

**G.14.1.2 Management of intercurrent illness**

**Pain Management**

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect estimate	Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Control	Summary of results	
Change in PRN medication quantification scores per unit of assessment time (PACSLAC vs activity log) – 3 months										

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect estimate	Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Control	Summary of results	
Fuchs-Lacelle (2008)	Cluster RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	None	89	84	MD 0.005 (p value = 0.00)	Low
<b>Nursing stress scale: total score (PACSLAC vs activity log) – 3 months</b>										
Fuchs-Lacelle (2008)	Cluster RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	None	89	84	MD -6.10 (p value = 0.04)	Low
<b>Overall pain intensity: MOBID-2 (stepwise-treatment vs usual care) – 8 weeks</b>										
Sandvik (2014)	Cluster RCT	Serious <sup>2</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	None	164	163	-1.393 (p value < 0.001)	Moderate
<b>NPI-NH total score (stepwise-treatment vs usual care) – 8 weeks</b>										
Husebo (2014)	Cluster RCT	Serious <sup>2</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	None	142	156	-9.6 (p value < 0.001)	Moderate

<sup>1</sup>No blinding of intervention or assessment, high dropout rate

<sup>2</sup>No adequate description of usual care

## Delirium

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect estimate	Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Control	Summary of results	
<b>Barthel Index (Intervention versus control) – 30 days</b>										
Kolanowski (2011)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>2</sup>	None	11	5	MD 4.33 (p value (group/time	Very low

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect estimate	Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Control	Summary of results	
									interaction) = 0.001)	
<b>Confusion Assessment Method (Intervention versus control) – 30 days</b>										
Kolanowski (2011)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>2</sup>	None	11	5	MD -0.17 (p value (group/time interaction) = 0.1128)	Very low
<b>Delirium Rating Scale (Intervention versus control) – 30 days</b>										
Kolanowski (2011)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>2</sup>	None	11	5	MD -1.80 (p value (group/time interaction) = 0.0842)	Very low
<b>MMSE (Intervention versus control) – 30 days</b>										
Kolanowski (2011)	RCT	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>2</sup>	None	11	5	MD 0.59 (p value (group/time interaction) = 0.0298)	Very low

<sup>1</sup>No blinding of intervention or assessment, lack of clarity in methods

<sup>2</sup>Sample size of only 16 people

## Hip fracture

Quality assessment							No of patients	Effect estimate	Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Other considerations		Summary of results	
<b>Barthel Index (Intervention versus control) – 30 days</b>									
Stenvall (2007)	Cluster RCT	Not serious	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>2</sup>	None	199	Full population: IRR 0.38 (0.20, 0.76) Dementia sub-population: IRR 0.07 (0.01, 0.57)	Moderate
<b>Mortality (Enhanced inpatient care vs conventional care) – 12 months</b>									
1: Smith (2015)	SR of RCTs	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>2</sup>	None	47	OR 2.25 (0.67, 7.61)	Low
<b>Personal activities of daily living independence (Enhanced inpatient care vs conventional care) – 12 months</b>									
1: Smith (2015)	SR of RCTs	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Very serious <sup>3</sup>	None	47	OR 4.62 (0.18, 119.63)	Very low
<b>Mortality (Enhanced inpatient and home care vs conventional care) – 12 months</b>									
2: Smith (2015)	SR of RCTs	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Very serious <sup>3</sup>	None	177	OR 1.07 (0.47, 2.45)	Very low
<b>Activities of daily living (Enhanced inpatient and home care vs conventional care) – 12 months</b>									
1: Smith (2015)	SR of RCTs	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	None	36	MD 25.40 (10.89, 39.91)	Moderate
<b>Incidence of falls (Enhanced inpatient and home care vs conventional care) – 12 months</b>									
1: Smith (2015)	SR of RCTs	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Very serious <sup>3</sup>	None	36	OR 0.20 (0.01, 4.47)	Very low
<b>Cumulative incidence of delirium (Geriatrician-led inpatient management vs orthopaedic-led inpatient management) – acute hospitalisation</b>									
1: Smith (2015)	SR of RCTs	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	N/A	Very serious <sup>3</sup>	None	126	OR 0.73 (0.22, 2.38)	Very low

<sup>1</sup>Lack of reporting of trial methods

<sup>2</sup>Non-significant result

<sup>3</sup>95% CI crosses two lines of a defined MID interval

## Falls

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect estimate	Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Control	Summary of results	
<b>Community: Home-based exercise versus usual care – mean number of falls</b>										
2 (Pitkälä, Wesson)	RCT	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	74	74	MD -1.07 (-1.78, -0.36)	Moderate
<b>Community: Home-based exercise versus usual care – proportion of people falling</b>										
2 (Pitkälä, Wesson)	RCT	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	None	74	74	RR 0.69 (0.51, 0.93)	Low
<b>Community: Home-based exercise versus usual care – Zarit Burden Score</b>										
2 (Suttanon, Wesson)	RCT	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious <sup>3</sup>	None	26	32	MD 4.02 (-3.16, 11.19)	Low
<b>Community: Group-based exercise versus usual care – mean number of falls</b>										
Pitkälä (2013)	RCT	Not serious	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>3</sup>	None	60	63	MD -1.03 (-2.19, 0.13)	Moderate
<b>Community: Group-based exercise versus usual care – proportion of people falling</b>										
Pitkälä (2013)	RCT	Not serious	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>2</sup>	None	60	63	RR 0.68 (0.50, 0.94)	Moderate
<b>Exercise versus usual care – proportion of people falling</b>										
7: Chan (2015)	SR of RCTs	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	Some contacted authors did not return study data	372	316	RR 0.68 (0.51, 0.91)	Moderate
<b>Exercise versus usual care – proportion of people with fractures</b>										

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect estimate	Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Control	Summary of results	
2: Chan (2015)	SR of RCTs	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Very serious <sup>4</sup>	Some contacted authors did not return study data	185	119	RR 1.47 (0.56, 3.81)	Very low
<b>Meta-regression for effect of prevalence of dementia on effect size of interventions</b>										
43: Oliver (2006)	SR	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Serious <sup>3</sup>	None	Not reported		p value - rate ratio for falls: 0.72 p value - relative risk for fallers: 0.87 p value - rate ratio for fractures: 0.18	Very low
<b>Multifactorial intervention versus usual care – proportion of people falling</b>										
Shaw (2003)	RCT	Not serious	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	None	130	144	RR 0.92 (0.81, 1.05)	Moderate
<b>Multifactorial intervention versus usual care – fractured neck of femur</b>										
Shaw (2003)	RCT	Not serious	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Very serious <sup>4</sup>	None	130	144	RR 0.55 (0.21, 1.43)	Very low
<b>Multifactorial intervention versus usual care – fall-related A&amp;E attendance</b>										
Shaw (2003)	RCT	Not serious	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Serious <sup>2</sup>	None	130	144	RR 1.25 (0.91, 1.72)	Low
<b>Multifactorial intervention versus usual care – fall-related hospital admission</b>										
Shaw (2003)	RCT	Not serious	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Very serious <sup>4</sup>	None	130	144	RR 1.11 (0.61, 2.00)	Very low
<b>Multifactorial intervention versus usual care – mortality</b>										
Shaw (2003)	RCT	Not serious	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Very serious <sup>4</sup>	None	130	144	RR 1.03 (0.65, 1.64)	Very low
<b>Home-based technology intervention – proportion of people falling</b>										

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect estimate	Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Control	Summary of results	
Tchalla (2013)	RCT	Not serious	Not serious	N/A	Serious <sup>2</sup>	None	49	47	OR 0.37 (0.15, 0.88)	Moderate

<sup>1</sup>Contains patients with cognitive impairment but no diagnosis of dementia

<sup>2</sup>95% CI crosses one line of a defined MID interval

<sup>3</sup>Non-significant result

<sup>4</sup>95% CI crosses one line of a defined MID interval