


Figures

Figure 1

	Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Other bias
Hollander 2006	?	?	+	+	+	+	?
Ichikawa 2017	?	+	+	+	+	-	?
Kent 2013	+	+	+	+	+	+	?
Marcus 2009	?	?	+	+	+	-	?
McCracken 2002	?	?	+	+	+	?	+
Shea 2004	?	?	+	+	+	+	?

Risk of bias summary: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item for each included study.

Figure 2 (Analysis 1.1)




Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)
- (G) Other bias

Forest plot of comparison: 1 Antipsykotika vs. ingen antipsykotika, outcome: 1.1 Antal personer med aggression.

Figure 3 (Analysis 1.2)




Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)
- (G) Other bias

Forest plot of comparison: 1 Antipsykotika vs. ingen antipsykotika, outcome: 1.2 Antal personer med alvorlige bivirkninger.

Figure 4 (Analysis 1.3)




Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)
- (G) Other bias

Forest plot of comparison: 1 Antipsykotika vs. ingen antipsykotika, outcome: 1.3 Funktionsniveau, klinikerbedømt, antal personer med CGI-improvement, much eller very-much improved (score of 1 or 2).

Figure 5 (Analysis 1.4)



Footnotes


- (1) CGI-Severity, Final
- (2) CGI-Severity, change
- (3) CGI-Severity, change
- (4) CGI-Severity, change

Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)
- (G) Other bias

Forest plot of comparison: 1 Antipsykotika vs. ingen antipsykotika, outcome: 1.4 Funktionsniveau, klinikerbedømt.

Figure 6 (Analysis 1.5)




Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)
- (G) Other bias

Forest plot of comparison: 1 Antipsykotika vs. ingen antipsykotika, outcome: 1.5 Antal personer med ikke-ålvrlige bivirkninger.

Figure 7 (Analysis 1.6)




Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)
- (G) Other bias

Forest plot of comparison: 1 Antipsykotika vs. ingen antipsykotika, outcome: 1.6 Antal personer med vægtøgning.

Figure 8 (Analysis 1.7)



Footnotes


- (1) Vægtøgning kg.
- (2) Vægtøgning kg.
- (3) Vægtøgning kg.

Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)
- (G) Other bias

Forest plot of comparison: 1 Antipsykotika vs. ingen antipsykotika, outcome: 1.7 Vægt, kg.

Figure 9 (Analysis 1.8)



Footnotes


- (1) change
- (2) Change

Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)
- (G) Other bias


Forest plot of comparison: 1 Antipsykotika vs. ingen antipsykotika, outcome: 1.8 Irritabilitet, ABC-J irritability subscale, lower better.

Figure 10 (Analysis 1.9)



Forest plot of comparison: 1 Antipsykotika vs. ingen antipsykotika, outcome: 1.9 Livskvalitet.

Figure 11 (Analysis 1.10)



Forest plot of comparison: 1 Antipsykotika vs. ingen antipsykotika, outcome: 1.10 Forældre trivsel (caregiver strain).