, 1076-1089.

Guideline topic: Autism in adults	<b>Review question no:</b> B1
Checklist completed by: Amina Udechuku	
Was the spectrum of participants representative of the patients who will receive the test in practice?	Yes
Were selection criteria clearly described?	Yes
Was the reference standard likely to classify the target condition correctly?	Yes
Was the period between performance of the reference standard and the index test short enough to be reasonably sure that the target condition did not change between the two tests?	No RAADS-R given straight after diagnosis
Did the whole sample or a random selection of the sample receive verification using the reference standard?	Yes
Did participants receive the same reference standard regardless of the index test result?	Yes
Was the reference standard independent of the index test? (that is, the index test did not form part of the reference standard)	Yes
Was the execution of the index test described in sufficient detail to permit its replication?	Yes
Was the execution of the reference standard described in sufficient detail to permit its replication?	Yes
Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard?	No Same clinician performed diagnosis and assisted with index test
Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test?	No Same clinician performed diagnosis and assisted with index test
Were the same clinical data available when the test results were interpreted as would be available when the test is used in practice?	Yes
Were uninterpretable, indeterminate or intermediate test results reported?	Yes
Were withdrawals from the study explained?	Unclear

# **1.3 PSYCHOSOCIAL INTERVENTIONS**

#### 1.3.1 Randomised controlled trials

Study ID		BOTSFORD2004		
Bibl	Bibliographic reference:			
	Botsford, A.L. & Rule, D. (2004) Evaluation of a group intervention to assist aging parents with permanency planning for an adult offspring with special needs. <i>Social Work, 49,</i> 423-431.			
Guio	leline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> D1		
Chee	<b>klist completed by:</b> Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Unclear		
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes		
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was selection bias present? If so, what		
is the	is the likely direction of its effect?			
	High risk of bias			
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)				
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	No		
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No		

B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 1; Control group N: 0	0 I	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	For how many participants in each group we Experimental group N: 1; Control group N: 0		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinic ikely direction of its effect?	on was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
D. D	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	No	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Unclear	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	No	

	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to	No	
	participants' exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Base	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is th	is the likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
1			

Stud	ły ID	GARCIAVILLAMISAR2010	
Bibl	Bibliographic reference:		
Garc	García-Villamsiar, D.A. & Dattilo, J. (2010) Effects of a leisure programme on quality of life		
	stress of individuals with ASD. Journal of Intelle	10 1 5	
Guideline topic: Adults with autismReview question number: C1			
Checklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect: B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Unclear	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			

	High risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	reatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
the l	ikely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
D. D	Petection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	tained, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what	
is the likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			

Study ID	GARCIAVILLAMISAR2011
Bibliographic reference:	

García-Villamisar, D. & Dattilo, J. (2011) Social and clinical effects of a leisure program on adults with autism spectrum disorder. Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders, 5, 246-253. Guideline topic: Adults with autism **Review question number:** C1 Checklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups) A1 An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have Yes balanced any confounding factors equally across groups) A2 There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians Unclear and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation) A3 The groups were comparable at baseline, Yes including all major confounding and prognostic factors Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect? Low risk of bias Likely direction of effect: B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation) **B1** The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied Unclear B2 Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' No to treatment allocation Individuals administering care were kept **B**3 No 'blind' to treatment allocation

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?

	High risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	reatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
the l	ikely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
D. D	Petection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	tained, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding and prognostic	
	factors	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Stud	ly ID	GOLAN2006	
Bibl	Bibliographic reference:		
Golan, O. & Baron-Cohen, S. (2006) Systemizing empathy: teaching adults with Asperger syndrome or high-functioning autism to recognize complex emotions using interactive multimedia. <i>Development and Psychopathology</i> , <i>18</i> , 591-617.			
Guio	Guideline topic: Adults with autism     Review question number: C1		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
	erformance bias (systematic differences betwe n the intervention under investigation)	en groups in the care provided, apart	
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	No	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was performance bias present? If so,	
	t is the likely direction of its effect?	· · ·	

	High risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	reatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 1; Control group N: 0		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
the l	ikely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
D. D	Petection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	tained, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	No		
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what		
15 110	is the likely direction of its effect?			
	High risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger				

Stud	ly ID	KHEMKA2000		
Bibl	iographic reference:			
Khemka, I. (2000) Increasing independent decision-making skills of women with mental retardation in simulated interpersonal situations of abuse. <i>American Journal on Mental Retardation</i> , 105, 387-401.				
Guio	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes		
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes		
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	on was selection bias present? If so, what		
is the	e likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias				
Likely direction of effect:				
Energy uncerton of effect.				
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)				
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Unclear		
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No		
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No		
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio t is the likely direction of its effect?	n was performance bias present? If so,		

High risk of bias					
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger				
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)					
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes			
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0				
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes			
C3	For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0				
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes			
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinio ikely direction of its effect?	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is			
	Low risk of bias				
Like	Likely direction of effect:				
D. I	Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	tained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Unclear			
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Unclear			
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	No			
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No			

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what	
is the	is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			

Study ID	KHEMKA2005
Bibliographic reference:	

Khemka, I., Hickson, L. & Reynolds, G. (2005) Evaluation of a decision-making curriculum designed to empower women with mental retardation to resist abuse. *American Journal of Mental Retardation*, *110*, 193-204.

Guideline topic: Adults with autism		<b>Review question number:</b> C1
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio e likely direction of its effect?	on was selection bias present? If so, what
	Low risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
fron	erformance bias (systematic differences between the intervention under investigation)	een groups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Unclear
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio t is the likely direction of its effect?	n was performance bias present? If so,

	High risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 8	reatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	No	
C3	For how many participants in each group wer Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinio ikely direction of its effect?	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	High risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Unknown		
D. E	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	No	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Unclear	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what	
is the	e likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			

Stud	ly ID	LAUGESON2009
Bibliographic reference:		
impi	geson, E.A., Frankel, F., Mogil, C., <i>et al</i> . (2009) P cove friendships in teens with autism spectrum <i>lopmental Disorders, 39,</i> 596-606.	0
Guio	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio e likely direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what
	Low risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	No
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

	High risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	reatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
the l	ikely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
D. D	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	No	
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what	
1s the	is the likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			

Stud	ly ID	LEE1977
ר וית		
B1DI	iographic reference:	
	D.Y. (1977) Evaluation of a group counseling p	0 0
	stment of mentally retarded adults. Journal of C	
Guio	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1
Chee	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was selection bias present? If so, what
1S the	e likely direction of its effect?	
	Low risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
<b>B.</b> Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	No
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so,		
what is the likely direction of its effect?		

Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger         C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect t loss of participants)         C1       All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)       Yes         C2       a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group?       Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)       No         C3       For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, whe the likely direction of its effect?         High risk of bias         Likely direction of effect: Unknown         D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)         D1       The study had an appropriate length of follow-up         D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to				
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect t loss of participants)         C1       All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)       Yes         C2       a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       No         C3       For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       No         C3       For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       No         C3       For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       No         D       b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available!       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, wh the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias         Likely direction of effect: Unknown       Yes       1         D1       The study had an appropriate length of follow-up       Yes         D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes <th></th> <th colspan="3">High risk of bias</th>		High risk of bias		
loss of participants)         C1       All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)       Yes         C2       a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       No         D       b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)       No         C3       For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       No         C3       For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       No         B       b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, wh the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias         Likely direction of effect: Unknown       Yes         D1       The study had an appropriate length of follow-up       Yes         D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4	Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
loss of participants)         C1       All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)       Yes         C2       a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       No         D       b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)       No         C3       For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       No         b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, wh the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias         Likely direction of effect: Unknown       Yes         D1       The study had an appropriate length of follow-up       Yes         D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to data duta duta duta duta duta duta duta				
length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)       Yes         C2       a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)       No         C3       For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, wh the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias         Likely direction of effect: Unknown       Yes         D1       The study had an appropriate length of follow-up       Yes         D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A vailiable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to       No		· -	the comparison groups with respect to	
Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0         b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)         C3       For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0         b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, wh the likely direction of its effect?       No         Likely direction of effect: Unknown       Yes         D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)         D1       The study had an appropriate length of follow-up       Yes         D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes	C1	length of time (or analysis was adjusted to	Yes	
b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)       No         C3       For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       No         C3       For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       No         C3       For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0       No         b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, whi the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias         Likely direction of effect: Unknown        Yes         D1       The study had an appropriate length of follow-up       Yes         D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to       No	C2		reatment in each group?	
Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 0         b. The groups were comparable with         respect to the availability of outcome data         (that is, there were no important or         systematic differences between groups in         terms of those for whom outcome data were         not available).         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, wh         the likely direction of its effect?         High risk of bias         Likely direction of effect: Unknown         D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)         D1       The study had an appropriate length of         follow-up       Yes         D2       The study used a precise definition of         outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to		b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)		
b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, which the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias         Likely direction of effect: Unknown       Ves         D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)         D1       The study had an appropriate length of follow-up         D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to	C3			
the likely direction of its effect?         High risk of bias         Likely direction of effect: Unknown         D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)         D1       The study had an appropriate length of follow-up       Yes         D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to       No		b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were		
High risk of bias         High risk of bias         Likely direction of effect: Unknown         D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)         D1       The study had an appropriate length of follow-up       Yes         D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to       No			n was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
D1The study had an appropriate length of follow-upYesD2The study used a precise definition of outcomeYesD3A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcomeYesD4Investigators were kept 'blind' toNo	Like	High risk of bias		
follow-upD2The study used a precise definition of outcomeYesD3A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcomeYesD4Investigators were kept 'blind' toNo			,	
D2The study used a precise definition of outcomeYesD3A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcomeYesD4Investigators were kept 'blind' toNo	D1		Yes	
determine the outcomeD4Investigators were kept 'blind' toNo	D2	The study used a precise definition of	Yes	
0 1	D3		Yes	
participants' exposure to the intervention	D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what	
is the	is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			

MATSON1981			
Bibliographic reference:			
K. (1981) Independence training as a the mentally retarded. <i>Behaviour Research</i>			
<b>Review question number:</b> C1			
the comparison groups)			
Yes			
Unclear			
Yes			
on was selection bias present? If so, what			
<b>B.</b> Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			
Yes			
No			
No			

	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio t is the likely direction of its effect?	n was performance bias present? If so,		
	High risk of bias			
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger			
	C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)			
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	reatment in each group?		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes		
C3	For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0			
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes		
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio ikely direction of its effect?	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is		
	Low risk of bias			
Like	ly direction of effect:			
D. D	Petection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	tained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Unclear		
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	No		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No		

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Base	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?			
	High risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

# **1.3.2** Observational studies (cohort studies)

Stud	ly reference	ELLIOTT1991		
Bibl	Bibliographic reference:			
Ellic	ott, R.O. Jr., Hall, K.L. & Soper, H.V. (1991) Analog	language teaching versus natural		
0	uage teaching: generalization and retention of lang	0		
	mental retardation. Journal of Autism and Developme	1		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w e likely direction of its effect?	as selection bias present? If so, what		
	Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:				
<b>B.</b> Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)				

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	High risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w likely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

### Low risk of bias

D. I	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias			
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Stuc	ly reference	ERGUNERTEKINALP2004	
Bibl	Bibliographic reference:		
the o	iner-Tekinalp, B. & Akkök, F. (2004) The effects of a coping skills, hopelessness, and stress levels of mot <i>mational Journal for the Advancement of Counselling</i> , 2	hers of children with autism.	
-	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> D1	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	No	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Unclear	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Unknown		
	B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	No
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	as performance bias present? If so,
	High risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

### Low risk of bias

D. I	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	No	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias			
Like	ly direction of effect:		

Bibliographic reference:			
García-Villamisar, D., Ross, D. & Wehman, P. (2000) Clinical differential analysis of persons			
with autism in a work setting: a follow-up study. Jour	rnal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 14, 183-		
185.			
Guideline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C2		
Checklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the	ne comparison groups)		
A1 The method of allocation to treatment groups			
was unrelated to potential confounding factors			
(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	Unclear		
treatment groups is not expected to affect the			
outcome(s) under study)			
A2 Were any attempts made within the design or			
analysis to balance the comparison groups for	Yes		
potential confounders?			
A3 The groups were comparable at baseline,			
including all major confounding and prognostic	Yes		
factors			
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion	was selection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?	1		
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			
Likely direction of effect.			
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
from the intervention under investigation)			

Study reference

GARCIAVILLAMISAR2000

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Unclear
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	as performance bias present? If so,
	High risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the o of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length	
	of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatm Not reported	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Unclear
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Not reported	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Unclear
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

Unclear/unknown risk		
Like	ly direction of effect: Unknown	
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion v e likely direction of its effect?	was detection bias present? If so, what
	High risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	

Stu	dy reference	GARCIAVILLAMISAR2002	
Bib	liographic reference:		
		(2002) Changes in the quality of	
	cía-Villamisar, D., Wehman, P. & Diaz Navarro, M. stic people's life that work in supported and shelte		
	ly. Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 17, 309-312.		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Unclear	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
~	5		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
from the intervention under investigation)			

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Unclear	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	as performance bias present? If so,	
	High risk		
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)			
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length		
	of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	C2 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Not reported		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Unclear	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Not reported	no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Unclear	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			

Unclear/unknown risk			
Like	ely direction of effect: Unknown		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
High risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			

Study reference		GARCIAVILLAMISAR2007			
Bibl	Bibliographic reference:				
Gare	cía-Villamisar, D. & Hughes, C. (2007) Supported e	mployment improves cognitive			
perf	ormance in adults with autism. Journal of Intellectua	l Disability Research, 51, 142-150.			
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C2			
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars				
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)			
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Unclear			
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	No			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes			
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	ras selection bias present? If so, what			
is th	e likely direction of its effect?				
	Unclear/unknown risk				
Likely direction of effect:					
<b>B.</b> Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)					
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Unclear			

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	Attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Unclear	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Stu	ly reference	HARRIS1984	
Bib	liographic reference:		
DIU	lographic reference.		
	ris, M.B. & Bloom, S.R. (1984) A pilot investigation	0	
- `	gram with mentally retarded adolescents and adult	0	
	wledge of nutritional and behavioral principles. <i>Re</i>		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups		
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors		
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	No	
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the		
	outcome(s) under study)		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or		
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	No	
	potential confounders?		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
	including all major confounding and prognostic	Yes	
	factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
т •1			
L1KE	ely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
B. P	erformance bias (systematic differences between	groups in the care provided, apart	
from the intervention under investigation)			

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	No		
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No		
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,		
	High risk of bias			
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger			
	C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)			
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes		
C2	C2 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Experimental group N: NA; Control group N: NA			
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA		
C3	Experimental group N: NA; Control group N: NA			
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA		
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?				

### NA

Likely direction of effect:

## D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Stuc	ly reference	LINDSAY2004	
Bibl	iographic reference:		
Lind	lsay, W.R., Allan, R., Parry, C., et al. (2004) Anger a	nd aggression in people with	
	lectual disabilities: treatment and follow-up of con		
com	parison. Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 11, 2	55-264.	
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to	Unclear	
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	No	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	No	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
High risk of bias			
Liko	ly direction of effect. Unknown		
Likely direction of effect: Unknown			
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
from the intervention under investigation)			

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	No		
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No		
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,		
	High risk of bias			
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger			
	C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)			
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	No		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes		
C3	C3 a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0 b. The groups were comparable with respect to			
	the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes		
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?				

#### Low risk of bias

Likely direction of effect:

## D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
	-		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
05		Tes	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
	exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
-			
	High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			

Study reference		MAWHOOD1999		
Bibl	iographic reference:			
	vhood, L. & Howlin, P. (1999) The outcome of a sup			
	tioning adults with autism or asperger syndrome.			
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C2		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups			
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors			
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	Yes		
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the			
	outcome(s) under study)			
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or			
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	No		
	potential confounders?			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,			
115	including all major confounding and prognostic	Yes		
	factors			
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	ras selection bias present? If so, what		
is th	e likely direction of its effect?			
	Low risk of bias			
Т :1				
LIKE	ly direction of effect:			
<b>B.</b> Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart				
from the intervention under investigation)				
B1	The comparison groups received the same care			
	apart from the intervention(s) studied	Unclear		

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Experimental group N: 5; Control group N: 0	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 1; Control group N: 0	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as attrition bias present? If so, what is
the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias			
Like	ly direction of effect:		

Stud	ly reference	MAZZUCCHELLI2001	
Bibl	iographic reference:		
Maz	zucchelli, T.G. (2001) Feel safe: a pilot study of a pi	rotective behaviours programme for	
	ble with intellectual disability. Journal of Intellectual		
126.			
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups		
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors	<b>N</b>	
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the	No	
	outcome(s) under study)		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or	N <sub>1</sub> -	
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	No	
	-		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,	X	
	including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Unknown		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention up der investigation)			
non	from the intervention under investigation)		

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	No
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	High risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	ment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
	-		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
05		103	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
	- F		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	-		
	High risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	Energy uncerton of effect. Effect offect		
1			

Stud	ly reference	ROSE2005	
Bibl	iographic reference:	·	
Rose	e, J., Loftus, M., Flint, B., et al. (2005) Factors associa	ted with the efficacy of a group	
	vention for anger in people with intellectual disab		
	hology, 44, 305-317.		
Guio	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1	
Chee	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	I	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups		
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors		
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the	Yes	
	outcome(s) under study)		
4.0			
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for	No	
	potential confounders?		
4.0	-		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic	Yes	
	factors	105	
	11 1		
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w e likely direction of its effect?	as selection bias present? If so, what	
15 110			
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			
from the intervention under investigation)			

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	No
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	High risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
	_		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
05		165	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
	exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	is the likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	Energy unceden of energy Energies		

Stu	ly reference	RUSSELL2009	
DU			
Bib	liographic reference:		
Rus	sell, A.J., Mataix-Cols, D., Anson, M.A.W., et al. (20	09) Psychological treatment for	
	essive-compulsive disorder in people with autism s	pectrum disorders - a pilot study.	
-	hotherapy and Psychosomatics, 78, 59-61.		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1 & C6	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups		
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors		
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	Yes	
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the		
	outcome(s) under study)		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or		
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	No	
	potential confounders?		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
	including all major confounding and prognostic	No	
	factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
<b>T</b> 11			
Like	ely direction of effect: Unknown		
	erformance bias (systematic differences between	groups in the care provided, apart	
fron	from the intervention under investigation)		

The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
	No
Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
High risk of bias	
ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	
ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	ment in each group?
b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?
b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion we is the likely direction of its effect? High risk of bias y direction of effect: Effect size bigger ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants) All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up) a. How many participants did not complete treate Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0 b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment) a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0 b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
05		165	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
	0		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
LIKE	Likely direction of cheet. Effect size bigget		
1			

Stuc	ly reference	TAYLOR2005
D'1 1		
Bibl	iographic reference:	
Tayl	or, J.L., Novaco, R.W., Gillmer, B.T., et al. (2005) In	dividual cognitive-behavioural anger
	tment for people with mild-borderline intellectual	
	ression: a controlled trial. British Journal of Clinical F	
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups	
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors	
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	Yes
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the	
	outcome(s) under study)	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or	
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	No
	potential confounders?	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,	
	including all major confounding and prognostic	Yes
	factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what
	e likely direction of its effect?	-
	Low risk of bias	
т •1		
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	erformance bias (systematic differences between	groups in the care provided, apart
fron	n the intervention under investigation)	

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	No
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	High risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
	-		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
05		165	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
	exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	is the likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

## **1.3.3** Observational studies (before-and-after studies)

Study reference		BATHAEE2001		
Bibl	Bibliographic reference:			
		atment of adaptive skills of		
	haee, M.A. (2001) A longitudinal study of active tre viduals with profound mental retardation. <i>Psycholo</i>	-		
	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1		
Gui	define topic. Addits with autishi	Review question number. Er		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups			
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors			
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA		
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the			
	outcome(s) under study)			
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or			
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA		
	potential confounders?			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,			
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA		
	factors			
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?				
NA				
Like	Likely direction of effect:			
<b>B. P</b>	B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
fron	n the intervention under investigation)			

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 8; Control group N: NA	ment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
	· ·	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
	L	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is th	e likely direction of its effect?	
	High risk of bias	
	0	
Liko	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Study reference	BENSON1986
Bibliographic reference:	

Benson, B.A., Rice, C.J. & Miranti, S.V. (1986) Effects of anger management training with mentally retarded adults in group treatment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 54, 728-729.

720-727.			
Gui	Guideline topic: Adults with autismReview question number: C1		
Che	Checklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)			
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups		
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors		
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA	
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the		
	outcome(s) under study)		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or		
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA	
	potential confounders?		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA	
	factors		
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what			
is the likely direction of its effect?			
	NA		

Likely direction of effect:

# **B.** Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	as performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 8; Control group N: NA	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	as attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
	-		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Unclear	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Unclear	
D3		Unclear	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
	exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	d on your anguars to the above in your opinion y	vag datastion bias present? If so what	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			

Stu	dy reference	FELDMAN1999
D:1-1	l'a manh ia na fanan an	
B1D	liographic reference:	
Feld	lman, M.A., Ducharme, J.M. & Case, L. (1999) Usin	g self-instructional pictorial manuals
to te	each child-care skills to mothers with intellectual di	sabilities. Behavior Modification, 23,
480-		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups	
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors	
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the	
	outcome(s) under study)	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or	
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA
	potential confounders?	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,	
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA
	factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas selection bias present? If so, what
is th	e likely direction of its effect?	
	NA	
Like	ely direction of effect:	
	-	

# **B.** Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	ment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is th	e likely direction of its effect?	
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Stuc	ly reference	HERBRECHT2009
Bibl	liographic reference:	
Herl	brecht, E., Poustka, F., Birnkammer, S., <i>et al</i> . (2009)	Pilot evaluation of the frankfurt social
	s training for children and adolescents with autism	
and .	Adolescent Psychiatry, 18, 327-335.	
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w e likely direction of its effect?	vas selection bias present? If so, what
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
B. P	erformance bias (systematic differences between	groups in the care provided, apart

from the intervention under investigation)

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	C2 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w likely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is th	e likely direction of its effect?	
	Low risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect:	

Stuc	ly reference	HILLIER2007
Bibl	iographic reference:	
<b>Ц;</b> 11;	ier, A., Fish, T., Cloppert, P., <i>et al</i> . (2007) Outcomes	of a social and vocational skills
	port group for adolescents and young adults on the	
	Other Developmental Disabilities, 22, 107-115.	
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w e likely direction of its effect?	vas selection bias present? If so, what
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	-,	
B P	erformance bias (systematic differences between	groups in the care provided apart
	n the intervention under investigation)	groups in the care provided, apart

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	as performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	C2 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w likely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
	-	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
00		105
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is the	e likely direction of its effect?	
	High risk of bias	
	0	
Liko	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	
LINC	iy direction of effect. Effect size bigget	

Stuc	ly reference	HOWLIN1999
Bibl	iographic reference:	
	vlin, P. & Yates, P. (1999) The potential effectivenes a autism. <i>Autism, 3,</i> 299-307.	s of social skills groups for adults
-	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	<u> </u>
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w e likely direction of its effect?	as selection bias present? If so, what
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	erformance bias (systematic differences between n the intervention under investigation)	groups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	as performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	as attrition bias present? If so, what is
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	

D. E	Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain	ned, diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	No
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	No
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is th	e likely direction of its effect?	
	High risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	

Stuc	ly reference	HOWLIN2005
D'1 1		
B1D1	iographic reference:	
Ном	vlin, P., Alcock, J. & Burkin, C. (2005) An 8 year foll	ow-up of a specialist supported
-	loyment service for high-ability adults with autism	n or Asperger syndrome. <i>Autism, 9,</i>
533-		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C2
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups	
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors	
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	
	outcome(s) under study)	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or	
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA
	potential confounders?	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,	
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA
	factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what
is th	e likely direction of its effect?	
	NA	
T :1.0	ly direction of offects	
ыке	ly direction of effect:	
<b>D D</b>		
	erformance bias (systematic differences between	groups in the care provided, apart
iron	n the intervention under investigation)	

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	C2 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1       The study had an appropriate length of follow-up       Yes         D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       Low risk of bias			
D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       Low risk of bias	D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       Low risk of bias		up	
D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       Low risk of bias			
D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       Low risk of bias	D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       Low risk of bias	D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       Low risk of bias	00		105
exposure to the intervention       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       Low risk of bias		determine the outcome	
D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       Low risk of bias	D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       Low risk of bias		exposure to the intervention	
important confounding/prognostic factors         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?         Low risk of bias			
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?  Low risk of bias	D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?  Low risk of bias		important confounding/prognostic factors	
is the likely direction of its effect?  Low risk of bias			
Low risk of bias	Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what
	is th	e likely direction of its effect?	
		-	
		Low risk of bias	
Likely direction of effect:	Like	ly direction of effect	

Bibliographic reference:	
King, N., Lancaster, N., Wynne, G., <i>et al.</i> (1999) Cogn training for adults with mild intellectual disability. <i>S</i> <i>28</i> , 19-22.	0 0
Guideline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C2

Checklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars

### A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)

A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA	

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?

#### NA

Likely direction of effect:

## **B.** Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA		
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA		
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,		
	NA			
Likely direction of effect:				
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)				
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	ment in each group?		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA		
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA			
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w likely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is		

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
	determine the outcome		
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
	T		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	-		
	High risk of bias		
Libele dimetice of effects Effect size his sec			
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			
1			

Stu	ly reference	MYLES1996A	
Bib	liographic reference:		
-	es, B.S., Simpson, R.L. & Smith, S.M. (1996) Collate		
	g facilitated communication with individuals with <i>elopmental Disabilities</i> , 11, 163-169.	autism. Focus on Autism unu Other	
	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1	
		-	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups		
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors		
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA	
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)		
	outcome(s) under study)		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or		
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA	
	potential comounders:		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA	
	factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
Tile	Likely direction of effect:		
LIKE			
P. Derformence bies (custometic differences between groups in the same growthed are t			
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	ment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w likely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
	-		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Unclear	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	No	
20	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
	1		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
	0		
Like	Likely direction of effect: Unclear		
	iy direction of check. Orefeti		

Stuc	ly reference	POLIRSTOK2003		
Bibl	iographic reference:			
Poli	rstok, S.R., Dana, L., Buono, S., et al. (2003) Improvi	ing functional communication skills in		
adol	escents and young adults with severe autism using	g gentle teaching and positive		
	roaches. <i>Topics in Language Disorders,</i> 23, 146-153.			
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w e likely direction of its effect?	vas selection bias present? If so, what		
	NA			
Like	ly direction of effect:			
2.1.0	-,			
P. Derformer en bien (protomotic difformer en between errors in the error in the				
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)				
1101	itom the intervention under investigation,			

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	as performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	as attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
	· ·	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
	1	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is th	e likely direction of its effect?	
	High risk of bias	
	0	
Likely direction of offects Effect size bigger		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Stuc	ly reference	TSE2007	
Bibl	iographic reference:		
	J., Strulovitch, J., Tagalakis, V., <i>et al.</i> (2007) Social s	C C	
-	erger syndrome and high-functioning autism. <i>Journ</i>	nal of Autism and Developmental	
	rders, 37, 1960–1968.	Device question number C1	
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors		
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA	
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the		
	outcome(s) under study)		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or		
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA	
	potential confounders?		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA	
	factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
from the intervention under investigation)			

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
	-	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
05		165
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is the	e likely direction of its effect?	
	High risk of bias	
	0	
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
Energy uncerton of energy. Energer		

Stuc	ly reference	WEBB2004	
Bibl	iographic reference:		
Web	bb, B.J., Miller, S.P., Pierce, T.B., et al. (2004) Effects	of social skill instruction for high-	
func	tioning adolescents with autism spectrum disorder	rs. Focus on Autism and Other	
	elopmental Disabilities, 19, 53-62.		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C1	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups		
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors		
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA	
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or		
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA	
	potential confounders?		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA	
	factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
т •1	1 1		
L1ke	ly direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
fron	from the intervention under investigation)		

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w likely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
	*	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
D3		165
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is th	e likely direction of its effect?	
	-	
	High risk of bias	
	0	
Libele direction of effect time his on		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
1		

# **1.4 BIOMEDICAL INTERVENTIONS**

## 1.4.1 Randomised controlled trials

Stud	y ID	BELSITO2001	
Bibl	iographic reference:		
Belsito, K.M., Law, P.A., Kirk, K.S., <i>et al.</i> (2001) Lamotrigine therapy for autistic disorder: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. <i>Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders</i> , <i>31</i> , 175-181.			
Guio	leline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4	
Chee	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. Se	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			
<b>B.</b> Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	

	T		
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept		
	'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was performance bias present? If so,	
what	t is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups with respect to	
loss	of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal		
	length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2		reatment in each group?	
C2	<ul> <li>a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group?</li> <li>Experimental group N: 5; Control group N: 2</li> </ul>		
	b. The groups were comparable for		
	treatment completion (that is, there were no	Yes	
	important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not	ies	
	complete treatment)		
C3	For how many participants in each group wer		
	Experimental group N: 5; Control group N: 2		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data		
	(that is, there were no important or	X	
	systematic differences between groups in	Yes	
	terms of those for whom outcome data were		
Baco	not available).	n was attrition bias present? If so what is	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1	The study had an appropriate length of	Yes	
	follow-up		

D2	The study used a precise definition of	Yes	
	outcome		
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to	Yes	
	participants' exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Base	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is the	e likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		

Study ID	GAGIANO2005

I

Gagiano, C., Read, S., Thorpe, L., <i>et al.</i> (2006) Short- and long-term efficacy and safety of risperidone in adults with disruptive behaviour disorders. <i>Psychopharmacology</i> , 179, 629-636.		
Guid	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4
Chec	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. Se	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

#### Low risk of bias

Likely direction of effect:

# **B.** Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?

#### Low risk of bias

Likely direction of effect:

# C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)

C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete the Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 4	reatment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	For how many participants in each group wer Experimental group N: 2; Control group N: 1 b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or	re no outcome data available? Yes
	systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?

#### Low risk of bias

Likely direction of effect:

	×	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID	HAESSLER2007
county	

Haessler, F., Glaser, T., Beneke, M., *et al.* (2007) Zuclopenthixol in adults with intellectual disabilities and aggressive behaviours: discontinuation study. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 190, 447-448.

Guideline topic: Adults with autism		<b>Review question number:</b> C4	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	ie comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Unclear	
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinic e likely direction of its effect?	on was selection bias present? If so, what	
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
	erformance bias (systematic differences between the intervention under investigation) The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	een groups in the care provided, apart Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinic t is the likely direction of its effect?	n was performance bias present? If so,	

	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t	the comparison groups with respect to	
loss	of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal		
	length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t	reatment in each group?	
C2	Not reported		
	b. The groups were comparable for		
	treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between	Unclear	
	groups in terms of those who did not	Unclear	
	complete treatment)		
C3	For how many participants in each group wer Results reported for the intention-to-treat san		
	b. The groups were comparable with		
	respect to the availability of outcome data		
	(that is, there were no important or	Unclear	
	systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were		
	not available).		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinio	on was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
the I	ikely direction of its effect?		
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
	Likely direction of chect.		
D. D	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of	No	
נת	follow-up The study used a precise definition of	No	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	INU	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Unclear	
D4	determine the outcome	Ver	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding and prognostic	
	factors	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what
is the	e likely direction of its effect?	
	Unclear/unknown risk	
Like	Likely direction of effect:	

Hellings, J.A., Weckbaugh, M., Nickel, E.J., *et al.* (2005) A double-blind, placebo-controlled study of valproate for aggression in youth with pervasive developmental disorders. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychopharmacology*, *15*, 682-692.

	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinic e likely direction of its effect?	on was selection bias present? If so, what
	Low risk of bias	
Like	ely direction of effect:	
<b>B.</b> P	ely direction of effect: erformance bias (systematic differences between the intervention under investigation) The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	een groups in the care provided, apart Yes
B. P fron	erformance bias (systematic differences between the intervention under investigation) The comparison groups received the same	

	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
2	-)		
	C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 3; Control group N: 2	reatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	For how many participants in each group wer Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is		
Like	the likely direction of its effect?  Low risk of bias  Likely direction of effect:		
	Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	Yes	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic	Yes
	factors	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what
is the	e likely direction of its effect?	_
	Low risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect:	

Study ID	HELLINGS2006

Hellings, J.A., Zarcone, J.R., Reese, R.M., *et al.* (2006) A crossover study of risperidone in children, adolescents and adults with mental retardation. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *36*, 401-411.

Charlet			
Checklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		the comparison groups)	
	An appropriate method of randomisation		
	was used to allocate participants to		
t	reatment groups (which would have	Yes	
b	palanced any confounding factors equally		
a	across groups)		
A2 T	There was adequate concealment of		
a	allocation (such that investigators, clinicians	Ver	
	and participants cannot influence enrolment	Yes	
	or treatment allocation)		
A3 T	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
in	ncluding all major confounding and	Yes	
p p	prognostic factors		
Based	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what		
	is the likely direction of its effect?		
	•		
	Low risk of bias		
Likely	Likely direction of effect:		

B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
from the intervention under investigation)			
D1			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
		165	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind'		
	to treatment allocation	Yes	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept		
	'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was performance bias present? If so,	
what	is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Likel	y direction of effect:		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups with respect to	
loss	of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal		
	length of time (or analysis was adjusted to	Yes	
<b>62</b>	allow for differences in length of follow-up)		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete the NA	reatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for		
	treatment completion (that is, there were no	Var	
	important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not	Yes	
	complete treatment)		
C3	For how many participants in each group wer		
	Experimental group N: 1; Control group N: 7		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data		
	(that is, there were no important or		
	systematic differences between groups in	Yes	
	terms of those for whom outcome data were		
Bass	not available).	n was attrition hiss property If as what is	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		

Likely direction of effect:

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:	

Stuc	ly ID	HOLLANDER2010	
Bibl	iographic reference:		
treat	ander, E., Chaplin, W., Soorya, L., <i>et al</i> . (2010) I ment of irritability in children and adolescents <i>ropsychopharmacology, 35,</i> 990-998.	1 1	
Gui	Guideline topic: Adults with autismReview question number: C4		
Che	Checklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	No	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinio e likely direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what	
15 11			
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
	erformance bias (systematic differences betwe n the intervention under investigation)	een groups in the care provided, apart	
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

	Low risk of bias		
Liko	Likely direction of effect:		
LIKC	ly direction of effect.		
	C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 2; Control group N: 1	reatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	For how many participants in each group wer Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
Like	the likely direction of its effect?  Low risk of bias  Likely direction of effect:		
D. L D1	Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer The study had an appropriate length of	Yes	
	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding and prognostic	
	factors	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what
is the	e likely direction of its effect?	
	Low risk of bias	
Like	Likely direction of effect:	

Study ID	IZMETH1988

Izmeth, M.G.A., Khan, S.Y., Kumarajeewa, D.I.S.C., *et al.* (1988) Zuclopenthixol decanoate in the management of behavioural disorders in mentally handicapped patients. *Pharmatheraneutica*, 5, 217-227

Guideline topic: Adults with autism		<b>Review question number:</b> C4		
Checklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars				
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)				
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes		
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes		
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio e likely direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what		
T '1	Low risk of bias			
B. Pe	Likely direction of effect: B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			
	1	1		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes		
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes		
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear		
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio t is the likely direction of its effect?	n was performance bias present? If so,		

	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between to of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal		
	length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t	<b>0</b>	
	Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 14	4	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no		
	important or systematic differences between	No	
	groups in terms of those who did not		
C3	complete treatment) For how many participants in each group we	ro no outcomo data availablo?	
CJ	Experimental group N: Not clear; Control group		
	b. The groups were comparable with		
	respect to the availability of outcome data		
	(that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in	Unclear	
	terms of those for whom outcome data were		
	not available).		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinic	on was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
the l	ikely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect: Unknown		
Line	Likely direction of effect. Offkhown		
D. E	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of	No	
D0	follow-up		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
D4	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding and prognostic	
	factors	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID	KARSTEN1981

Karsten, D., Kivimäki, T., Linna, S., -L., *et al.* (1981) Neuroleptic treatment of oligophrenic patients. A double-blind clinical multicentre trial of cis(Z)-clopenthixol and haloperidol. *Acta Psuchiatrica Scandinavica*, *Suppl.* 294, 39-45.

Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4
Checklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Unclear
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinio e likely direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what
Like	Low risk of bias ly direction of effect:	
	erformance bias (systematic differences between the intervention under investigation) The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	een groups in the care provided, apart Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio t is the likely direction of its effect?	n was performance bias present? If so,

	Unclear/unknown risk		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t of participants)	he comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 1; Control group N: 1	reatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	For how many participants in each group wer Experimental group N: 1; Control group N: 1		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio ikely direction of its effect?	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
D. D	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	No	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear	

Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic	Unclear	
factors		
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
-		
e	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion e likely direction of its effect? Unclear/unknown risk	

Stud	y ID	MCDOUGLE1996	
Bibl	iographic reference:		
McDougle, C.J., Naylor, S.T., Cohen, D.J., <i>et al.</i> (1996) A double-blind, placebo-controlled study of fluvoxamine in adults with autistic disorder. <i>Archives of General Psychiatry</i> , 53, 1001-1008.			
Guio	leline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4	
Chee	<b>klist completed by:</b> Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. Se	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so,			
what is the likely direction of its effect?			
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t of participants)	he comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	reatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	For how many participants in each group wer Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
D. D	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what	
is the	is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		

Stuc	ly ID	MCDOUGLE1998A
Bibl	iographic reference:	
stud diso	Dougle, C.J., Holmes, J.P., Carlson, D.C., <i>et al</i> . (1 y of risperidone in adults with autistic disorder rders. <i>Archives of General Psychiatry</i> , <i>55</i> , 633-641	r and other pervasive developmental
	deline topic: Adults with autism	Review question number: C4
	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	the comperison groups)
	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinic	on was selection bias present? If so, what
is th	e likely direction of its effect?	
	Low risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	erformance bias (systematic differences betwe n the intervention under investigation)	een groups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinic t is the likely direction of its effect?	on was performance bias present? If so,

Low risk of bias			
Liko	ly direction of offset		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
		1	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal		
	length of time (or analysis was adjusted to	Yes	
	allow for differences in length of follow-up)		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t	reatment in each group?	
	Experimental group N: 3; Control group N: 4	1	
	b. The groups were comparable for		
	treatment completion (that is, there were no		
	important or systematic differences between	Yes	
	groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)		
C3	For how many participants in each group we	re no outcome data available?	
Co	Experimental group N: 1; Control group N: 0		
	Data from the 30 participants who completed		
	included in the efficacy analysis and the last-		
	treat method was used in the data analysis		
	b. The groups were comparable with		
	respect to the availability of outcome data		
	(that is, there were no important or	Yes	
	systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were		
Base	not available). d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was attrition bias present? If so what is	
	ikely direction of its effect?	in was attracted blus present: it so, what is	
	,		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
	etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	Ę ,	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of	No	
	follow-up		
D2	The study used a precise definition of	Yes	
D3	outcome A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
	determine the outcome	100	
		1	

D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID	MCKENZIE1966			
Bibliographic reference:				
	McKenzie, M.E. & Roswell-Harris, D. (1966) A controlled trial of Prothipendyl (Tolnate) inmentally subnormal patients. <i>British Journal of Psychiatry</i> , 112, 95-100.			
Guideline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4			
Checklist completed by: Odette Megnin-V	ïiggars			
A. Selection bias (systematic differences l	petween the comparison groups)			
A1 An appropriate method of randomisa was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors eq across groups)	Yes			
A2 There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, cli and participants cannot influence en or treatment allocation)				
A3 The groups were comparable at base including all major confounding and prognostic factors	line, No			
Based on your answers to the above, in you is the likely direction of its effect?	r opinion was selection bias present? If so, what			
Unclear/unknown risk				
Likely direction of effect:				
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)				
B1 The comparison groups received the care apart from the intervention(s) st				
B2 Participants receiving care were kept to treatment allocation	'blind' Unclear			
B3 Individuals administering care were 'blind' to treatment allocation	kept Unclear			
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?				

Unclear/unknown risk			
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
C. A	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t	the comparison groups with respect to	
loss	of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 1	reatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3			
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio ikely direction of its effect?	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
D. D	etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	tained, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	No	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	No	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Unclear	

D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Unclear	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		

Stuc	ly ID	REMINGTON2001
Bibl	iographic reference:	
in th	ington, G., Sloman, L., Konstantareas, M., <i>et al.</i> le treatment of autistic disorder: a double-blind <i>1al of Clinical Psychopharmacology</i> , 21, 440-444.	
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinic	on was selection bias present? If so, what
is th	e likely direction of its effect?	
	Low risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	erformance bias (systematic differences betwe n the intervention under investigation)	en groups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinic	n was performance bias present? If so,
	t is the likely direction of its effect?	· · · ·

	Low risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
-		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 20 (clomipramine); Co	ē .
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	No
C3	For how many participants in each group wer Experimental group N: 4; Control group N: 4	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinio ikely direction of its effect?	on was attrition bias present? If so, what is
	High risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	
D. D	Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	tained, diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes
		·

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what	
is the	is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:			

Study ID	SINGH1992

#### **Bibliographic reference:**

Singh, I. & Owino, J. E. (1992) A double-blind comparison of zuclopenithixol tablets with placebo in the treatment of mentally handicapped in-patients with associated behavioural disorders. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, *36*, 541-549.

	rders. <i>Journal of Intellectual Disability Research,</i> 3 <b>deline topic:</b> Adults with autism	Review question number: C4	
	•		
Chec	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. Se	A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was selection bias present? If so, what	
is the	e likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Likel	ly direction of effect:		
	erformance bias (systematic differences betwe	een groups in the care provided, apart	
from	from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so,			
what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias			
Like	y direction of effect:		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal		
	length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t	reatment in each group?	
	Experimental group N: 3; Control group N: 12	2	
	b. The groups were comparable for		
	treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between	No	
	groups in terms of those who did not		
	complete treatment)		
C3	For how many participants in each group wer		
	Experimental group N: 3; Control group N: 6		
	b. The groups were comparable with		
	respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or		
	systematic differences between groups in	No	
	terms of those for whom outcome data were		
	not available).		
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Like	y direction of effect: Unknown		
LIKE	ly direction of enect. Offkhown		
D. D	etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	tained, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Unclear	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to	Yes	
	participants' exposure to the intervention		

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Unclear
	important confounding and prognostic	
	factors	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what
is the	e likely direction of its effect?	
	Low risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	-	

1.4.2

Stuc	ly ID	TYRER2008	
Bibliographic reference:			
place	er, P., Oliver-Africano, P.C., Ahmed, Z., et al. (20 ebo in the treatment of aggressive challenging l bility: a randomised controlled trial. <i>The Lancet</i> ,	behaviour in patients with intellectual	
Gui	Guideline topic: Adults with autismReview question number: C4		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinic	on was selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
<b>B.</b> Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so,			
what is the likely direction of its effect?			

	Low risk of bias			
т :1				
LIKE	ly direction of effect:			
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes		
C2	<ul> <li>a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group?</li> <li>Experimental group N: Risperidone=11; Haloperidol=6</li> <li>Control group N: 8</li> </ul>			
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes		
C3	For how many participants in each group we Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0			
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinic ikely direction of its effect?	on was attrition bias present? If so, what is		
	Low risk of bias			
Like	Likely direction of effect:			
D. I	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1	The study had an appropriate length of	Yes		
D2	follow-up The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes		
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes		

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what	
is the	is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID	VANDENBORRE1993
Bibliographic reference:	

Vanden Borre, R., Vermote, R., Buttiëns, M., *et al.* (1993) Risperidone as add-on therapy in behavioural disturbances in mental retardation: a double-blind placebo-controlled cross-over study. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 87, 167-171.

Guideline topic: Adults with autism		<b>Review question number:</b> C4
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinic e likely direction of its effect?	on was selection bias present? If so, what
is th	5	
15 11	Low risk of bias	
	Low risk of bias ly direction of effect:	
Like B. P		een groups in the care provided, apart Yes
Like B. P fron	erformance bias (systematic differences between the intervention under investigation) The comparison groups received the same	

	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
Line	ly uncenton of effect.		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 5; Control group N: 2	reatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	For how many participants in each group wer Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
Like	ikely direction of its effect? <b>Low risk of bias</b> ly direction of effect:	tained diagnosed or warifind)	
	Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascert	<b>,</b>	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	No	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what	
is the	is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID	VANHEMERT1975

#### **Bibliographic reference:**

van Hemert, J.C.J. (1975) Pipamperone (Dipiperon, R3345) in troublesome mental retardates: a double-blind placebo controlled cross-over study with long-term follow-up. *Acta* 

<u> </u>	hiatrica Scandinavica, 52, 237-245.	1
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinic e likely direction of its effect? Low risk of bias	on was selection bias present? If so, what
B. Pe	ly direction of effect: erformance bias (systematic differences betwe the intervention under investigation)	een groups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinic t is the likely direction of its effect?	n was performance bias present? If so,

	Low risk of bias			
Like	ly direction of effect:			
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t of participants)	he comparison groups with respect to		
	· · /			
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t	reatment in each group?		
	Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0			
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes		
C3				
	Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0 b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes		
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is				
the likely direction of its effect?				
Low risk of bias				
Like	Likely direction of effect:			
D. D	etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	tained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	No		
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	No		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes		

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what	
is the	e likely direction of its effect?		
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Like	ly direction of effect:		

### Observational studies (case series)

Stuc	ly reference	HARDAN2004
	<b>iographic reference:</b> dan, A.Y., Jou, R.J. & Handen, B.L. (2004) A retrosp	ective assessment of toniramate in
chilo	dan, A.T., Jou, K.J. & Handen, B.L. (2004) A ferrosp dren and adolescents with pervasive developmenta descent Psychopharmacology, 14, 426-432.	-
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4
	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w e likely direction of its effect?	vas selection bias present? If so, what
NA		
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	erformance bias (systematic differences between n the intervention under investigation)	groups in the care provided, apart

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 3; Control group N: NA	ment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

nt? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
Likely direction of cirect. Effect size bigger		
1		

# **1.4.3** Observational studies (before-and-after)

Stuc	ly reference	COOK1992		
Bibl	iographic reference:			
adu	k, E.H. Jr., Rowlett, R., Jselskis, C., <i>et al</i> . (1992) Fluo Its with autistic disorder and mental retardation. <i>Jo</i> Adolescent Psychiatry, 31, 739-745.			
	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1The method of allocation to treatment groupswas unrelated to potential confounding factors(that is, the reason for participant allocation totreatment groups is not expected to affect theoutcome(s) under study)				
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA		
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?				
	NA			
Likely direction of effect:				
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)				

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	ment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1The study had an appropriate length of follow- upYesD2The study used a precise definition of outcome determine the outcomeYesD3A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcomeYesD4Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the interventionNoD5Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factorsNoBased on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, wha is the likely direction of its effect?Investigators present? If so, wha		
D2The study used a precise definition of outcomeYesD3A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcomeYesD4Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the interventionNoD5Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factorsNoBased on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, whatNo		
D2The study used a precise definition of outcomeYesD3A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcomeYesD4Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the interventionNoD5Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factorsNoBased on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, whatNo		
D3A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcomeYesD4Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the interventionNoD5Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factorsNoBased on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, whatNo		
determine the outcomeNoD4Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the interventionNoD5Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factorsNoBased on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, whatNo		
determine the outcomeNoD4Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the interventionNoD5Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factorsNoBased on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, whatNo		
D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what       No		
exposure to the intervention       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what       No		
D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
important confounding/prognostic factors         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?		
is the likely direction of its effect?		
<u> </u>		
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Stuc	ly reference	HANDEN2006		
Bibl	iographic reference:			
Han	den, B.L. & Hardan, A.Y. (2006) Open-label, prosp	ective trial of olanzapine in		
	escents with subaverage intelligence and disruptiv	-		
Ame	rican Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 45,	928-935.		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	I		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors			
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA		
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the			
	outcome(s) under study)			
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or			
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA		
	potential confounders?			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,			
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA		
	factors			
Base	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what			
is the likely direction of its effect?				
NA				
Likely direction of effect:				
	,			
B. P	B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
from the intervention under investigation)				

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 5; Control group N: NA	ment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	No			
	up				
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes			
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes			
	determine the outcome				
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	NA			
	exposure to the intervention				
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	NA			
	important confounding/prognostic factors				
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what			
is the likely direction of its effect?					
Low risk of bias					
Likely direction of effect:					

Stuc	ly reference	MCDOUGLE1998B		
Bibl	iographic reference:			
McE	Dougle, C.J., Brodkin, E.S., Naylor, S.T., et al. (1998)	Sertraline in adults with pervasive		
deve	elopmental disorders: a prospective open-label invo	estigation. Journal of Clinical		
	hopharmacology, 18, 62-66.			
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	I		
A.S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors			
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA		
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)			
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA		
	potential confounders?			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,			
	including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas selection bias present? If so, what		
is th	e likely direction of its effect?			
NA				
Likely direction of effect:				
P D	P. Derformen es bies (motometic differences between errors in the same root in the			
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)				
	mont the intervention under investigation,			

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA		
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA		
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,		
	NA			
Likely direction of effect:				
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)				
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA		
C2	<ul> <li>a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group?</li> <li>Experimental group N: 5; Control group N: NA</li> </ul>			
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA		
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Experimental group N: 5; Control group N: NA			
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is		

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes		
	up			
	*			
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes		
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes		
		105		
	determine the outcome			
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No		
	exposure to the intervention			
	I			
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No		
	important confounding/prognostic factors			
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what				
is the likely direction of its effect?				
	-			
High risk of bias				
Libely divertion of effects Effect size bigger				
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger				
1				

Stud	ly reference	READ2007		
Bibliographic reference:				
Read, S.G. & Rendall, M. (2007) An open-label study of risperidone in the improvement of				
quality of life and treatment of symptoms of violent and self-injurious behaviour in adults				
-	intellectual disability. Journal of Applied Research in	,		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> C4		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)				
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups			
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors			
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA		
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the			
	outcome(s) under study)			
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or			
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA		
	potential confounders?			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,			
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA		
	factors			
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what		
is th	e likely direction of its effect?			
	NA			
T ··1	1 1			
Likely direction of effect:				
	erformance bias (systematic differences between	groups in the care provided, apart		
from the intervention under investigation)				

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 3; Control group N: NA	ment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

#### NA

Likely direction of effect:

### D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

# 1.5 ORGANISATION AND DELIVERY OF CARE: SETTINGS FOR CARE

### **1.5.1 Randomised controlled trials**

y ID	HASSIOTIS2009	
Bibliographic reference:		
Hassiotis, A., Robotham, D., Canagasabey, A., <i>et al.</i> (2009) Randomized, single-blind, controlled trial of a specialist behaviour therapy team for challenging behaviour in adults with intellectual disabilities. <i>American Journal of Psychiatry</i> , <i>166</i> , 1278-1285.		
Guideline topic: Adults with autismReview question number: E1 & E2		
klist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
lection bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)	
An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear	
The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
l on your answers to the above, in your opinio likely direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what	
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Unclear	
	olled trial of a specialist behaviour therapy tea intellectual disabilities. <i>American Journal of Psy</i> eline topic: Adults with autism klist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars lection bias (systematic differences between An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups) There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation) The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors I on your answers to the above, in your opinio likely direction of its effect? Low risk of bias y direction of effect: rformance bias (systematic differences betwee the intervention under investigation)	

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between to of participants)	the comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete t Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	0 1	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinic ikely direction of its effect?	on was attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
D. E	Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	tained, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	

D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Unclear	
Base	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
	is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID	RAGHAVAN2009

#### **Bibliographic reference:**

Raghavan, R., Newell, R., Waseem, F., *et al.* (2009) A randomized controlled trial of a specialist liaison worker model for young people with intellectual disabilities with challenging behaviour and mental health needs. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, *22*, 256-263.

Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinic e likely direction of its effect?	on was selection bias present? If so, what
Low risk of bias Likely direction of effect:		
	erformance bias (systematic differences betwo n the intervention under investigation)	een groups in the care provided, apart
	· -	een groups in the care provided, apart Unclear
fron	The comparison groups received the same	

	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio t is the likely direction of its effect?	n was performance bias present? If so,
	High risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger	
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete to Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	reatment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	For how many participants in each group wer Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio ikely direction of its effect?	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is
	Low risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
D. D	etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascer	tained, diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding and prognostic	
	factors	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinio	n was detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

# **1.5.2** Observational studies (cohort studies)

Study reference		BARLOW1991		
	ow, J. & Kirby, N. (1991) Residential satisfaction of or in an institution or in the community Australia a			
	living in an institution or in the community. <i>Australia and New Zealand Journal of Developmental Disabilities</i> , 17, 7-23.			
Gui	Guideline topic: Adults with autismReview question number: E1 & E2			
Che	Checklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)				
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups			
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors			
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA		
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the			
	outcome(s) under study)			
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or			
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA		
	potential confounders?			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,			
	including all major confounding and prognostic	Yes		
	factors			
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?				
	NA			
T :1.0	he dimention of offert			
Like	ly direction of effect:			
	erformance bias (systematic differences between , n the intervention under investigation)	groups in the care provided, apart		
11011				
B1	The comparison groups received the same care	NA		
	apart from the intervention(s) studied	11/1		
1				

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to	NA	
	treatment allocation		
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
C. A	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups with respect to	
loss	of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	No	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 2; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:			

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Unclear
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Unclear
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is th	e likely direction of its effect?	
	High risk of bias	
Like	ly direction of effect: Unknown	

Study reference		CHOU2008		
	Chou, Y-C., Lin, L-C., Pu, C-Y., et al. (2008) Outcomes and costs of residential services for			
	lts with intellectual disabilities in Taiwan: a comparate a comparate and the second structure of the second state and the second structure of the sec	rative evaluation. <i>Journal of Applied</i>		
-	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2		
	-	-		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups			
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors			
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	No		
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the			
	outcome(s) under study)			
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or			
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	Yes		
	potential confounders?			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,			
	including all major confounding and prognostic	No		
	factors			
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what		
	e likely direction of its effect?	•		
	Unclear/unknown risk			
Like	ly direction of effect:			
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart				
	n the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care	N		
	apart from the intervention(s) studied	No		

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Unclear	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Not reported	nent in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Unclear	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Not reported	no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Unclear	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:			

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	Unknown
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Study reference		CULLEN1995	
Cull	en, C., Whoriskey, M., Mackenzie, K., et al. (1995) T	The effects of deinstitutionalization on	
	adults with learning disabilities. Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 39, 484-494.		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups		
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors		
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA	
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the		
	outcome(s) under study)		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or		
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA	
	potential confounders?		
	r		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA	
	factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?	-	
	NA		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
fron	n the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care		
	apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA	

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as performance bias present? If so,	
	what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
C. A	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups with respect to	
loss	of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length		
	of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for	Yes	
	differences in length of follow-up)		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat	ment in each group?	
02	Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	inent in each group.	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment		
	completion (that is, there were no important or		
	systematic differences between groups in terms	Yes	
	of those who did not complete treatment)		
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were	no outcome data available?	
CO	Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to		
	the availability of outcome data (that is, there		
	were no important or systematic differences	Yes	
	between groups in terms of those for whom		
	outcome data were not available)		
	outcome data were not available)		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is	
the	likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Unclear
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Unclear
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Stuc	ly reference	DAGNAN1994A
otat		
0	nan, D., Howard, B. & Drewett, R.F. (1994a) A mov	1
	les for people with learning disabilities: activities or <i>bility Research, 38,</i> 567-576.	utside the nome. <i>Journal of Intellectual</i>
-	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2
Gui	actific topic. Mauris with autism	Review question number. Er & Ez
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	
AS	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)
11.0	election blus (systematic anterences between the	comparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups	
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors	
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the	
	outcome(s) under study)	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or	
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA
	potential confounders?	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,	
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA
	factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what
	e likely direction of its effect?	r
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart		
from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care	
	apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to	NA	
	treatment allocation		
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
C. A	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups with respect to	
loss	of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is	
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	No
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	No
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Study reference		HOLBURN2004	
long	Holburn, S., Jacobson, J.W., Schwartz, A.A., <i>et al.</i> (2004) The willowbrook futures project: a longitudinal analysis of person-centered planning. <i>American Journal on Mental Retardation</i> , 109, 63-76.		
	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Unclear	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
	B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart		
from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	No	

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	Attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 1; Control group N: 2	nent in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 1; Control group N: 2	no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w likely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is	
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study reference		KEARNEY1995	
	rney, C.A., Durand, V.M. & Mindell, J.A. (1995) It's adaptive/maladaptive behavior in persons with se		
	elopmental and Physical Disabilities, 7, 11-24.	evere nanoucaps. <i>Journal of</i>	
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	I	
A.S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups		
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors		
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA	
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the		
	outcome(s) under study)		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or		
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	Yes	
	potential confounders?		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA	
	factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care		
	apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA	

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w likely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Study reference		MCCONKEY2007		
Study reference				
	McConkey, R., Abbott, S., Walsh, P. N., et al. (2007) Variations in the social inclusion of			
	ole with intellectual disabilities in supported living	schemes and residential settings.		
	nal of Intellectual Disability Research, 51, 207–217.			
	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups			
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors			
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA		
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the			
	outcome(s) under study)			
A2	More any attempts made within the design or			
AZ	Were any attempts made within the design or			
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA		
	potential confounders?			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,			
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA		
	factors			
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	ras selection bias present? If so, what		
is th	e likely direction of its effect?			
	NA			
Like	ly direction of effect:			
D D				
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart				
from the intervention under investigation)				
B1	The comparison groups received the same care			
	apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA		

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	Attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Unclear
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w likely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is
	Low risk of bias	
Like	ely direction of effect:	

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	Unclear
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Unclear
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	No
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Study reference		MOLONY1990	
disa	Molony, H. & Taplin, J.E. (1990) The deinstitutionalization of people with developmental disability under the Richmond program: I. changes in adaptive behavior. <i>Australia and New Zealand Journal of Developmental Disabilities</i> , <i>16</i> , 149-159.		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w e likely direction of its effect?	as selection bias present? If so, what	
15 11	e likely difection of its effect:		
	NA		
Likely direction of effect:			
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA	

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	Attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w likely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Study reference		SCHALOCK1984	
	Schalock, R.L., Gadwood, L.S. & Perry, P.B. (1984) Effects of different training environments on the acquisition of community living skills. <i>Applied Research in Mental Retardation</i> , <i>5</i> , 425- 438		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A.S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:			
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to		
DZ	treatment allocation	No	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	Low risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Unclear
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Unclear
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	Yes
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study reference		SCHWARTZ2003
Schwartz, C. (2003) Self-appraised lifestyle satisfaction of persons with intellectual disability: the impact of personal characteristics and community residential facilities. <i>Journal of</i> <i>Intellectual and Developmental Disability, 28,</i> 227-240.		
Guideline topic: Adults with autismReview question number: E1 & E2		
Checklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	No
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
NA		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,	
	NA		
Like	ely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
	attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Study reference		SPREAT1998		
	eat, S., Conroy, J.W. & Rice, D.M. (1998) Improve qu			
	munity placement? implementation of OBRA for in arch in Developmental Disabilities, 19, 507-518.	adviduals with mental retardation.		
	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2		
Cha	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
Che	cknst completed by. Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups			
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors			
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA		
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the			
	outcome(s) under study)			
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or			
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA		
	potential confounders?			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,			
	including all major confounding and prognostic	Yes		
	factors			
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?				
	NA			
Likely direction of effect:				
<b>B</b> Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided apart				
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)				
B1	The comparison groups received the same care			
	apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA		

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ely direction of effect:	
	attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: 0	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

## **1.5.3** Observational studies (before-and-after studies)

Study reference		BHAUMIK2009		
Bibl	iographic reference:			
Bha	umik, S., Watson, J.M., Devapriam, J., et al. (2009) A	ggressive challenging behaviour in		
	ts with intellectual disability following community	resettlement. Journal of Intellectual		
	bility Research, 53, 298-302.			
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups			
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors			
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA		
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the			
	outcome(s) under study)			
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or			
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA		
	potential confounders?			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,			
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA		
	factors			
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what		
	e likely direction of its effect?	-		
NA				
T the last discretions of effects				
Likely direction of effect:				
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart				
from the intervention under investigation)				

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	ment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1       The study had an appropriate length of follow-up       Yes         D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias			
D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias	D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
D2       The study used a precise definition of outcome       Yes         D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias		up	
D3       A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome       Yes         D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias		•	
determine the outcome       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias	D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
determine the outcome       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias	D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
D4       Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention       No         D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias			
exposure to the intervention       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/ prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias			
D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias	D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
D5       Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors       No         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?       High risk of bias		exposure to the intervention	
important confounding/prognostic factors         Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?         High risk of bias		I the second	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect? High risk of bias	D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
is the likely direction of its effect? High risk of bias		important confounding/prognostic factors	
is the likely direction of its effect? High risk of bias			
High risk of bias	Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what
	is the likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
	0		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
Likely direction of effect. Effect Size bigger			

Study reference		BOURAS1993		
Siuc	ly reference	DOURAS1993		
Bibl	liographic reference:			
	ras, N., Kon, Y. & Drummond, C. (1993) Medical ar Ital handicap. <i>Journal of Intellectual Disability Researc</i>			
	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars			
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what		
is th	e likely direction of its effect?			
	NA			
Likely direction of effect:				
	erformance bias (systematic differences between n the intervention under investigation)	groups in the care provided, apart		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA		

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas performance bias present? If so,	
	t is the likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
C. A	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups with respect to	
	of participants)	companion groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length		
	of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for	NA	
	differences in length of follow-up)		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr	nent in each group?	
	Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment		
	completion (that is, there were no important or	NA	
	systematic differences between groups in terms		
	of those who did not complete treatment)		
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were	no outcome data available?	
	Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	I	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to		
	the availability of outcome data (that is, there		
	were no important or systematic differences	NA	
	between groups in terms of those for whom		
	outcome data were not available)		
Base	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is		
the likely direction of its effect?			
NA			
Like	ly direction of effect:		

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow- up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Unclear	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Unclear	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No	
Base	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?			
High risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			

Stu	dy reference	CHOU2011		
Bib	liagraphic reference:			
DID	liographic reference:			
	ou, Y.C., Pu, C., Kröger, T., et al. (2011) Outcomes of			
	n intellectual disabiliites in Taiwan: a 2-year follow-	-up. Journal of Intellectual Disability		
	arch, 55, 823-831.	Deriver question number E1 ( E)		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	•		
A. 5	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA		
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
NA				
Likely direction of effect:				
	-			
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart				
from the intervention under investigation)				

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 20; Control group N: NA	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 20; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	as attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Unclear	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
20	determine the outcome		
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
	1		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			

Stuc	ly reference	DAGNAN1998	
Bibl	iographic reference:		
peop	nan, D., Ruddick, L. & Jones, J. (1998) A longitudin ole with intellectual disability after leaving hospital <i>arch, 42,</i> 112-121.		
	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w e likely direction of its effect?	as selection bias present? If so, what	
	NA		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
	B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w at is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,	
	NA		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	Attrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	How many participants did not complete treatment in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA	
C3 a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data ava Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA		no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w likely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is	

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
	· ·		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
DU	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
	I the second		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
	0		
Like	Likely direction of offects Effect size bigger		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			

Study reference	DONNELLY1996
Bibliographic reference:	

Donnelly, M., McGilloway, S., Mays, N., *et al.* (1996) One and two year outcomes for adults with learning disabilities discharged to the community. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *168*, 598-606.

000.			
Gui	Guideline topic: Adults with autismReview question number: E1 & E2		
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
NA			

Likely direction of effect:

# **B.** Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	ment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
	*		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
		105	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
	I the second		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	-		
	High risk of bias		
	0		
Likely direction of offects Effect size bigger			
г гисе	Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		
1			

Stud	ly reference	GASKELL1995	
Bib	liographic reference:		
Gas	kell, G., Dockrell, J. & Rehman, H. (1995) Commun	ity care for people with challenging	
beha	aviours and mild learning disability: an evaluation	of an assessment and treatment unit.	
Briti	ish Journal of Clinical Psychology, 34, 383-395.		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A.S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w le likely direction of its effect?	vas selection bias present? If so, what	
	NA		
Likely direction of effect:			
B. P	erformance bias (systematic differences between	groups in the care provided, apart	

from the intervention under investigation)

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 16; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
	· ·		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
		105	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
	I		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	-		
	High risk of bias		
Likely direction of offects Effect size bigger			
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			
1			

Study reference		HEMMING1983	
D'11			
B1D1	iographic reference:		
	nming, H. (1983) The Swansea relocation study of m mational Journal of Rehabilitation Research, 6, 494-495		
	<b>deline topic:</b> Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA	

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas performance bias present? If so,	
	t is the likely direction of its effect?	1 1 /	
	NA		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
C. A	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups with respect to	
loss	of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length		
	of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for	NA	
	differences in length of follow-up)		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat	nent in each group?	
	Experimental group N: 19; Control group N: 23	1	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment		
	completion (that is, there were no important or	NA	
	systematic differences between groups in terms		
	of those who did not complete treatment)		
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were	no outcome data available?	
	Experimental group N: 25; Control group N: 24		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to		
	the availability of outcome data (that is, there		
	were no important or systematic differences	NA	
	between groups in terms of those for whom		
	outcome data were not available)		
Base	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is		
	likely direction of its effect?	-	
NA			
I :Lo	ly direction of offect:		
LIKE	Likely direction of effect:		

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			

Stud	ly reference	SIAPERAS2006			
Bibl	Bibliographic reference:				
-	eras, P. & Beadle-Brown, J. (2006) A case study of t roach in adults with autism in a residential home ir	C C			
	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2			
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars				
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)			
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	NA			
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	NA			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	NA			
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?					
	NA				
Likely direction of effect:					
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)					
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA			

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas performance bias present? If so,
	t is the likely direction of its effect?	
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
<b>C.</b> A	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups with respect to
loss	of participants)	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length	
_	of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for	NA
	differences in length of follow-up)	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treati	ment in each group?
	Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment	
	completion (that is, there were no important or	NA
	systematic differences between groups in terms	
	of those who did not complete treatment)	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were	no outcome data available?
	Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to	
	the availability of outcome data (that is, there	
	were no important or systematic differences	NA
	between groups in terms of those for whom	
	outcome data were not available)	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	l vas attrition bias present? If so, what is
	ikely direction of its effect?	
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	iy direction of chect.	

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Study reference		SPREAT2002	
Bibl	iographic reference:		
-	eat, S. & Conroy, J.W. (2002) The impact of deinstitu	itionalization on family contact.	
	arch in Developmental Disabilities, 23, 202-210.		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars		
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups		
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors		
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA	
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the		
	outcome(s) under study)		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or		
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA	
	potential confounders?		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA	
	factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
fron	n the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care	NTA	
	apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA	

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA	
Base	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as performance bias present? If so,	
	t is the likely direction of its effect?	· ·	
	NA		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
C. A	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups with respect to	
	of participants)	companyon groups man respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length		
	of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for	NA	
	differences in length of follow-up)		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr	nent in each group?	
	Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment		
	completion (that is, there were no important or	NA	
	systematic differences between groups in terms		
	of those who did not complete treatment)		
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were	no outcome data available?	
	Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to		
	the availability of outcome data (that is, there		
	were no important or systematic differences	NA	
	between groups in terms of those for whom		
	outcome data were not available)		
Base	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is		
the l	ikely direction of its effect?		
NA			
Likely direction of effect:			

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger		

Stu	ly reference	WEHMEYER2001	
Dib	liographic reference.		
D1D	liographic reference:		
	nmeyer, M.L. & Bolding, N. (2001) Enhanced self-de		
	llectual disability as an outcome of moving to com		
	ronments. Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 4		
Gui	deline topic: Adults with autism	<b>Review question number:</b> E1 & E2	
Che	cklist completed by: Odette Megnin-Viggars	1	
A. S	election bias (systematic differences between the	comparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups		
	was unrelated to potential confounding factors		
	(that is, the reason for participant allocation to	NA	
	treatment groups is not expected to affect the		
	outcome(s) under study)		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or		
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	NA	
	potential confounders?		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
	including all major confounding and prognostic	NA	
	factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as selection bias present? If so, what	
	e likely direction of its effect?		
	NA		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
B. P	erformance bias (systematic differences between	groups in the care provided, apart	
from the intervention under investigation)			

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	NA
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w t is the likely direction of its effect?	vas performance bias present? If so,
	NA	
Like	ly direction of effect:	
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between the of participants)	comparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	NA
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	nent in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	NA
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Experimental group N: 0; Control group N: NA	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	NA
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w ikely direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes	
	up		
	· ·		
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
05		165	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No	
	exposure to the intervention		
	- F		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what	
is th	e likely direction of its effect?		
	High risk of bias		
	0		
Libely divertion of effects Effect size bigger			
Likely direction of effect: Effect size bigger			
1			