G.9.1.11 Aromatherapy

Quality assessment						No of participants		Effect estimate	Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Aromather apy	Control	Summary of results Mean difference (95% CI)	
Behavioural and p	sychological	l symptoms – I	ower values fa	avour intervent	ion				
Post-intervention	– NPI								
1 (Burns 2011)	RCT	Serious	Not serious	N/A	Serious ¹	32	31	MD 2.80 (-6.15, 11.75)	Low
Agitation – lower	values favoui	r intervention							
Post-intervention	(standardise	d mean differe	nce) – CMAI o	r PAS					
3	RCTs	Serious	Not serious	Serious ²	Very serious ³	94	96	SMD -0.43 (-1.08, 0.23)	Very low
Post-intervention	– CMAI								
2	RCT	Serious	Not serious	Serious ²	Serious ¹	62	65	MD -9.36 (-22.01, 3.30)	Low
Depression - lowe	er values favo	our intervention	n						
Post-intervention	- CSDD								
1 (Yang 2016)	RCT	Serious	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	27	29	MD -5.83 (-8.57, -3.09)	Moderate
Activities of daily	living - highe	er values favou	ır intervention						
Post-intervention	 Barthel Ind 	ex							
1 (Burns 2011)	RCT	Serious	Not serious	N/A	Serious ¹	32	31	MD -0.50 (-1.81, 0.81)	Low
Quality of life – high	gher values f	avour interven	tion						
Post-intervention	- Blau QoL								
1 (Burns 2011)	RCT	Serious	Not serious	N/A	Serious ¹	32	31	MD 19.00 (-24.87, 62.87)	Low
1. Non-significa	ant result								

Non-significant result

CMAI: Cohen-Mansfield Agitation Inventory; CSDD: Cornell Scale for Depression in Dementia; MD: mean difference; NPI: Neuropsychiatric inventory; PAS: Pittsburgh agitation scale; QoL: Quality of life; RCT: randomised control trial; SMD: standardised mean difference

^{2.} $i^2 > 40\%$

^{3. 95%} CI crosses 2 lines of a defined MID interval