

Table 2. Summary of the articles included in the scoping review

Article	Aim	Method	Findings
Clark et al (2016)	To assess the effects of autism training for front-line staff in community learning disabilities teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Mixed-methods study</li> <li>» Clinical and administrative staff members (<math>n=56</math>) in a multidisciplinary community learning disability service completed an electronic questionnaire to evaluate their levels of autism knowledge</li> <li>» Autism training was then provided to 13 administrative staff. Three months post-training, eight members of staff participated in a focus group to provide feedback on the content of the training and subsequent changes in their practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Compared with clinical staff, administrative staff had less understanding of autism and less training was available to them</li> <li>» Focus group feedback identified positive outcomes from the training and changes to practice, which included alterations to waiting environments, adapted communication and increased communication between staff about the needs of autistic service users</li> </ul>
Nancarrow et al (2019)	To evaluate delivery of bespoke STOMP (stopping overmedication of people with a learning disability, autism or both) training for learning disability teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Quantitative</li> <li>» A questionnaire assessing staff's knowledge of best practice and national guidance on psychotropic medicines use for people with learning disabilities was distributed to three specialist learning disability teams. One team received bespoke training on the content of the questionnaire before completing it</li> <li>» The survey was completed by 31 members of the trained team and 15 and 7 members of the untrained teams</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» The trained team scored 80% on 19/21 questions, which was a higher percentage than that in both the untrained teams. Therefore, training was associated with better knowledge of best practice and national guidance on psychotropic medicines use for people with learning disabilities</li> <li>» Nurses and psychologists are essential to STOMP delivery and consider it a priority, but scored lower on the survey than allied health professionals</li> </ul>
Treise et al (2021)	To implement and evaluate a three-step autism screening and diagnostic protocol in an early intervention in psychosis service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Quality improvement project</li> <li>» The protocol comprised a screening questionnaire, case note review and specialist autism assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Implementation of the protocol identified previously unidentified autistic patients – about one in ten of the early intervention in psychosis service caseload</li> <li>» The protocol increased understanding of the engagement, treatment and recovery of autistic patients with psychosis</li> <li>» Findings indicated that autistic patients with psychosis have different clinical presentations and treatment needs compared with non-autistic patients with psychosis. For example, increased additional resources – such as occupational therapy, music or art therapy and peer worker support – were required for the autistic patients</li> </ul>
Clarke and Fung (2022)	To determine the effects of autism-related training programmes on physicians' knowledge, self-efficacy and practice behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Systematic review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» The results of the included studies indicated that specialised autism training programmes are associated with improvements in physicians' knowledge and confidence in caring for autistic patients</li> <li>» Physicians were more likely to screen patients for autism following completion of training programmes</li> </ul>
Corden et al (2022)	To review quantitative research of healthcare professionals' knowledge, self-efficacy and attitudes towards working with autistic people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Systematic review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Narrative synthesis indicated that healthcare professionals report only moderate levels of autism knowledge and self-efficacy and often lack training</li> <li>» Healthcare professionals' limited knowledge and self-efficacy in working with autistic people was identified as a challenge to the provision of healthcare for autistic people</li> </ul>
Crowley et al (2022)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» To increase awareness in the area of undiagnosed autism without intellectual impairment in adult mental health settings</li> <li>» To highlight the importance of identifying this population more efficiently by referring to best-practice guidelines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Literature review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Autistic adults are often vulnerable to mental health issues and experience high rates of physical and psychiatric morbidity. In addition, autistic adults experience barriers to engaging with effective interventions, with a lower chance of recovery compared with the general population</li> <li>» The reviewers suggested that there is a need for further research into the benefits of having specialist staff in adult mental health teams and proposed a practical model for the application of this</li> </ul>
Kyle and Connolly (2022)	To highlight some of the difficulties that autistic people experience in accessing healthcare and to discuss the development and evaluation of an e-learning programme to educate healthcare staff working in an acute hospital setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Literature review and mixed-methods study</li> <li>» Staff working in child and adult services in an acute hospital setting (<math>n=141</math>) responded to a survey to identify what they considered priorities for their learning</li> <li>» The survey sought to elicit staff attitudes, knowledge and confidence when supporting and responding to the needs of autistic people who presented at the hospital</li> <li>» 104 staff working at the hospital completed the education programme. The original survey was then modified to evaluate completion of the programme and to understand whether staff had improved their knowledge and confidence as a result (<math>n=44</math> respondents)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» The literature review highlighted some gaps in the evidence base that meant it was challenging to understand the accessibility of healthcare services for autistic patients. Therefore, the authors deemed it necessary to develop and implement a new education programme for staff</li> <li>» In the initial survey, almost 80% of respondents had undertaken no formal education on autism; almost 90% of respondents believed it was important to understand the characteristics of autism; and about 94% of respondents wanted to know about issues to consider when an autistic person accesses the healthcare system</li> <li>» It was recognised that use of the term 'autistic person' is preferred over 'person with autism'</li> <li>» The results of the survey following completion of the education programme were inconclusive due to the small response rate</li> </ul>
National Development Team for Inclusion (2022)	To evaluate the Oliver McGowan Mandatory Training Trial in Learning Disability and Autism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Three training packages (A, B and C) were trialled and evaluated. Each training package had two components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Tier 1 training – designed for those who require a general awareness of people with learning disabilities and/or autistic people and the support needed</li> <li>— Tier 2 training – designed for those who may need to provide care and support for people with learning disabilities and/or autistic people</li> </ul> </li> <li>» The training packages were evaluated using observations, surveys, interviews and group discussions</li> <li>» Tier 1 and 2 training packages were delivered to 8,374 participants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» The evidence for tier 1 training package B (1.5 hour e-learning followed by 0.5 hour online interactive webinar with an expert by experience) was that it was fit for purpose, high quality and well-received</li> <li>» There was insufficient evidence on tier 1 training packages A and C</li> <li>» Tier 2 training package C was found to have better outcomes than A or B, but required two days to deliver, which is likely to be a barrier to its implementation</li> </ul>
Rudra et al (2022)	To evaluate the effects of a simulation-based training course in learning disability psychiatry and autism co-delivered by people with learning disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Mixed-methods study</li> <li>» A simulation-based training course directed at speciality trainees (psychiatrists) was developed based on the speciality training in learning disability curriculum. The course was co-delivered by a person with a learning disability</li> <li>» Eight psychiatrists attended the training. They completed pre-course and post-course confidence questionnaires and attended a semi-structured group interview at two months post-course</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» All eight psychiatrists had a significant increase in confidence for all scores in the post-course questionnaire compared with the pre-course questionnaire. For example, their confidence in their knowledge of areas such as mental health legislation increased, and they had improved confidence in skills such as communication with families of people with learning disabilities and in having difficult conversations with senior supervisors</li> <li>» Follow-up interviews with the psychiatrists identified the importance of supported and structured training opportunities for people with learning disabilities, as well as the value of connection with their peers and supervisor</li> </ul>
Simpson et al (2022)	To identify the research and training priorities of staff supporting individuals with learning disabilities and/or autistic people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Quantitative study</li> <li>» Staff (<math>n=82</math>) from an organisation that supports individuals with learning disabilities and/or autistic people identified their access to training and research and what they viewed as priorities in these areas</li> <li>» These staff also completed a questionnaire on training and research priorities, which used a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'not important' to 'very important'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Staff were more likely to rely on training than research to inform their knowledge</li> <li>» Staff indicated understanding and managing behaviours as a training priority</li> <li>» Staff identified interventions and support for caregivers as a research priority</li> <li>» More than half of the staff reported never or rarely accessing research to inform their work</li> </ul>
O'Hagan et al (2023)	To identify features of autism-friendly practice according to a sample primarily consisting of professionals whose interests include autism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» A modified three-round Delphi method</li> <li>» Statements about components of autism-friendly practice were compiled and scored by participants in three rounds of surveys</li> <li>» 78 participants responded to the first-round survey, 51 responded to the second-round survey and 38 responded to the third-round survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» Highly ranked statements included topics such as environmental or operational modifications and staff training to support autistic patients</li> <li>» The findings highlighted previously reported barriers to accessing care, including the need for inclusive engagement with the autistic community</li> </ul>