Effectiveness of Wet Sheet Packs in Children and Adolescents with Severe Auto/Hetero Aggressive Behaviors: An Exploratory Approach
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Abstract: Objective: To explore the effectiveness of wet sheet packs on auto/hetero aggressive behaviors in children and adolescents hospitalized in a psychiatric setting.

Method: We reviewed the charts of all patients (N=8) who received packing therapy in the context of resistance to behavioral interventions, milieu therapy and medications from 2005-2009. We scored the level of auto/hetero aggressive behaviors per patient for each day they were hospitalized. Inter rater reliability was good (Intraclass correlations=0.91). We used a mixed generalized linear model to assess whether the following explanatory variables (time, typical and atypical antipsychotics, mood stabilizer, sedative drug, stimulant and wet sheet pack) influenced the course of aggression over time, the dependant variable.

Results: Using univariate analysis, the only variables that were found to be associated with a significant decrease in auto/hetero aggressive score were time (p=8 10^-3), atypical antipsychotics (p=.027) and packing therapy (p=10^-9). Effect of packing therapy remained significant after adjustment for atypical antipsychotics (p=1.8 10^-9) and for time (p=.0017).

Conclusion: In addition to atypical antipsychotics and milieu therapy, the results of this exploratory study suggest that wet sheet packs may be effective in relieving auto/hetero aggressive behaviors.
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Treatment of severe auto/hetero aggressive behaviors in children and adolescents is a complex issue. It is useful to treat symptoms as well as underlying psychiatric conditions. Symptomatic treatments include behavioral, family interventions (Périsset, Gérardin, Cohen, Flamet & Mazet, 2006), and psychotropic medications, mostly sedative drugs, mood stabilizers and antipsychotics (Gérardin, Cohen & Flamet, 2002). To date, only few atypical antipsychotics have been approved in minors for irritability and behavioral impairment associated with intellectual disability and/or pervasive developmental disorder, and these have numerous adverse effects (Bonnot, Inaoui, Lloret-Linares, & Cohen, 2011). In some treatment-resistant cases with autism, clozapine (Lambrey, S., et al., 2010), intensive behavioural intervention (Frazier et al., 2010) and electro-convulsive therapy (ECT) (Wachtel et al., 2009) have been recommended, even in children and adolescents. The search for other therapeutic options is urgent.

Wet sheet packs, or packing therapy, are an adjunct treatment given in a hospital. In our setting, this treatment is administered by psychomotricians, a type of occupational therapist. Packing therapy involves enveloping a patient in cold damp sheets for one hour sessions while he or she is fully and spontaneously invited to express him or herself (Cohen et al., 2009). Due to the absence of evidence-based studies supporting this treatment, its usefulness with children and adolescents with autism is controversial (Spinney, 2007; Rhode, 2008; Delion, 2010). Recent controversies have emerged based on: (i) the absence of an evidence base to support the treatment; (ii) the possible absence of free consent in individuals with poor communication skills; and (iii) the erroneous association of the theoretical background of packing with psychoanalysis (although the patient’s experience of packing may contribute to the psychodynamic metapsychology of the self (Delion, 2010)). This final point is crucial, as there is strong disagreement between parents’ associations and psychodynamic theory in the field of autism in France (Chamak & Cohen, 2003) and abroad (Rhode, 2008). As described by A. J. Ayres (2005) or A. Bullinger (Klocekner et al., 2009), we believe that packing therapy should be understood as a sensory integration approach. Sensory integration is the hierarchical organization of the somatic sensations which serve as foundations for an individual’s perceptions, behaviors and learning. The greatest potential for the development of sensory integration occurs within an adaptation response, which is defined as a purposeful, goal-directed response to a sensory experience. Auditory, vestibular, proprioceptive, tactile and visual senses are progressively integrated as a body percept and are rooted...
in different psychosomatic functions, such as the coordination of the two sides of the body, motor planning, activity level, attention span and emotional stability. Sensory integration dysfunction results in a wide variety of developmental disorders (Bundy, Shia, Qi & Miller, 2007) including pervasive developmental disorders and behavioral disturbances associated with severe psychosocial adversity.

Packing therapy has a long history, and was first used in the nineteenth century. In the United States, it was used mostly in adult psychiatric inpatients as an alternative to physical restraints. By the 1980s, when Ross and colleagues (1988) surveyed U.S. psychiatric hospitals, it was being used rarely. By reviewing its use in 46 hospitalized psychiatric patients at Sheppard-Pratt Hospital, these investigators concluded that the treatment was safe and had interesting and useful effects that go beyond the concept of simple restraint. There have been some case reports on children and adolescents. Singh, also working at Sheppard-Pratt, reported on the case of a severely self-destructive adolescent who responded well to treatment with cold wet sheet packs (1986).

Goeb and colleagues (2009), reported on a sample of ten outpatients aged 5 to 16 years with pervasive developmental disorder who demonstrated severe behavioral impairments; these patients showed significant improvement on the Aberrant Behavior Checklist (ABC, (Aman, Singh, Stewart, & Field, 1985) after packing therapy was implemented. ABC total, irritability and hyperactivity scores showed a 38%, 50% and 42% decrease, respectively. Cohen et al. (2009) reported on a sample of six patients with catatonia aged 13 to 17 years who received packing therapy. As measured by the Bush-Francis Catatonia Rating Scale (Bush, Fink, Petrides, Dowling, & Francis, 1996), four of the six patients improved after receiving packing therapy. However, because of the study designs, neither of these studies was able to control for other therapeutic approaches.

Given the paucity of data, we aimed to use an exploratory approach to study the potential effectiveness of packing therapy in severe aggressive behaviors. We retrospectively reviewed therapeutic data on all inpatients who received packing sessions from 2005 to 2009 due to severe auto/hetero aggressive behaviors that proved to be partially resistant to psychotropic drugs and milieu therapy. We used a General Linear Mixed (GLM) model with adjustments for time and psychotropic drugs to control for other therapeutic approaches (Lambrey et al., 2010). We found that packing therapy significantly reduced auto/hetero aggressive behaviors.

**METHOD**

**Participants**

We reviewed data from all cases of children and adolescents with severe auto/hetero aggressive behaviors who had wet sheet packs during their inpatient stay during the years 2005-2009. Inclusion criteria were intentionally broad to enhance the generalizability of findings, consistent with recommendations for effectiveness studies (Garleheger, Hansen, Nissman, Lohr & Carey, 2006). The exclusion criteria were the following: (1) dry sheet pack (n=0); (2) wet sheet pack for a different symptom (n=1: catatonia); and (3) inpatient stay less than eight weeks, as that would not allow for control of time within the GLM model (n=0) (see below). The final sample included eight patients hospitalized in the Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry at a university teaching hospital (GH Pitié-Salpêtrière, Paris). At this hospital, packing therapy was proposed as an adjunct or alternative treatment for patients who did not improve sufficiently to be discharged despite adequate behavioral interventions, milieu therapy and medications. All patients and parents consented to the use of packing therapy.

Table I summarizes the socio-demographic and clinical characteristics of the patients. The sample included 62.5% boys (n=5) and 37.5% girls (n=3). The mean age was 11 years (range 7-15). The eight patients presented severe auto/hetero aggressive behaviors comorbid with other disorders, including: externalizing disorders (n=6); mood disorders (n=4); pervasive developmental disorder (n=4); and/or attachment disorders (n=3). Five patients had experienced severe psychosocial trauma including maltreatment (n=4) and/or abandonment/foster care (n=4).

**Intervention: Packing Therapy**

Packing therapy is aimed at restoring sensory integration and body representations, and reducing anxiety. The overall treatment encompasses a series of twice-a-week sessions over a minimum length of one month. Sessions take place in the same quiet room and they usually last one hour each; though, they can be expanded up to two hours depending on the patient’s response. During sessions the patient wears a bathing suit. Sessions are conducted under the supervision of a *psychomotricien*\(^1\) and involve at least two members of the patient’s care team. At the beginning of the session, the patient’s consent to proceed is orally obtained as no session is compulsory. Then, the patient is first wrapped in cold damp sheets (cold phase) and covered up with a rescue and a dry blanket. Afterward the body spontaneously warms up (warm phase). The patient is then invited to freely express his feelings, bodily/receptive sensations and somatic fantasies. Cardiac rate, respiratory rate and blood pressure are monitored during the session to detect any adverse cardio-vascular effects or adverse autonomous reactions. A brief moment of drawing or modeling with clay is proposed at the end of each session in order to provide non-verbal avenues through which the patient can express feelings and explore body representations. Throughout the session, the patient’s comments as well as relevant observations from the clinicians (e.g., clinical signs, body image, coenesthesic sensations, and adverse events) are carefully recorded by one of the observers (Cohen et al., 2009; Delion, P., 2007).

**Procedure and Variables**

We retrospectively reviewed charts from the hospitalization period for all patients in the sample, including clinician and nursing notes. All information pertaining to the identity of the subjects was removed. Two co-authors (AL and CJ) independently extracted the relevant

---

\(^1\) *psychomotricien* is a therapist holding a French diploma in *psychomotricité* which is a specialized training in psychomotor disturbances within the Occupational Therapy course.
data from the originally selected reports and reviews. Contradictions between the data selected by the two co-authors were checked for improper extraction; final data decisions were made by consensus.

Selected data included socio-demographic data, medical histories, psychiatric diagnosis, and treatment information. Socio-demographic data were systematically assessed at admission and included age, gender, and psychosocial history. A detailed medical history based on personal and family past psychiatric history was recorded at intake using a semi-structured interview (Taieb et al., 2002). The inpatient team routinely uses standardized instruments to improve diagnosis (e.g. Autism Diagnostic Interview-Revised when pervasive developmental disorder is suspected; Diagnostic Interview for Genetic Study when schizophrenia or a mood disorder is suspected). Diagnoses were based on ICD-10 criteria. However, for the patients in this study diagnoses were made through the team consensus best-estimate diagnostic method due to the difficulties involved in testing individuals who exhibit such problematic behaviors and/or psychosocial backgrounds (Klein, Ouimette, Kelly, Ferro, & Riso, 1994). The diagnostic team included the two co-authors who extracted the data and two senior psychiatrists with a large amount of experience in inpatient care (DC and AC). Finally, data regarding treatment included duration of the hospitalization, the type, date and number of prescribed medications, the number and date of wet sheet pack sessions, and all adverse events regarding packing sessions.

To assess the effect of each treatment on auto/hetero aggression, medical and nursing files were systematically reviewed (Frazier et al., 2010). Following the method of Lambrey et al. (2010), each day was coded for aggression as follows: a score was given for each nurse team period (i.e., morning, afternoon and night) on each day; 0 indicated no aggressive behavior, 1 indicated at least one unquestionable physically aggressive act (e.g., destroying property, assaulting others, self-harm) with no emergency treatment, and 2 represented at least one aggressive act followed by an emergency sedative treatment. By summing the three periods per day, we computed scores ranging from 0 to 6 per day for each patient for each day of inpatient stay. Interrater reliability was calculated on 71 randomly selected patient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Sex, Age</th>
<th>Duration, in days*</th>
<th>Behavioral impairment</th>
<th>ICD10 diagnosis</th>
<th>Psychosocial context</th>
<th>Baseline aggression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F, 15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Auto/hetero AB</td>
<td>Conduct disorder</td>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed episode</td>
<td>Abandonment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PDD-NOS</td>
<td>Foster care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M, 9</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Auto/hetero AB</td>
<td>Disinhibited attachment disorder</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PDD-NOS</td>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F, 13</td>
<td>&gt;300</td>
<td>Auto AB</td>
<td>MDE with PF</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M, 11</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Auto/hetero AB</td>
<td>Disinhibited attachment disorder</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dysthymia</td>
<td>Child neglect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading &amp; mathematical disorder</td>
<td>FH of alcoholism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FH of antisocial PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foster care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M, 13</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>Auto/hetero AB</td>
<td>Conduct disorder</td>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dysthymia</td>
<td>Parent conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FH of antisocial PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foster care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M, 9</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Auto/hetero AB</td>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>FH of poor therapeutic alliance</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M, 7</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Hetero AB</td>
<td>Disinhibited attachment disorder</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADHD</td>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ODD</td>
<td>Foster care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct disorder</td>
<td>FH of instability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F, 11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Auto AB</td>
<td>PDD-NOS</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F=female; M=male; AB=aggressive behavior; PDD-NOS=pervasive developmental disorder-not otherwise specified; D=disorder; ODD=oppositional defiant disorder; ADHD=attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; FH=family history; P=personality; MDE with PF=Major Depressive Episode with Psychotic Features.

*Duration of hospitalization included also days spent outside the hospital (e.g. week ends).

**Baseline aggression score = Σ day 1 to day 7 (Maximum score = 7 x 6 = 42).
days. The intraclass correlation (ICC) between two blind raters was excellent (ICC=0.91).

Statistical Analysis
To assess the effect of therapeutic variables on auto/hetero aggressive behaviors during hospitalization, we used a generalized linear mixed model. Statistical analyses were performed using R Software, Version 2.11.0 with the package lme4, precisely the “glmer” function (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing). This function assumes the residuals correlation matrix to be symmetric and positive semidefinite, which in SAS-speak is called an “unstructured” variance-covariance matrix. For each treatment, a Poisson regression model for repeated measurements was applied, taking the aggression score as dependent variable and the treatment as explanatory variable. Indeed, the aggression score is a function of the number of aggressive events and it follows a Poisson distribution. Since the mean and the variance were approximately the same (respectively 0.95 and 1), we didn’t have to take any over dispersion into account. In sum, we performed a linear regression that was generalized to the variable distribution (here a Poisson distribution) and mixed to take into account patients’ auto correlations (Cnaan, Laird & Slasor, 1997).

RESULTS
The patients had in average 17 packing sessions (range: 6 – 32), for a duration of packing therapy ranging from 3 to 19 weeks. Clinicians reported no significant adverse events except 3 (2%) sessions that were postponed due to patient’s refusal and 7 (5.1%) sessions of dry sheet packs because the patient complained of the initial cold effect. Mean baseline aggression (Σ day 1 to day 7) and discharge aggression scores (Σ day -7 from discharge to day discharge) were 16.4 (range: 11–29) and 8.1 (range 3–20) (Paired t-test, t=3.72, df=7, p=0.0075). The total number of days of hospitalization with computed aggression scores for the eight patients in our sample was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>N [N’]*</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>z value</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical antipsychotic</td>
<td>N=6 [N’=550]</td>
<td>0.8165</td>
<td>5.012</td>
<td>&lt;10^-6</td>
<td>Significant effect: higher aggressive score when typical antipsychotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypical antipsychotic</td>
<td>N=5 [N’=448]</td>
<td>-0.2809</td>
<td>-2.205</td>
<td>0.0274</td>
<td>Significant effect: lower aggressive score when atypical antipsychotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood stabilizer</td>
<td>N=3 [N’=226]</td>
<td>-0.1550</td>
<td>-1.148</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>No significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressant</td>
<td>N=2 [N’=102]</td>
<td>0.09838</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>No significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedative drug</td>
<td>N=7 [N’=376]</td>
<td>0.1180</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>No significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulant</td>
<td>N=1 [N’=68]</td>
<td>0.1157</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>No significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing</td>
<td>N=8 [N’=596]</td>
<td>-0.48122</td>
<td>-6.329</td>
<td>&lt;10^-9</td>
<td>Significant effect: lower aggressive score when packing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>N=8 [N’=942]</td>
<td>-0.010764</td>
<td>-3.356</td>
<td>0.000792</td>
<td>Significant effect: lower aggressive score over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing adjusted for atypical antipsychotic</td>
<td>N=8 [N’=595]</td>
<td>-0.46854</td>
<td>-6.016</td>
<td>1.79 10^-9</td>
<td>Significant effect: lower aggressive score when packing after adjustment for atypical antipsychotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing adjusted for time</td>
<td>N=8 [N’=942]</td>
<td>-0.417646</td>
<td>-3.138</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>Significant effect: lower aggressive score when packing after adjustment for time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLM model= Generalized Linear Mixed model.
*N=Number of subjects exposed to treatment in the model.
N’=Number of days with one treatment all patients combined in the model.

The dependant variable entered in the model was aggression score. The explanatory variables included in the model were: atypical antipsychotics, typical antipsychotics, stimulants, antidepressants, sedative drugs, mood stabilizers, and packing therapy. For psychotropic drugs, therapeutic classes were defined on the basis of the EphMRA classification (European pharmaceutical Market Research Association). Since the effect of packing (or any other treatment) may theoretically reflect a spontaneous improvement over time or an improvement due to other therapeutic factors, rather than a specific effect, time was also entered as an explicative variable.

Table 2. Effect of Packing and Psychotropic Medications on Auto/Hetero Aggressive Behavior During Hospitalization (N=8): Summary of the GLM Model
equal to 942. Table 2 indicates all therapeutic approaches that were entered in the model by class in terms of number of patients (N) and the number of days (N′) patients were exposed to one treatment. Table 2 also summarizes the findings from the GLM model of the effect of each explicative variable on auto/hetero aggressive behaviors.

There was no significant effect on auto/hetero aggression score for mood stabilizers, antidepressants, sedative drugs or stimulants. Typical antipsychotics had a significant effect \( (p=10^{-6}) \); the prescription of typical antipsychotics was associated with higher aggression scores. Atypical antipsychotics also had a significant effect \( (p=0.027) \); the prescription of atypical antipsychotics was associated with lower aggression scores. Packing therapy had a significant effect \( (p=10^{-8}) \); lower aggression scores were seen when packing therapy was given. Finally, time had a significant effect \( (p=0.0008) \), with aggression scores decreasing over time. The effect of packing therapy remained significant after adjusting for atypical antipsychotics \( (p=1.8 \times 10^{-9}) \) and for time \( (p=0.0017) \).

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first report exploring the use of wet sheet packs as an adjunct to psychotropic medications for treating severe aggressive behaviors in children and adolescents hospitalized for such behaviors. Even after adjustments for time and atypical antipsychotic exposure, packing therapy appeared to significantly decrease aggressive behaviors. Our results support the effectiveness of atypical antipsychotics, for aggressive behaviors and/or irritability in children and adolescents with pervasive developmental disorder and/or intellectual disabilities, as has been demonstrated in evidence-based studies. In randomized placebo-controlled trials to date, risperidone (Aman, De Smedt, Derivan, Lyons & Finding, 2002; Buitelaar, Van der Gaag, Cohen-Kettenis & Melman, 2001; McCracken et al., 2002; Shea et al., 2004; Snyder, et al., 2002), aripiprazole (Marcus, et al., 2009; Owen, et al., 2009) and divalproex (Hollander et al., 2010) have been shown to be superior to placebo in reducing irritability and/or aggression. The paradoxical result regarding the significant increase of aggression with typical antipsychotic should be interpreted with caution since cyamemazine (a typical antipsychotic available in France) was the most frequent emergency prescription used due to its sedative properties. Given that the scoring method was based on whether or not an emergency treatment was given, it is not surprising to find such an association. The absence of significant effect with other medications is probably due to the lack of power and the small number of patients exposed (Table 2).

Several limitations of this study should be mentioned: (1) the retrospective collection of the data; (2) the small sample size; (3) the fact that the evaluation of the severity was not conducted by researchers blind to the diagnosis; (4) the absence of an a priori definition of responders, given the retrospective design; (5) the lack of a control group; (6) since the effect of wet sheet packs occurred both in children and adolescents in our small group, we cannot assume whether packing is better or equal according to age. However, strengths should be noted as well: (1) the excellent intraclass correlation of aggression score; (2) that each patient served as his own control, and that no patient was excluded; and (3) that confounding concurrent pharmacotherapy and time effect were accounted for through using GLM model. Given the difficulty of including such severe patients in double-blind placebo-controlled trials, the current method as well as other methods developed recently to answer these issues (Lambrey et al., 2010; Frazier et al., 2010), can be generalized to explore the effectiveness of other therapeutic approaches including behavioral interventions with prospective design and blind assessment.

Although it was not investigated in this study, some speculation on how packing therapy works may be proposed. First, in terms of therapeutic effect, we hypothesize that packing therapy provided the patient a new bodily/tactile experience, including both a holding effect and a sensory-integrative effect (Cohen, et al., 2009). To support this view, we recently reported the case of an adolescent with autism and catatonia in whom improvement of catatonia during packing paralleled better body representation of the body in drawings the patient made at the end of the sessions (Consoli et al., 2010). Second, packing therapy also had a powerful relaxing effect; normal individuals usually sleep during the warm time of the packing therapy session. This relaxing effect comes from the warming up of the body and from the body pressure caused by the wrapping. The relaxing effect of body pressure has been explained by Temple Grandin, an adult with autism who uses a self-made machine to produce this effect on her own body (Grandin, 1986; Chamak, Bonniau, Jaunay & Cohen, 2008). Third, since five of the eight cases in this study had a history of severe psychosocial adversity, we wonder whether or not the cumulative effects of holding, sensory-integration and relaxation during packing may have improved their feeling of being whole, of being internally secure. All together, these effects may improve body image and integration.

We conclude that packing therapy operates as a sensory-integration and relaxing approach useful in treating severe auto/hetero aggressive behaviors in children and adolescents. Packing therapy seems to be a feasible and promising adjunct treatment, along with psychotropic medications and other behavioral interventions. Further clinical studies are needed to clarify the possible efficacy and underlying mechanisms of packing therapy.
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