Table O.52: Mindfulness interventions for paid carers versus any control

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 any control	With mindfulness interventions		Risk with any control	Risk difference with mindfulness interventions (95% CI)
Carer health and well-being (mental well-being) – post-treatment (Better indicated by higher values)											
120 (1 study)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	54	66	-		The mean carer health and well-being (mental well-being) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.17 standard deviations higher (0.19 lower to 0.53 higher)
Carer health and well-being (mental well-being) – follow-up (Better indicated by higher values)											
120 (1 study) 6 weeks	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	54	66	-		The mean carer health and well-being (mental well-being) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.28 standard deviations higher (0.08 lower to 0.64 higher)
Carer health and well-being (mental ill health) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
154 (2 studies)	serious[3]	serious[4]	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[2,3,4] due to risk of bias,	70	84	-		The mean carer health and well-being (mental ill health) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
						inconsistency, imprecision			-		0.54 standard deviations lower (1.06 to 0.02 lower)
Carer health and well-being (mental ill health) – follow-up (Better indicated by lower values)											
154 (2 studies) 6-13 weeks	serious[3]	serious[4]	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[2,3,4] due to risk of bias, inconsistency, imprecision	70	84	-		The mean carer health and well-being (mental ill health) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.24 standard deviations lower (0.72 lower to 0.24 higher)
Carer health and well-being (stress) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
120 (1 study)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	54	66	-		The mean carer health and well-being (stress) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was 0.17 standard deviations higher (0.19 lower to 0.53 higher)
Carer health and well-being (stress) – follow-up (Better indicated by lower values)											
120 (1 study) 6 weeks	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	54	66	-		The mean carer health and well-being (stress) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.05 standard deviations lower (0.41 lower to 0.31 higher)
Carer health and well-being (burnout) – post-treatment (Better indicated by lower values)											
34 (1 study)	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias,	16	18	-		The mean carer health and well-being (burnout) – post-treatment in the intervention groups was

Quality assessment										Summary of findings
					imprecision					0.18 standard deviations lower (0.86 lower to 0.49 higher)
Carer health and well-being (burnout) – follow-up (Better indicated by lower values)										
34 (1 study) 13 weeks	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[1,2] due to risk of bias, imprecision	16	18	-		The mean carer health and well-being (burnout) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.08 standard deviations lower (0.76 lower to 0.59 higher)

[1] Crucial limitation for one criterion or some limitations for multiple criteria sufficient to lower ones confidence in the estimate of effect
[2] Optimal information size not met; small, single study
3 Most information is from studies at moderate risk of bias
4 I[2] > 40%