

G.12.1.19 Residential care staff and nurse training: restraint use reduction

Quality assessment						No of patients		Effect estimate	Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Usual care	Summary of results	
<b>Proportion of residents restrained (higher values favour control)</b>									
1 (Pellfolk 2010)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	149	139	RR 0.53 (0.36, 0.77)	Moderate
<b>Frequency of use of physical restraints (higher numbers favour control)</b>									
1 (Testad 2005)	RCT	Very serious <sup>2</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	55	87	MD -2.40 (-4.35, -0.45)	Low
<b>Proportion of residents prescribed neuroleptics (higher numbers favour control)</b>									
1 (Pellfolk 2010)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>4</sup>	144	127	RR 1.24 (0.94, 1.64)	Low
<b>Proportion of residents experiencing paralysis (higher numbers favour control)</b>									
1 (Pellfolk 2010)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Very serious <sup>5</sup>	138	127	RR 1.07 (0.66, 1.72)	Very low
<b>Proportion of residents walking independently (higher numbers favour intervention)</b>									
1 (Pellfolk 2010)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>4</sup>	142	129	RR 1.16 (0.93, 1.46)	Low

Quality assessment						No of patients		Effect estimate	Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Usual care	Summary of results	
<b>Proportion of residents able to rise from their bed (higher numbers favour intervention)</b>									
1 (Pellfolk 2010)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>4</sup>	141	129	RR 1.04 (0.87, 1.25)	Low
<b>Proportion of residents able to rise from a chair (higher numbers favour intervention)</b>									
1 (Pellfolk 2010)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>4</sup>	142	128	RR 1.13 (0.96, 1.32)	Low
<b>Proportion of residents needing an aid when walking (higher numbers favour control)</b>									
1 (Pellfolk 2010)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>4</sup>	140	124	RR 1.11 (0.91, 1.34)	Low
<b>Staff assessment of fall risk (higher numbers favour control)</b>									
1 (Pellfolk 2010)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>3</sup>	140	120	MD -2.90 (-10.64, 4.84)	Low
<b>Proportion of people falling (higher numbers favour control)</b>									
1 (Pellfolk 2010)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Very serious <sup>5</sup>	149	139	RR 1.17 (0.57, 2.40)	Very low
<b>Agitation (higher numbers favour control)</b>									
2 (Testad 2005, Testad 2010)	RCT	Very serious <sup>2</sup>	Not serious	Serious <sup>6</sup>	Very serious <sup>5</sup>	99	133	SMD -0.08 (-0.90, 0.75)	Very low
<b>Proportion of residents who hit others (higher numbers favour control)</b>									
1 (Pellfolk 2010)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Very serious <sup>5</sup>	141	130	RR 1.23 (0.79, 1.91)	Very low
<b>Proportion of residents who make aggressive threats (higher numbers favour control)</b>									
1 (Pellfolk 2010)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>4</sup>	142	131	RR 0.91 (0.70, 1.18)	Low
<b>Proportion of residents with wandering behaviour (higher numbers favour control)</b>									
1 (Pellfolk 2010)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>4</sup>	142	131	RR 1.24 (0.91, 1.69)	Low

Quality assessment						No of patients		Effect estimate	Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Usual care	Summary of results	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. High level of attrition in study</li> <li>2. Major differences in baseline characteristics between the two arms of the trial</li> <li>3. Non-significant result</li> <li>4. 95% CI crosses one line of a defined MID interval</li> <li>5. 95% CI crosses two lines of a defined MID interval</li> <li>6. <math>i^2 &gt; 40\%</math></li> </ol>									