Table O.15: Advocacy Skills Kit Diary or Personal Health Profile versus treatment as usual

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated absolute effects	
							With treatment as usual	With hand-held health record		Risk with treatment as usual	Risk difference with hand-held health record (95% CI)

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
Health promotion (blood pressure checked)											
119 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊝ LOW[1] due to imprecision	32/68 (47.1%)	28/51 (54.9%)	RR 1.17 (0.82 to 1.66)	471 per 1000	80 more per 1000 (from 85 fewer to 311 more)
Health promotion (constipation investigation)											
119 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊝ LOW[1] due to imprecision	1/68 (1.5%)	5/51 (9.8%)	RR 6.67 (0.8 to 55.33)	15 per 1000	83 more per 1000 (from 3 fewer to 799 more)
Health promotion (hearing test)											
119 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊝ LOW[1] due to imprecision	2/68 (2.9%)	3/51 (5.9%)	RR 2 (0.35 to 11.53)	29 per 1000	29 more per 1000 (from 19 fewer to 310 more)
Health promotion (vision test)											
119 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊝ LOW[1] due to imprecision	4/68 (5.9%)	7/51 (13.7%)	RR 2.33 (0.72 to 7.55)	59 per 1000	78 more per 1000 (from 16 fewer to 385 more)
Health promotion (weight measured)											
119 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊝ LOW[1] due to imprecision	17/68 (25%)	18/51 (35.3%)	RR 1.41 (0.81 to 2.46)	250 per 1000	102 more per 1000 (from 47 fewer to 365 more)
Health promotion (weight management plan)											
119	no	no serious	no serious	very	undetecte	⊕⊕⊝⊝	12/68	5/51	RR 0.56	176 per	78 fewer per

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
(1 study) 52 weeks	serious risk of bias	inconsistency	indirectness	serious[1]	d	LOW[1] due to imprecision	(17.6%)	(9.8%)	(0.21 to 1.48)	1000	1000 (from 139 fewer to 85 more)
Health promotion (epilepsy review)											
119 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW[1] due to imprecision	8/68 (11.8%)	11/51 (21.6%)	RR 1.83 (0.8 to 4.23)	118 per 1000	98 more per 1000 (from 24 fewer to 380 more)
Service user knowledge of health problems (measured with: Knowledge of Health Problems and Terminology Checklist (unvalidated measure); Better indicated by higher values)											
66 (1 study)	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	32	34	-		The mean service user knowledge of health problems in the intervention groups was 0.32 standard deviations lower (0.81 lower to 0.16 higher)
Carer knowledge of health problems (measured with: Knowledge of Health Problems and Terminology Checklist (unvalidated measure); Better indicated by higher values)											
144 (1 study)	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	74	70	-		The mean carer knowledge of health problems in the

Quality assessment						Summary of findings				
										intervention groups was 0 standard deviations higher (0.33 lower to 0.33 higher)
Carer satisfaction (Better indicated by lower values)										
101 (1 study)	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	undetected	$\oplus\ominus\ominus\ominus$ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	52	49	-		The mean carer satisfaction in the intervention groups was 0 standard deviations higher (0.39 lower to 0.39 higher)
Service user satisfaction (Better indicated by lower values)										
36 (1 study)	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	undetected	$\oplus\ominus\ominus\ominus$ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	20	16	-		The mean service user satisfaction in the intervention groups was 0.6 standard deviations higher (0.08 lower to 1.27 higher)
Premature death										
169	serious[2]	no serious	no serious	very	undetecte	$\oplus\ominus\ominus\ominus$	2/88	5/81	RR 2.72	23 per	39 more per

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
(1 study)		inconsistency	indirectness	serious[1]	d		VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	(2.3%)	(6.2%)	(0.54 to 13.61)	1000	1000 (from 10 fewer to 287 more)

[1] Optimal information size not met; small, single study
[2] Crucial limitation for one criterion or some limitations for multiple criteria sufficient to lower ones confidence in the estimate of effect