# Table S1: Summary of findings table

|  |
| --- |
| **Home Visits versus Controls for prevention of impairment and death in older adults** |
| **Outcomes** | **Illustrative comparative risks\* (95% CI)** | **Relative effect(95% CI)** | **No of Participants(studies)** | **Quality of the evidence(GRADE)** |
| **Assumed risk** | **Corresponding risk** |  |  |
|  | **Control** | **Home Visits versus Controls** |  |  |
| Mortality | Study population | RR 0.93 (0.87 to 0.99) | 24198 (55 studies) | ⊕⊕⊕⊕high |
| 139 per 1000 | 130 per 1000 (121 to 138) |  |
| Low |
| 50 per 1000 | 47 per 1000 (44 to 50) |
| High |
| 200 per 1000 | 186 per 1000 (174 to 198) |
| Institutionalisation (people admitted) | Study population | RR 1.02 (0.88 to 1.18) | 16459 (27 studies) | ⊕⊕⊕⊝moderate a,b |
| 85 per 1000 | 87 per 1000 (75 to 100) |  |
| Low |
| 40 per 1000 | 41 per 1000 (35 to 47) |
| High |
| 120 per 1000 | 122 per 1000 (106 to 142) |
| Falls (people who fell) | Low | OR 0.86 (0.73 to 1.01) | 7455 (23 studies) | ⊕⊕⊕⊝moderate c |
| 200 per 1000 | 177 per 1000 (154 to 202) |  |
| High |
| 600 per 1000 | 563 per 1000 (523 to 602) |
| Hospitalisation (people admitted) | Study population | RR 0.96 (0.91 to 1.01) | 6288 (15 studies) | ⊕⊕⊕⊝moderated |
| 410 per 1000 | 394 per 1000 (373 to 414) |  |
| Low |
| 200 per 1000 | 192 per 1000 (182 to 202) |
| High |
| 600 per 1000 | 576 per 1000 (546 to 606) |
| Functioning (ADL/IADL) | The mean functioning (ADL/IADL) in the intervention groups was 0.10 standard deviations better (0.17 to 0.03 better) |  | 8769 (27 studies) | ⊕⊝⊝⊝very low e,f,g |
| Health Related Quality of Life | The mean health related quality of life in the intervention groups was 0.06 standard deviations better (0.11 to 0.01 better) |  | 9892 (29 studies) | ⊕⊕⊝⊝low5, 7 |
| \*The basis for the assumed risk (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio; OR: Odds ratio;  |
| GRADE Working Group grades of evidenceHigh quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect. Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.Low quality: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate. |
| a. Institutionalisation people was recorded and reported in several different ways within and across studiesb. This is a main outcome for this intervention and this review, but only 57% of participants and 42% of studies are included in this analysis.c. Heterogeneity was significant for this outcome (Chi²=43.59, df=22, p=0.004; I²=50%). d. Trim and fill analysis imputed 6 studies and adjusted effect RR = 0.98 (0.91 - 1.06)e. Lack of blinding of outcome assessors was a significant risk of bias for this outcome.f. Heterogeneity was important and statistically significant for this outcome (Chi²=55.40, df=26, p=0.0007; I²=53%). g. This is a main outcome for this intervention, yet only a minority of participants and studies were included in this analysis. We concluded there is a high risk that the effect is overestimated as a result of selective outcome reporting. |