

This is a repository copy of 1600 Community-based complex interventions to sustain independence in older people: systematic review and network meta-analysis.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/206525/

Version: Accepted Version

Proceedings Paper:

Crocker, T.F. orcid.org/0000-0001-7450-3143, Lam, N., Ensor, J. et al. (8 more authors) (2023) 1600 Community-based complex interventions to sustain independence in older people: systematic review and network meta-analysis. In: Age and Ageing. British Geriatrics Society Spring Meeting 2023, 17-19 May 2023, Edinburgh and Online. Oxford University Press

https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afad104.076

© The Author(s) 2023. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the British Geriatrics Society. This is an author produced version of an conference abstract published in Age and Ageing. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.





Community-based complex interventions to sustain independence in older people: systematic review and network meta-analysis

TF Crocker; N Lam; J Ensor; M Jordão; R Bajpai; M Bond; A Forster; R Riley; J Gladman; A Clegg; on behalf of the complex interventions review team

Introduction

Sustaining independence is important for older people, but there is insufficient guidance about which community services to implement.

Methods

Systematic review and network metaanalysis (NMA) to synthesise effectiveness evidence from randomised or cluster-randomised controlled trials of community-based complex interventions to sustain independence for older people (mean age 65+) living at home, grouped according to their intervention components. Main outcomes: Living at home, activities of daily living (ADL), care-home placement, and service/economic outcomes at one year.

We searched five databases and two registries, and scanned reference lists.

A random-effects NMA was used. We assessed risk of bias, inconsistency, and certainty of evidence.

PROSPERO registration: CRD42019162195

Results

We included 129 studies (74,946 participants). Nineteen intervention components, including 'multifactorial-action' (individualised care planning), were identified in 63 combinations.

Few studies contributed to each comparison. High risk of bias and imprecision meant results were very low certainty (not reported) or low certainty (unless otherwise stated). Findings may not apply to all contexts.

For living at home, evidence favoured 'multifactorial-action and review with medication-review' (odds ratio (OR) 1.22, 95% CI 0.93 to 1.59; moderate certainty), and three other interventions: 'multifactorial-action with medication-review'; 'cognitive training, medication-review, nutrition and exercise'; and, 'ADL, nutrition and exercise'. Four interventions may reduce odds of remaining at home.

For instrumental ADL (IADL), evidence favoured 'multifactorial-action and review with medication-review' (standardised mean difference (SMD) 0.11, 95% CI 0.00 to 0.21; moderate certainty). Two interventions may reduce IADL.

For personal ADL, evidence favoured 'exercise, multifactorial-action and review with medication-review and self-management' (SMD 0.16, 95% CI -0.51 to 0.82). Among homecare recipients, evidence favoured addition of multifactorial-action and review with medication-review (SMD 0.60, 95% CI 0.32 to 0.88).

Other findings were inconclusive.

| | Living | | |
|---|------------------|----------|-------------|
| Intervention groupa | at home | IADLb | PADL° |
| ADL, aids, education, exercise, multifactorial-action and review with medication-review and self-management | | ⊕⊕⊝⊝ | |
| ADL, aids and exercise | | ⊕⊕⊝⊝ | |
| ADL, nutrition and exercise | ⊕⊕⊝⊝ | | |
| Cognitive training, medication-review, nutrition and exercise | ⊕⊕⊝⊝ | | |
| Education, multifactorial-action and review with medication-review | ⊕⊕⊝⊝ <u>-</u> | | |
| Education, multifactorial-action and review with medication-review and self-management strategies | ⊕⊕⊖⊝ | | |
| Exercise, multifactorial-action and review with medication-review and self-management | | | ⊕⊕⊝⊝ + |
| Multifactorial-action and review with medication-review | ⊕⊕⊕⊖ | ⊕⊕⊕⊖ | |
| Multifactorial-action with medication-review | ⊕⊕⊝⊝ | | |
| Risk-screening | ⊕⊕⊝⊝ <u>-</u> | | |
| Homecare, ADL, multifactorial-action and review with self-management strategies | ⊕⊕⊝⊝ | | |
| Homecare, multifactorial-action and review with medication-review | | | ⊕⊕⊝⊝ +++ |
| a: compared to available care or homecare (last two) in instrumental ADI ic: nersonal ADI | | | |

a: compared to available care or homecare (last two), b: instrumental ADL, c: personal ADL.

Green indicates increased independence, red reduced, GRADE certainty and scale of effect indicated with saturation, darkness and symbols

Conclusions

The intervention combinations most likely to sustain independence include multifactorial-action, medication-review and ongoing review of patients. Unexpectedly, some combinations may reduce independence.









