

G.16.1.2 Quantitative evidence

Specialist palliative care team versus usual care

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Palliative care plan developed							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	99	RR 5.84 (1.37, 25.02)	Moderate
Palliative care plan during hospitalisation							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	RR 5.31 (0.26, 107.77)	Low
Palliative care plan on discharge							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	96	RR 4.50 (1.03, 19.75)	Moderate
Decision to forgo enteral feeds							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	RR 0.80 (0.19, 3.38)	Low
Decision to forgo mechanical ventilation							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	RR 7.43 (0.39, 140.15)	Low
Decision to forgo intravenous lines							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	RR 5.31 (0.64, 43.84)	Low
Decision to forgo blood draws							

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	RR 9.55 (0.53, 172.81)	Low
Decision to forgo antibiotics							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	RR 7.43 (0.39, 140.15)	Low
Death in hospital							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	RR 1.06 (0.53, 2.13)	Low
Hospital admissions							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	MD 0.04 (-0.74, 0.82)	Low
New feeding tube							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	RR 1.06 (0.68, 1.65)	Low
Total feeding tube use							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	RR 1.06 (0.81, 1.39)	Low
Mechanical ventilation							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	RR 0.53 (0.10, 2.77)	Low
Tracheostomy							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	RR 0.35 (0.01, 8.84)	Low
Cardiopulmonary resuscitation							
1 (Ahronheim 2000)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	99	RR 0.15 (0.01, 2.86)	Low
1. Allocation assignment unclear and participants not blinded. 2. Non-significant result.							

Use of decision aid on feeding options

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Decisional conflict in surrogate decision-makers							
1 (Hanson 2011)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	90	MD -0.30 (-0.61, 0.01)	Low
Feeding discussion with physician, nurse practitioners or physician assistants							
1 (Hanson 2011)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	90	RR 1.57 (0.93, 2.64)	Low
Feeding discussion with other nursing home staff							

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
1 (Hanson 2011)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	90	RR 1.12 (0.86, 1.45)	Low
Any modified diet							
1 (Hanson 2011)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	90	RR 1.19 (0.31, 4.54)	Low
Specialised dysphagia diet							
1 (Hanson 2011)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	90	RR 1.30 (1.09, 1.56)	Moderate
Specialised staff assistance							
1 (Hanson 2011)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	90	RR 2.39 (0.81, 7.07)	Low
Specialised utensils							
1 (Hanson 2011)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	90	RR 0.24 (0.03, 2.06)	Low
Head/body positioning							
1 (Hanson 2011)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	90	RR 2.87 (0.12, 68.60)	Low
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Participants and assessors not blinded. Non-significant result. 							

Goals of Care intervention versus usual care

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Quality of communication (overall) – higher numbers favour intervention							
1 (Hanson 2017)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	299	MD 0.20 (-0.29, 0.69)	Low
Quality of communication (general) – higher numbers favour intervention							
1 (Hanson 2017)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	299	MD 0.40 (-0.08, 0.88)	Low
Quality of communication (end of life) – higher numbers favour intervention							
1 (Hanson 2017)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	299	MD 0.80 (0.15, 1.45)	Moderate
Family-care provider concordance on primary care goal – higher numbers favour intervention							
1 (Hanson 2017)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	299	RR 1.24 (1.11, 1.40)	Moderate
Advanced care planning problem score >1 – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Hanson 2017)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	299	RR 1.03 (0.88, 1.20)	Low
Symptom management – higher numbers favour intervention							

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
1 (Hanson 2017)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	299	MD -1.10 (-3.18, 0.98)	Low
Satisfaction with care – higher numbers favour intervention							
1 (Hanson 2017)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	299	MD -0.60 (-1.87, 0.67)	Low
Palliative care treatment plan domain score – higher numbers favour intervention							
1 (Hanson 2017)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	299	MD 0.60 (0.13, 1.07)	Moderate
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Participants not blinded. Non-significant result. 							

Enteral tube feeding

Number of studies	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Systematic review of enteral tube feeding studies							
Sampson (2009)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	1,813	No meaningful effects identified	Low
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> All included studies were observational studies at high risk of bias, but risk of bias upgraded from very serious to serious due to large sample size and consistent results No meaningful differences identified between groups. 							