

iCAHE JC Critical Appraisal Summary

Journal Club Details

Date of submission	October 2011
Journal Club location	DomCare
JC Facilitator	Angela Basso
JC Discipline	Multidisciplinary

Clinical Scenario

Is home follow up effective in reducing the risk of hospital readmission for elderly people?

P	elderly people
I	home follow-up
C	other interventions
O	hospital readmission

Article/Paper

Linertova Ba Econ R, Garcia-Perez L, Ramon Vazquez-Diaz J, Lorenzo-Riera A & Sarria-Santamera A (2010) Interventions to reduce hospital readmissions in the elderly: in-hospital or home care. A systematic review, *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 1-9.

Please note: due to copyright regulations CAHE is unable to supply a copy of the critically appraised paper/article. If you are an employee of the South Australian government you can obtain a copy of articles from the [DOHSA librarian](#).

Article Methodology:	Systematic Review
Returned JC on:	5 October 2011
By iCAHE staff member:	Olivia Thorpe



CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
 karen.grimmer-somers
 @unisa.edu.au
 Telephone (08) 8302 2769
 Facsimile (08) 8302 2766

University of South Australia
 GPO Box 2471
 Adelaide SA 5001
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
 001218



iCAHE

University of South Australia | International Centre for Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
1	✓			<p>Did the review ask a clearly-focused question?</p> <p>Yes, the objective of this systematic review was to identify interventions that effectively reduce the risk of hospital readmissions in patients of 75 years and older, and to assess the role of home follow-up.</p> <p><i>Population:</i> Those readmitted to hospital, 75 years and older. <i>Outcome:</i> Risk of hospital readmission.</p>
2	✓			<p>Did the review include the right type of study?</p> <p>Controlled clinical trials were considered. This meant that 32 clinical trials were included in the review (25 randomised and 7 non-randomised).</p> <p>Is it worth continuing? YES the studies which have been looked at are relevant in addressing the study aims.</p>
3	✓			<p>Did the reviewers try to identify all relevant studies?</p> <p>Yes, the reviewers aimed to identify all relevant literature through the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Searching a range of databases, including: MEDLINE, EMBASE, MEDLINE in process, CINAHL, CENTRAL (Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials), CRD (Centre for Reviews and Dissemination), Science Citation Index, Social Science Citation Index, Google Scholar, Índice Médico Español and LILACS ▪ Reference lists of relevant articles were also searched. <p>❖ A protocol was developed, which could be an indication that the process was peer-reviewed before the actual review was undertaken.</p>
4	✓			<p>Did the reviewers assess the quality of the included studies?</p> <p>Yes, the methodological quality of the selected studies was independently assessed by two reviewers using the SIGN (Scottish Intercollegiate Guideline Network) tool for clinical trials. Disagreements were discussed and when a consensus was not reached, a third reviewer was consulted.</p>
5		NA		<p>If the results of the studies have been combined, was it reasonable to do so?</p> <p>The results were not combined quantitatively; no meta-analysis was done because of the heterogeneity of interventions, measures and methodologies.</p>

6			<p>How are the results presented and what is the main result? The findings from different studies were narratively summarised under different headings. Tables are also included in the results section.</p> <p><i>Bottom line results:</i> Although the results were not combined due to heterogeneity of interventions, measures and methodologies, it appears that interventions that comprise some kind of home care follow-up are more likely to be successful in reducing readmissions.</p>
7		✓	<p>How precise are these results? They did not combine the results quantitatively; therefore the precision cannot be determined as confidence intervals are not reported.</p>
8 9 10	Journal Club to answer		<p>Can the results be applied to the local population?</p> <p>Were all important outcomes considered?</p> <p>Should policy or practice change as a result of the evidence contained in this review?</p>

CONTACTS
www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
 karen.grimmer-somers
 @unisa.edu.au
 Telephone (08) 8302 2769
 Facsimile (08) 8302 2766

University of South Australia
 GPO Box 2471
 Adelaide SA 5001
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
 001218

