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RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the comparative effectiveness of the sensory processing measure versus the sensory profile 2?

2. What are the evidence-based guidelines regarding the assessment and treatment of sensory processing challenges in children?

KEY FINDINGS

No relevant literature was identified regarding the clinical effectiveness of the sensory processing measure compared with the sensory profile 2. In addition, no relevant evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding the assessment and treatment of sensory processing challenges in children.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, The Cochrane Library, University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) and CINAHL databases, Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. For research question 1, no methodological filters were applied to limit retrieval by study type. For research question 2 methodological filters were applied to limit retrieval health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and guidelines. Where possible, retrieval was limited to the human population. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2011 and September 9, 2016. Internet links were provided, where available.

SELECTION CRITERIA

One reviewer screened citations and selected studies based on the inclusion criteria presented in Table 1.
Table 1: Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Children (2-18 years of age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Q1: Sensory processing measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2: Any assessment type; Any treatment associated with sensory processing challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparator</td>
<td>Q1: Sensory profile 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2: No comparator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Q1: Clinical effectiveness;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2: Guidelines and clinical practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Designs</td>
<td>Health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, evidence-based guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

No relevant health technology assessments, systematic reviews and meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, or non-randomized studies were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness of the sensory processing measure compared with the sensory profile 2. In addition, no relevant evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding the assessment and treatment of sensory processing challenges in children.

References of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

No relevant literature was identified regarding the clinical effectiveness of the sensory processing measure compared with the sensory profile 2. In addition, no relevant evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding the assessment and treatment of sensory processing challenges in children; therefore, no summary can be provided.
REFERENCES SUMMARIZED

Health Technology Assessments
No literature identified.

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses
No literature identified.

Randomized Controlled Trials
No literature identified.

Non-Randomized Studies
No literature identified.

Guidelines and Recommendations
No literature identified.
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APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses – No/Alternate Comparator


Non-Randomized Studies

Alternate Comparator

Alternate Interventions


