Tables of additional results

Intervention and control group abbreviations are a combination of the following:- ac: available care; ADL: activities of daily living training; aids: provision of aids and adaptions; cgn: cognitive training; comm: technology for communication and engagement; educ: health education; eng: engagement in meaningful activities; exrc: physical exercise; hmcr: formal homecare; hmnt: alternative medicine; med: medication review; mfa: multifactorial action; mfar: multifactorial action and follow-on routine review; mntr-mfa: monitoring, which may trigger multifactorial action; ntr: nutritional support; psyc: psychological therapy; rsk-mfa: risk screening, which may trigger multifactorial action; sst: social skills training; vchr: care voucher provision; wlfr: welfare rights advice; w/med: with medication review; w/slfm: with self-management.

Table 1. Living at home: other medium-term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Rockwood 2000[1]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Institution-free survival (mean days over 12 months)	12 Months	n=95; mean ± SE: 340 ± 9	n=87; mean ± SE: 340 ± 8	P = 0.426	No serious concerns

Table 2. Living at home: other long-term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Fischer 2009[2]	eng & mfa-(w/slfm)	ac	Remaining at home/ community time (days)	43 Months			HR: 0.981 (95% CI 0.819 to 1.174); P = 0.832	No serious concerns
Hall 1992[3]	hmcr & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfar	Living at home (pts)	24 Months	n=81; 69 persons (85.2%)	n=86; 60 persons (69.8%)		No serious concerns
Kono 2012[4]	mfar (Preventive home visit arm)	mfar (Control arm)	Living at home (pts)	24 Months	n=155; 139 persons (89.7%)	n=156; 133 persons (85.3%)		No serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Care home and mortality (inverse of living at home)	24 Months			HR: 0.69 (95% CI 0.4 to 1.16); P = 0.1630	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	Care home and mortality (inverse of living at home)	24 Months	n=103; 44 persons (42.7%)	n=108; 66 persons (61.1%)	HR: 0.67 (95% CI 0.45 to 0.99); P = 0.0394	Very serious concerns

Table 3. IADL: other results in the short term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Gill 2002[7]	ADL & exrc	ac	IADL (Lawton & Brody 1969) (5 items, 0-10) (smaller is better)	7 Months	n=91; mean: 3.2	n=91; mean: 4.5	P = 0.036	No serious concerns
Whitehead 2016[8]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-	hmcr & mfa-	Nottingham Extended Activities of Daily Living (NEADL) (0-22) (larger is better)	8 Months	n=12	n=10	MD change: 1.58±5.28 (95% CI -9.47 to 12.64)	Serious concerns

Table 4. IADL: other results in the medium term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Gill 2002[7]	ADL & exrc	ac	IADL (Lawton & Brody 1969) (5 items, 0-10) (smaller is better)	12 Months	n=88; mean: 3.7	n=90; mean: 4.8	P = 0.143	No serious concerns
Kerse 2014[9]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Nottingham Extended Activities of Daily Living (NEADL) (0-22) (larger is better)	18 Months	mean (SD): 19.4 (2.8) n=unclear (total of 2 arms=3190)	mean (SD): 19.4 (2.7) n=unclear (total of 2 arms=3190)	P = 0.13	No serious concerns
Hogg 2009[10]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Lawton IADL scale (0-8) (Lawton & Brody 1969) (larger is better)	15 Months	n=112; Δ mean: 0.3	n=116; Δ mean: 0.6	MD change: -0.3 (95% CI -1.1 to 0.5); P = 0.50	Serious concerns
Kono 2016[11]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Tokyo Metropolitan Institute of Gerontology (TMIG) Index of Competence (Koyano *et al.*, 1991) (Score range 0-13) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=179; mean: 7.8 (95% CI 7.4 to 8.2)	n=181; mean: 7.8 (95% CI 7.4 to 8.2)		Serious concerns
Kono 2012[4]	mfar (Preventive home visit arm)	mfar (Control arm)	Tokyo Metropolitan Institute of Gerontology (TMIG) Index of Competence (Koyano *et al.*, 1991) (Score range 0-13) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=161; mean (SD): 7.1 (3.8)	n=162; mean (SD): 7.1 (3.9)		Serious concerns

Table 5. IADL: other results in the long term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Kerse 2014[9]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Nottingham Extended Activities of Daily Living (NEADL) (0-22) (larger is better)	36 Months	mean (SD): 19.4 (3) n=unclear (total of 2 arms=3190)	mean (SD): 19.3 (3) n=unclear (total of 2 arms=3190)	P = 0.13	No serious concerns
von Bonsdorff 2008[12]	exrc	ac	IADL (8-0) (von Bonsdorff 2008) (smaller is better)	24 Months	n=295; mean (SD): 1.3 (1.84)	n=283; mean (SD): 1.81 (2.01)	RR: 1.07; P = 0.5	No serious concerns
Counsell 2007[13]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	AHEAD survey IADL (7 items) (0-21) (smaller is better)	24 Months	n=474; Δ mean (SD): 0.4 (3.3)	n=477; Δ mean (SD): 0.6 (3.6)	MD change: -0.2; P = 0.77	Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Kono 2016[11]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Tokyo Metropolitan Institute of Gerontology (TMIG) Index of Competence (Koyano et al., 1991) (Score range 0-13) (larger is better)	24 Months	n=179; mean: 7.4 (95% CI 6.8 to 8)	n=181; mean: 7.3 (95% CI 6.9 to 7.7)		Serious concerns
Kono 2012[4]	mfar (Preventive home visit arm)	mfar (Control arm)	Tokyo Metropolitan Institute of Gerontology (TMIG) Index of Competence (Koyano et al., 1991) (Score range 0-13) (larger is better)	24 Months	n=132; mean (SD): 7 (3.8)	n=127; mean (SD): 7 (4)		Serious concerns
Meng 2005[14]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	OASIS IADL dependence (6 items) (smaller is better)	22 Months	n=218	n=234	P = 0.18	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	IADL Summary Scale (InterRAI, MDS-IADL scale) (smaller is better)	24 Months			MD values: 0.8 (95% CI -0.45 to 2.05)	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	IADL Summary Scale (InterRAI, MDS-IADL scale) (smaller is better)	24 Months			MD values: 0.671 (95% CI 0.11 to 1.23); P <0.05	Very serious concerns

Table 6. PADL: other results in the short term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Challis 2004[15]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Barthel index (0-100 scale) (Mahoney & Barthel, 1965) (larger is better)	6 months	n=103; Δ mean (SD): -2.52 (13.11)	n=93; Δ mean (SD): -6.43 (14.2)	P = 0.04	No serious concerns
Gill 2002[7]	ADL & exrc	ac	Summary Disability ADL score (Gill 2002) (smaller is better)	7 months	n=91; mean: 2	n=90; mean: 3.6	P = 0.008	No serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	ADL Long Form Scale (The InterRAI MDS, Morris et al., 1999) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=169; Δ mean ± SE: 0.52 ± 0.23	n=182; Δ mean ± SE: 0.33 ± 0.22	MD values: -0.19 (95% CI -0.81 to 0.43)	No serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	MDS: Late loss ADL (Transfer, toilet use, bed mobility and eating; Morris et al., 1999) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=169; Δ mean ± SE: 0.27 ± 0.11	n=182; Δ mean ± SE: 0.14 ± 0.11	MD values: -0.13 (95% CI -0.43 to 0.18)	No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	ADL Self-Performance Hierarchy Scale (The InterRAI MDS, Morris et al., 1999) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=169; Δ mean ± SE: 0.13 ± 0.06	n=182; Δ mean ± SE: 0.12 ± 0.06	MD values: -0.01 (95% CI -0.17 to 0.16)	No serious concerns
Stewart 2005[16]	mfa- (Social Worker-led assessment arm)	mfa- (Occupational Therapist-led assessment arm)	Community Dependence Index (CDI) (larger is better)	8 months	n=131; mean (SD): 65.1 (20)	n=133; mean (SD): 63.3 (20.2)	MD values: 1.73 (95% CI -3.1 to 6.6); P = 0.49	No serious concerns
van der Pols-Vijlbrief 2017[17]	hmcr & ntr & mfar	hmcr	Barthel Index (0-20 scale) (larger is better)	6 months	n=79; mean: 16.99	n=76; mean: 16.11	MD values: 0.69 (95% CI -0.12 to 1.49); P = 0.09	No serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	MDS: Late loss ADL (Transfer, toilet use, bed mobility and eating; Morris et al., 1999) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=56; Δ mean ± SE: 0.09 ± 0.39	n=57; Δ mean ± SE: 0.35 ± 0.42	MD values: 0.26 (95% CI -0.88 to 1.39)	Serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	ADL Self-Performance Hierarchy Scale (The InterRAI MDS, Morris et al., 1999) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=56; Δ mean ± SE: -0.25 ± 0.2	n=57; Δ mean ± SE: -0.11 ± 0.21	MD values: 0.14 (95% CI -0.43 to 0.71)	Serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	ADL Long Form Scale (The InterRAI MDS, Morris et al., 1999) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=56; Δ mean ± SE: 0.23 ± 0.67	n=57; Δ mean ± SE: 0.86 ± 0.72	MD values: 0.63 (95% CI -1.31 to 2.57)	Serious concerns
Rockwood 2000[1]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Physical Self-Maintenance Scale (6-30) (Lawton & Brody 1969) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=78; mean: 11.1 (95% CI 10.6 to 11.7)	n=70; mean: 10.7 (95% CI 10.1 to 11.2)		Serious concerns
Whitehead 2016[8]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-	hmcr & mfa-	Barthel Index (0-20 scale) (larger is better)	8 months	n=10	n=12	MD change: 0.28±1.12 (95% CI -2.06 to 2.61)	Serious concerns
Liddle 1996[18]	aids & mfar	ac	Health Assessment Questionnaire Disability Index (HAQ-DI) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=48; ; pBaseline: 0.96; Δ mean: 0	n=44; ; pBaseline: 0.95; Δ mean: 0		Very serious concerns

Table 7. PADL: other results in the medium term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Borrows 2013[19]	aids	mfa-	Community Dependence Index (CDI) (larger is better)	12 months	n=18; mean (SD): 71.7 (20.5)	n=18; mean (SD): 71.6 (16.1)	MD values: 0.01 (95% CI -13.4 to 13.6); P = 0.98	No serious concerns
Gill 2002[7]	ADL & exrc	ac	Summary Disability ADL score (Gill 2002) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=88; mean: 2.7	n=90; mean: 4.2	P = 0.02	No serious concerns
Leveille 1998[20]	educ & exrc & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Health Assessment Questionnaire Disability Index (HAQ-DI) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=95	n=93		No serious concerns
Gitlin 2006[21]	ADL & aids & exrc	ac	ADL (Gitlin 2006) (6 items, each rated from 1=no difficulty to 5=unablt to do because of health problems) (smaller is better)	12 months			MD values: -0.1; P = 0.10	Serious concerns
Kono 2012[4]	mfar (Preventive home visit arm)	mfar (Control arm)	Barthel index (0-100 scale) (Mahoney & Barthel, 1965) (larger is better)	12 months	n=161; mean (SD): 89 (14.3)	n=162; mean (SD): 89.8 (15.1)		Serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	ADL Self-Performance Hierarchy Scale (The InterRAI MDS, Morris et al., 1999) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=169; Δ mean ± SE: 0.15 ± 0.08	n=182; Δ mean ± SE: 0.25 ± 0.07	MD values: 0.11 (95% CI -0.1 to 0.32)	Serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	ADL Long Form Scale (The InterRAI MDS, Morris et al., 1999) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=169; Δ mean ± SE: 0.76 ± 0.32	n=182; Δ mean ± SE: 1.03 ± 0.31	MD values: 0.27 (95% CI -0.6 to 1.15)	Serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	MDS: Late loss ADL (Transfer, toilet use, bed mobility and eating; Morris et al. 1999) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=169; Δ mean ± SE: 0.43 ± 0.18	n=182; Δ mean ± SE: 0.54 ± 0.17	MD values: 0.11 (95% CI -0.38 to 0.6)	Serious concerns
Rockwood 2000[1]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Physical Self-Maintenance Scale (6-30) (Lawton & Brody 1969) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=75; mean: 11.4 (95% CI 10.8 to 12)	n=70; mean: 11.9 (95% CI 11.3 to 12.6)		Serious concerns
Wolter 2013[22]	hmcr & mfar(w/med)	hmcr	ADL (RAI Home care) (10 items, 0-66) (smaller is better)	13 months	n=268; mean: 28.99; Δ mean: 2.69	n=216; mean: 29.64; Δ mean: 2.31	MD values: 1.06 (95% CI -0.71 to 2.83)	Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa- (UPRIM screening arm)	ac	Katz ADL Scale (Katz et al., 1963) (Range 0-6, 6 questions) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=628; mean: 0.55 (95% CI 0.5 to 0.61)	n=714; mean: 0.67 (95% CI 0.61 to 0.73)		Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	MDS: Late loss ADL (Transfer, toilet use, bed mobility and eating; Morris et al. 1999) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=56; Δ mean ± SE: 0.08 ± 0.52	n=57; Δ mean ± SE: 0.26 ± 0.55	MD values: 0.18 (95% CI -1.31 to 1.66)	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	ADL Self-Performance Hierarchy Scale (The InterRAI MDS, Morris et al., 1999) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=56; Δ mean ± SE: -0.46 ± 0.25	n=57; Δ mean ± SE: -0.17 ± 0.26	MD values: 0.29 (95% CI -0.42 to 1)	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	ADL Long Form Scale (The InterRAI MDS, Morris et al., 1999) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=56; Δ mean ± SE: 0.34 ± 0.9	n=57; Δ mean ± SE: 1.9 ± 0.95	MD values: 1.56 (95% CI -1.02 to 4.15)	Very serious concerns

Table 8. PADL: other results in the long term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Counsell 2007[13]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	AHEAD survey ADL (6 items) (0-18) (smaller is better)	24 months	n=474; Δ mean (SD): 0.2 (2.7)	n=477; Δ mean (SD): 0.4 (2.7)	MD change: -0.2 (SD=2.7); P = 0.37	Serious concerns
Meng 2005[14]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	OASIS ADL dependence (6 items) (smaller is better)	22 months	n=218	n=234	P = 0.04	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	MDS: Late loss ADL (Transfer, toilet use, bed mobility and eating; Morris *et al.* 1999) (smaller is better)	24 months			MD values: 0.015 (95% CI -0.21 to 0.24); P >0.05	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	ADL Long Form Scale (The InterRAI MDS, Morris *et al.*, 1999) (smaller is better)	24 months			MD values: 0.045 (95% CI -0.43 to 0.52); P >0.05	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	ADL Self-Performance Hierarchy Scale (The InterRAI MDS, Morris *et al.*, 1999) (smaller is better)	24 months			MD values: 0.018 (95% CI -0.11 to 0.14); P >0.05	Very serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	ADL Long Form Scale (The InterRAI MDS, Morris *et al.*, 1999) (smaller is better)	24 months			MD values: 0.4 (95% CI -1.04 to 1.83); P >0.05	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	ADL Self-Performance Hierarchy Scale (The InterRAI MDS, Morris *et al.*, 1999) (smaller is better)	24 months			MD values: 0.1 (95% CI -0.32 to 0.53); P >0.05	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	MDS: Late loss ADL (Transfer, toilet use, bed mobility and eating; Morris *et al.* 1999) (smaller is better)	24 months			MD values: -0.04 (95% CI -0.91 to 0.83); P >0.05	Very serious concerns

Table 9. PADL & IADL: results in the short term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Dupuy 2017[24]	hmcr & aids & comm	hmcr	Inventaire des Habiletés for pour la Vie en Appartement (IHVA Scale, Corbeil et al., 2009) - proxy (completed by caregivers) (larger is better) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=16; mean (SD): 307.31 (6.49)	n=16; mean (SD): 298.06 (9.55)	prt eta sq: 0.34; P <0.001	No serious concerns
Jing 2018[25]	exrc & psyc	psyc	ADL scale (14 items, score range 14-56) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=39; mean (SD): 19.59 (4.79)	n=40; mean (SD): 25.35 (7.52)	P <0.05	No serious concerns
Alegria 2019[26]	exrc & psyc	ac	LLFDI: Function component overall score (Jette et al., 2002; Sayers et al., 2004) (Raw score - range 32-160) (larger is better)	6 months	n=120	n=117	SMD: 0.23±0.09; P = 0.02	Very serious concerns
Morey 2009[27]	exrc	ac	LLFDI: Function component overall score (Haley et al., 2002; Jette et al., 2002; Sayers et al., 2004) (re-calculated score - range 0-100) (larger is better)	6 months	n=181; mean (SD): 62.4 (11.8)	n=181; mean (SD): 59.8 (10.2)		No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Cutchin 2009[28]	mfar	ac	LLFDI: Function component overall score (Haley et al., 2002; Jette et al., 2002; Sayers et al., 2004) (re-calculated score - range 0-100) (larger is better)	7 months	n=56; mean: 53.8 (95% CI 51.8 to 55.9)	n=54; mean: 52.9 (95% CI 50.8 to 54.9)	MD change: -0.64 (95% CI -2.18 to 0.89); P = 0.405	Serious concerns
de Craen 2006[29]	mfa-	ac	Groningen Activity Restriction Scale (GARS) (overall) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=175; Δ mean ± SE: 2.1 ± 0.4	n=176; Δ mean ± SE: 1.8 ± 0.4	MD change: 0.3 (95% CI -0.7 to 1.4); P = 0.56	Serious concerns
Gustafson 2021[30]	aids & educ & comm	ac	6-item independence in ADLs scale (Gustafson 2021) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=197; mean (SD): 0.8 (0.2)	n=193; mean (SD): 0.82 (0.2)		Serious concerns
Melis 2008[31]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Groningen Activity Restriction Scale (GARS-3) (overall) (18 items, score range 18-54) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=74; mean (SD): 35.9 (8.6)	n=51; mean (SD): 37 (9.5)	MD values: -1.6 (95% CI -3.9 to 0.7)	Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Groningen Activity Restriction Scale (GARS) (overall) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=171; mean (SD): 32.83 (10.98)	n=145; mean (SD): 30.16 (10.07)	MD values: 0.41 (95% CI -0.8 to 1.62); P = 0.51	Serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Katz-15 (0-15) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=1209; mean: 3.02 (95% CI 2.92 to 3.12)	n=1074; mean: 3.09 (95% CI 2.98 to 3.21)		Serious concerns
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa- (UPRIM screening arm)	ac	Katz-15 (0-15) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=701; mean: 1.69 (95% CI 1.61 to 1.78)	n=771; mean: 1.75 (95% CI 1.67 to 1.82)		Very serious concerns
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa- (UPRIM+U-CARE arm)	ac	Katz-15 (0-15) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=1282; mean: 1.7 (95% CI 1.59 to 1.8)	n=771; mean: 1.75 (95% CI 1.67 to 1.82)		Very serious concerns

Table 10. PADL & IADL: results in the medium term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Hebert 2001[34]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Functional Autonomy Measurement System (SMAF) (Hebert 2001, 1984) (smaller is better)	1 years	n=233; mean (SD): 10.7 (10)	n=231; mean (SD): 10.4 (10.9)	P = 0.34	No serious concerns
Morey 2009[27]	exrc	ac	LLFDI: Function component overall score (Haley *et al.*, 2002; Jette *et al.*, 2002; Sayers *et al.*, 2004) (re-calculated score - range 0-100) (larger is better)	12 months	n=178; mean (SD): 62.4 (11.6)	n=177; mean (SD): 59.4 (10.2)		No serious concerns
Williams 1992[35]	mfar	mfa-	Townsend Disability Scale (9 items, 0-18) (larger is better)	12 months	n=176; mean: 8; pBaseline: 0.0001; Δ mean: -2.1	n=188; mean: 7.8; pBaseline: 0.0001; Δ mean: -2.6		No serious concerns
Cutchin 2009[28]	mfar	ac	LLFDI: Function component overall score (Haley *et al.*, 2002; Jette *et al.*, 2002; Sayers *et al.*, 2004) (re-calculated score - range 0-100) (larger is better)	15 months	n=56; mean: 53.3 (95% CI 51.2 to 55.5)	n=54; mean: 52.3 (95% CI 50.1 to 54.4)	MD change: -0.57 (95% CI -2.09 to 0.95); P = 0.458	Serious concerns
Dorresteijn 2016[36]	ADL	ac	Groningen Activity Restriction Scale (GARS) (overall) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=141; mean (SD): 32.41 (9.4)	n=171; mean (SD): 34.04 (9.3)	MD values: -1.81; P = 0.002	Serious concerns
Gustafson 2021[30]	aids & educ & comm	ac	Independence in ADLs scale (6 items, each item rate 1-4, score is averaged) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=197; mean (SD): 0.8 (0.23)	n=193; mean (SD): 0.81 (0.23)		Serious concerns
Kerse 2014[9]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Activity Measure for Post-Acute Care (AM-PAC) daily activity scale (self-care and IADL) (larger is better)	18 months	mean (SD): 59.8 (8.8)	mean (SD): 59.6 (9.1)	P = 0.42	Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Groningen Activity Restriction Scale (GARS) (overall) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=172; mean (SD): 33.08 (11.34)	n=145; mean (SD): 30.81 (10.29)	MD values: 0.47 (95% CI -0.81 to 1.76); P = 0.47	Serious concerns
Siemonsma 2018[37]	ADL	mfa-	Groningen Activity Restriction Scale (GARS) (overall) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=76	n=79; ; pBaseline: <0.001; Δ mean: 2.6 [95% CI 1.3 to 3.8]	MD change: -0.4 (95% CI -2.3 to 3); P = 0.795	Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Siemonsma 2018[37]	ADL	mfa-	Katz-15 (0-15) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=76	n=79; ; pBaseline: 0.509; Δ mean: 0.1 (95% CI -0.2 to 0.5)	MD change: -0.4 (95% CI -1.1 to 0.4); P = 0.339	Serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Katz-15 (0-15) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=1209; mean: 3.31 (95% CI 3.2 to 3.42)	n=1074; mean: 3.39	MD values: -0.05 (95% CI -0.2 to 0.1); P = 0.52	Serious concerns
van Hout 2010[38]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Groningen Activity Restriction Scale (GARS) (overall) (smaller is better)	18 months	n=331; mean (SD): 51.8 (10.4)	n=320; mean (SD): 53 (10.5)		Serious concerns
Alegria 2019[26]	exrc & psyc	ac	LLFDI: Function component overall score (Jette *et al.*, 2002; Sayers *et al.*, 2004) (Raw score - range 32-160) (larger is better)	12 months			SMD±SE: 0.26±0.29; P <0.01	Very serious concerns
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa- (UPRIM+U-CARE arm)	ac	Katz-15 (0-15) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=1147; mean: 1.88 (95% CI 1.8 to 1.96) (intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC)=0.031 (95% CI 0.01 –0.05))	n=714; mean: 2.03 (95% CI 1.93 to 2.13) (intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC)=0.031 (95% CI 0.01 –0.05))		Very serious concerns
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa- (UPRIM screening arm)	ac	Katz-15 (0-15) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=628; mean: 1.87 (95% CI 1.76 to 1.97) (intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC)=0.031 (95% CI 0.01 –0.05))	n=714; mean: 2.03 (95% CI 1.93 to 2.13) (intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC)=0.031 (95% CI 0.01 –0.05))		Very serious concerns
Blom 2016[39]	mfa-(w/med+slfm)	ac	Groningen Activity Restriction Scale (GARS) (overall) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=288	n=1091; ; pBaseline: <0.001; Δ mean: 3.5 [95% CI 3 to 4]	MD values: -0.6 (95% CI -1.7 to 0.5); P = 0.299	Very serious concerns
Hay 1998[40]	mfa-	ac	Older Americans Research and Services Center Instrument (OARS) (Part A, 14 items) (larger is better)	12 months	n=78; mean (SD): 13.37 (3.54); Δ mean (SD): -0.32 (2.46)	n=89; mean (SD): 13.25 (3.25); Δ mean (SD): -0.2 (2.26)		Very serious concerns
Rooijackers 2021[41]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	Groningen Activity Restriction Scale (GARS) (overall) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=133; mean: 40.9 (95% CI 38.6 to 43.2)	n=131; mean: 42.8 (95% CI 40.5 to 45)	MD values: -1.1 (95% CI -2.9 to 0.8); P = 0.252	Very serious concerns

Table 11. PADL & IADL: results in the long term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Stuck 1995[42]	educ & mfar(w/med)	ac	Physical Self Maintenance and IADL scale (0-100) (Lawton and Brody; Kempen) (larger is better)	36 months	n=170; mean: 75.6 (95% CI 73.2 to 77.9)	n=147; mean: 72.7 (95% CI 70.2 to 75.2)	MD values: 2.9 (95% CI 0.4 to 5.4); P = 0.03	No serious concerns
de Craen 2006[29]	mfa-	ac	Groningen Activity Restriction Scale (GARS) (overall) (smaller is better)	24 months	n=143; Δ mean ± SE: 3.7 ± 0.6	n=154; Δ mean ± SE: 3.8 ± 0.5	MD change: -0.1 (95% CI -1.8 to 1.5); P = 0.89	Serious concerns
Kerse 2014[9]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Activity Measure for Post-Acute Care (AM-PAC) daily activity scale (self-care and IADL) (larger is better)	3 years	mean (SD): 60.6 (9.4) n=unclear (total of 2 arms=2117)	mean (SD): 60.6 (9.3) n=unclear (total of 2 arms=2117)	P = 0.42	Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Groningen Activity Restriction Scale (GARS) (overall) (smaller is better)	24 months	n=171; mean (SD): 34.39 (11.58)	n=145; mean (SD): 31.5 (10.92)	MD values: 1.18 (95% CI -0.35 to 2.71); P = 0.35	Serious concerns
Moll van Charante 2016[43]	educ & mfar(w/slfm)	ac	Academic Medical Center Linear Disability Score (ALDS) (1-100) (larger is better)	4 years	n=1189; Δ mean ± SE: -1.56 ± 0.14	n=1001; Δ mean ± SE: -1.5 ± 0.16	P = 0.863	Serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Katz-15 (0-15) (smaller is better)	24 months	n=1209; mean: 3.19 (95% CI 3.05 to 3.32)	n=1074; mean: 3.27 (95% CI 3.12 to 3.41)	MD values: -0.07 (95% CI -0.22 to 0.07); P = 0.33	Serious concerns
Hay 1998[40]	mfa-	ac (Control 2 arm)	Older Americans Research and Services Center Instrument (OARS) (Part A, 14 items) (larger is better)	24 months	n=79; mean (SD): 13.35 (3); Δ mean (SD): -0.25 (2.38)	n=87; mean (SD): 13.37 (2.29); Δ mean (SD): -0.15 (2.48)		Very serious concerns

Table 12. Hospitalisation: short term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Auvinen 2020[44]	hmcr & med	hmcr	Hospitalisation (admissions/ last 6 mth)	6 months	n=151; 102 admissions	n=149; 70 admissions		No serious concerns
Counsell 2007[13]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions / per 1000 persons/ last 12 mth)	6 months	n=474; mean: 804 (95% CI 656 to 952)	n=477; mean: 1036 (95% CI 778 to 1294)		No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Hattori 2019[45]	educ & mfar(w/slfm)	mfar	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	8 months	n=190; 20 persons (10.5%)	n=185; 15 persons (8.1%)	P = 0.530	No serious concerns
Hendriksen 1984[46]	mfar	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more/ last 6 mth)	6 months	n=285; 38 persons (13.3%)	n=287; 44 persons (15.3%)		No serious concerns
King 2012[47]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more/ last 3 mth)	7 months	n=76; 9 persons (11.8%)	n=81; 15 persons (18.5%)		No serious concerns
Imhof 2012[48]	mfar	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more/ last 3 mth)	9 months	n=206; 47 persons (22.8%)	n=207; 68 persons (32.9%)	RR: 0.7; P = 0.03	No serious concerns
Leung 2004[49]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights/ last 6 mth)	6 months	n=130; 487 days or nights; mean (SD): 3.8 (6.5)	n=130; 607 days or nights; mean (SD): 4.7 (7.8)	P = 0.029	No serious concerns
Mann J 2021[50]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions /per 1000 person days)	9 months			IRR: 0.62 (95% CI 0.28 to 1.4); P = 0.253	No serious concerns
Challis 2004[15]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	6 months	n=129; 25 persons (19.4%)	n=127; 31 persons (24.4%)		Serious concerns
Melis 2008[31]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights per person)	6 months	n=85; mean (SD): 4 (14)	n=66; mean (SD): 6 (16)		Serious concerns
Morgan 2019[51]	exrc	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions / per person-year)	6 months	n=24; mean: 2.17 (95% CI 1.17 to 4.04)	n=15; mean: 1.73 (95% CI 0.78 to 3.85)		Serious concerns
Ng 2015[52]	cgn & ntr & exrc	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	6 months	n=47; 4 persons (8.5%)	n=47; 2 persons (4.3%)	P = 0.64	Serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions/ last 6 mth)	6 months	n=1017; mean: 0.11 (95% CI 0.09 to 0.13)	n=918; mean: 0.12 (95% CI 0.1 to 0.14)		Serious concerns
van Dongen 2020[53]	ntr & exrc	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	24 weeks	n=82; 24 persons (29.3%)	n=86; 20 persons (23.3%)		Serious concerns
Whitehead 2016[8]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-	hmcr & mfa-	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more/ last 3 mth)	8 months	n=10; 4 persons (40.0%)	n=12; 2 persons (16.7%)		Serious concerns
Wong 2019[54]	mfar(w/slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	6 months	n=230; mean: 0.12 (95% CI 0.07 to 0.17)	n=229; mean: 0.16 (95% CI 0.11 to 0.21)	P = 0.253	Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Wong 2019[54]	mfar(w/slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	6 months	n=230; mean: 0.84 (95% CI 0.22 to 1.46)	n=229; mean: 0.76 (95% CI 0.27 to 1.25)	P = 0.129	Serious concerns

Table 13. Hospitalisation: other medium-term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Auvinen 2020[44]	hmcr & med	hmcr	Hospitalisation (admissions/ last 6 mth)	12 months	n=134; 75 admissions	n=129; 62 admissions		No serious concerns
Cameron 2013[55]	exrc & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions/ last 12 mth)	12 months	n=120; 152 admissions; mean: 1.31	n=121; 135 admissions; mean: 1.14		No serious concerns
Cameron 2013[55]	exrc & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights/ last 12 mth)	12 months	n=120; 2227; mean (SD): 15 (15.1)	n=121; 2012; mean (SD): 14 (12.6)		No serious concerns
Counsell 2007[13]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights / per 1000 persons / last 12 mth)	12 months	n=474; 2076	n=477; 1983	P = 0.85	No serious concerns
Counsell 2007[13]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions / per 1000 persons/ last 12 mth)	12 months	n=474; 384	n=477; 358	P = 0.66	No serious concerns
Hogg 2009[10]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	15 months	n=120 persons	n=121 persons	RD: 0 (95% CI -11.1 to 11.1); P = 0.97	No serious concerns
Hogg 2009[10]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	15 months	n=120; Δ mean: 0.4 [95% CI 0.27 to 0.53]	n=121; Δ mean: 0.46 [95% CI 0.33 to 0.59]	MD change: -0.06 (95% CI -0.31 to 0.2); P = 0.67	No serious concerns
Kukkonen-Harjula 2017[56]	ADL & ntr & exrc	ac	Hospitalisation (days per person-year)	12 months	n=150; mean ± SE: 4.57 ± 0.8	n=149; mean ± SE: 3.26 ± 0.49	IRR: 1.4 (95% CI 0.89 to 2.21)	No serious concerns
van Rossum 1993[57]	mfar	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	12 months	n=292; 59 admissions	n=288; 88 admissions		No serious concerns
van Rossum 1993[57]	mfar	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	12 months	n=292; 1318 days or nights	n=288; 2189 days or nights		No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Mann WC 1999[58]	hmcr & aids	hmcr	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	18 months	n=52; mean (SD): 5.9 (13.2); median: 0; range: 0 to 62	n=49; mean (SD): 23.7 (46.5); median: 0; range: 0 to 223	SMD: 0.53	Serious concerns
Fristedt 2019[59]	hmcr & mfar(w/med)	hmcr	Hospitalisation (admissions/ last 12 mth)	1 years	n=31; mean: 1.903	n=31; mean: 1.968	MD values: -0.065; P = 0.578	Serious concerns
Bernabei 1998[60]	hmcr & mfar(w/med)	hmcr	Hospitalisation (days or nights/ last 12 mth)	12 months	n=99; 894	n=100; 1376		Serious concerns
Bernabei 1998[60]	hmcr & mfar(w/med)	hmcr	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	12 months	n=99; 36 persons (36.4%)	n=100; 51 persons (51.0%)	HR: 0.74 (95% CI 0.56 to 0.97); P <0.05	Serious concerns
Fabacher 1994[61]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	1 years	n=100 persons	n=95 persons		Serious concerns
Fristedt 2019[59]	hmcr & mfar(w/med)	hmcr	Hospitalisation (days or nights/ last 12 mth)	1 years	n=31; mean: 14.97;	n=31; mean: 14.71; pBaseline: 0.0001; Δ mean: -19.709	MD values: 0.258; P = 0.352	Serious concerns
Leveille 1998[20]	educ & exrc & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights / only admitted pts / last 12 mth)	12 months	n=100; 33 days or nights	n=100; 116 days or nights		Serious concerns
Dalby 2000[62]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	14 months	n=70; mean (SD): 18.8 (31.9)	n=69; mean (SD): 10.5 (10.7)	MD values: -8.3 (95% CI -25.2 to 8.6); P = 0.33	Serious concerns
Dalby 2000[62]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	14 months	n=70; mean (SD): 0.4 (0.7)	n=69; mean (SD): 0.3 (0.8)	MD values: -0.1 (95% CI -0.3 to 0.2); P = 0.52	Serious concerns
Ploeg 2010[63]	educ & mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	12 months	n=331; mean (SD): 0.29 (0.66); median: 0 (IQR 0 to 0)	n=314; mean (SD): 0.49 (1.5); median: 0 (IQR 0 to 1)	P = 0.893	Serious concerns
Rubenstein 2007[64]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	12 months	n=334; mean (SD): 0.57 (1.2)	n=360; mean (SD): 0.51 (0.93)	P >0.05	Serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions/ last 6 mth)	12 months	n=936; mean: 0.11 (95% CI 0.09 to 0.13)	n=817; mean: 0.12 (95% CI 0.1 to 0.14)		Serious concerns
Takahashi 2012[65]	mntr-mfa-	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	12 months	n=102; mean (SD): 1.1 (1.7)	n=103; mean (SD): 0.83 (1.2)	P = 0.2751	Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Takahashi 2012[65]	mntr-mfa-	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights per person)	12 months	n=102; mean (SD): 4.1 (8.1)	n=103; mean (SD): 6.1 (20.1)	P = 0.6055	Serious concerns
Teut 2013[66]	hmcr & hmnt & exrc	hmcr	Hospitalisation (admissions)	12 months	n=29; mean (SD): 0.7 (1.1)	n=29; mean (SD): 1 (1.8)		Serious concerns
Wolter 2013[22]	hmcr & mfar(w/med)	hmcr	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	13 months	n=268 persons	n=216 persons	OR: 0.78 (95% CI 0.57 to 1.07); P = 0.1245	Serious concerns
Blom 2016[39]	mfa-(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	12 months	n=288; mean: 2.1	n=1091; mean: 2.7	MD values: -0.7 (95% CI -3.9 to 2.5); P = 0.68	Very serious concerns
Henderson 2005[67]	mfar	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	12 months	n=61; mean (SD): 3.05 (8.99); range: 0 to 49	n=63; mean (SD): 3.33 (8.1); range: 0 to 42	MD change: 0; P = 0.845; F=0.038, df=1, 112	Very serious concerns
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions/ last 12 mth)	12 months	n=1147; mean: 0.27 (95% CI 0.24 to 0.31)	n=714; mean: 0.33 (95% CI 0.29 to 0.39)		Very serious concerns
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa- (UPRIM screening arm)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions/ last 12 mth)	12 months	n=628; mean: 0.29 (95% CI 0.25 to 0.35)	n=714; mean: 0.33 (95% CI 0.29 to 0.39)		Very serious concerns
Lewin 2013[68]	hmcr & educ & mfar	hmcr	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	12 months	n=375; 206 persons (54.9%)	n=375; 218 persons (58.1%)	P = 0.377 OR from logistic regression: 0.93 (95% CI 0.69 to 1.26) p=0.650	Very serious concerns
Lewin 2013[68]	hmcr & educ & mfar	hmcr	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	12 months	n=375; mean (SD): 18.4 (24.2)	n=375; mean (SD): 18.6 (19)	P = 0.926	Very serious concerns

Table 14. Hospitalisation: long-term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Bouman 2008[69]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	24 months	n=160; 80 persons (50.0%)	n=170; 71 persons (41.8%)		No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Bouman 2008[69]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	24 months	n=160; mean (SD): 0.97 (1.38); range: 0 to 8	n=170; mean (SD): 0.8 (1.23); range: 0 to 7	IRR: 1.17 (95% CI 0.88 to 1.56); P = 0.27	No serious concerns
Bouman 2008[69]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	24 months	n=160; mean (SD): 8.14 (18.14); range: 0 to 159	n=170; mean (SD): 8.54 (17.99); range: 0 to 109	HR: 0.92 (95% CI 0.7 to 1.21); P = 0.57	No serious concerns
Coleman 1999[70]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions/ last 12 mth)	24 months	n=96; mean: 0.58	n=73; mean: 0.59	P = 0.91	No serious concerns
Coleman 1999[70]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights / only admitted pts / last 12 mth)	24 months	n=96; mean: 6.4	n=73; mean: 5.4	P = 0.57	No serious concerns
Coleman 1999[70]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more/ last 12 mth)	24 months	n=96; 35 persons (36.5%)	n=73; 25 persons (34.3%)	P = 0.72	No serious concerns
Counsell 2007[13]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights / per 1000 persons / last 12 mth)	24 months	n=474; 3759	n=477; 4069	P = 0.66	No serious concerns
Counsell 2007[13]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions / per 1000 persons/ last 12 mth)	24 months	n=474; 700	n=477; 740	P = 0.66	No serious concerns
Fischer 2009[2]	eng & mfa-(w/slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	43 months	n=1281; mean (SD): 1.76 (3.06); range: 0 to 48	n=2884; mean (SD): 1.78 (2.86); range: 0 to 46	P = 0.861	No serious concerns
Fischer 2009[2]	eng & mfa-(w/slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	43 months	n=1281; mean (SD): 19.04 (33.55); range: 0 to 314	n=2884; mean (SD): 19.61 (35.3); range: 0 to 478	P = 0.679	No serious concerns
Kukkonen-Harjula 2017[56]	ADL & ntr & exrc	ac	Hospitalisation (days per person-year)	24 months	n=150; mean ± SE: 4.22 ± 0.58	n=149; mean ± SE: 3.2 ± 0.41	IRR: 1.32 (95% CI 0.91 to 1.91)	No serious concerns
Liimatta 2019[71]	exrc & mfa-(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	24 months	n=211; mean ± SE: 1.61 ± 0.23	n=211; mean ± SE: 2.1 ± 0.35		No serious concerns
Moll van Charante 2016[43]	educ & mfar(w/slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	6 years	n=1890; 784 persons (41.5%)	n=1636; 696 persons (42.5%)	HR: 0.96; P = 0.56	No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Stuck 1995[42]	educ & mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	36 months	n=215; 99 persons (46.0%)	n=199; 93 persons (46.7%)	RR: 1 (95% CI 0.8 to 1.4); P = 0.8	No serious concerns
Stuck 1995[42]	educ & mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights / 100 persons / year)	36 months	n=215; 197	n=199; 160		No serious concerns
van Rossum 1993[57]	mfar	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	24 months	n=292; 131 admissions	n=288; 188 admissions		No serious concerns
van Rossum 1993[57]	mfar	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	24 months	n=292; 2971 days or nights	n=288; 3603 days or nights		No serious concerns
van Rossum 1993[57]	mfar	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	24 months	n=292; 88 persons (30.1%)	n=288; 108 persons (37.5%)		No serious concerns
Vass 2005[72]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	3 years	n=2092; 985 persons (47.1%)	n=1942; 935 persons (48.1%)	P = 0.82	No serious concerns
Carpenter 1990[73]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	3 years	n=121; 305 admissions	n=107; 202 admissions		Serious concerns
Carpenter 1990[73]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	3 years	n=121; 8312 days or nights	n=107; 7709 days or nights		Serious concerns
Ford 1971[74]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	24 months	n=150; 95 admissions	n=150; 76 admissions		Serious concerns
Hendriksen 1984[46]	mfar	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more/ last 6 mth)	24 months	n=252; 25 persons (9.9%)	n=251; 35 persons (13.9%)		Serious concerns
Hendriksen 1984[46]	mfar	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	36 months	n=285; 219 admissions	n=287; 271 admissions		Serious concerns
Hendriksen 1984[46]	mfar	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	36 months	n=285; 4884 days or nights	n=287; 6442 days or nights	P = 0.01	Serious concerns
Jitapunkul 1998[75]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	3 years	n=57; 16 persons (28.1%)	n=59; 18 persons (30.5%)		Serious concerns
Kono 2016[11]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more/ last 12 mth)	24 months	n=138; 26 persons (18.8%)	n=142; 36 persons (25.4%)		Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	24 months	n=148; 39 persons (26.4%)	n=131; 33 persons (25.2%)		Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	24 months	n=148; mean (SD): 5.3 (17.6)	n=131; mean (SD): 3.1 (9.8)	MD values: 2.2 (95% CI -1.07 to 5.57); P = 0.18	Serious concerns
Pathy 1992[76]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	3 years	n=369; 262 admissions	n=356; 284 admissions		Serious concerns
Rubenstein 2007[64]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more/ last 12 mth)	24 months	n=298; 168 persons (56.4%)	n=309; 171 persons (55.3%)	P >0.05	Serious concerns
Rubenstein 2007[64]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	24 months	n=298; mean (SD): 0.56 (1.1)	n=309; mean (SD): 0.56 (1.6)	P >0.05	Serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions/ last 6 mth)	24 months	n=924; mean: 0.12 (95% CI 0.09 to 0.14)	n=812; mean: 0.13 (95% CI 0.1 to 0.15)	IRR: 0.9 (95% CI 0.76 to 1.07); P = 0.25	Serious concerns
Tulloch 1979[77]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	24 months	n=140; 34 persons (24.3%)	n=150; 26 persons (17.3%)		Serious concerns
Tulloch 1979[77]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions)	24 months	n=145; 43 admissions	n=150; 29 admissions		Serious concerns
Tulloch 1979[77]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	24 months	n=145; 418 days or nights	n=150; 611 days or nights		Serious concerns
Balaban 1988[78]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights / only admitted pts / last 12 mth)	2 years	n=69; mean (SD): 7.5 (12.2)	n=74; mean (SD): 11.5 (27.4)	P >0.30	Very serious concerns
Balaban 1988[78]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (admissions/ last 12 mth)	2 years	n=69; mean (SD): 1.2 (1.2)	n=74; mean (SD): 0.6 (0.8)	P <0.003	Very serious concerns
Balaban 1988[78]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Hospitalisation (days or nights/ last 12 mth)	2 years	n=69; mean (SD): 6.2 (11.1)	n=74; mean (SD): 7.7 (21.7)	P >0.60	Very serious concerns
Lewin 2013[68]	hmcr & educ & mfar	hmcr	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	24 months	n=375; 248 persons (66.1%)	n=375; 265 persons (70.7%)	P = 0.182 OR from logistic regression: 0.85 (95% CI 0.62 to 1.17) P = 0.316	Very serious concerns
Lewin 2013[68]	hmcr & educ & mfar	hmcr	Hospitalisation (days or nights)	24 months	n=375; mean (SD): 24.4 (36.4)	n=375; mean (SD): 22.8 (22.8)	P = 0.558	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	24 months	n=56; 20 persons (35.7%)	n=57; 19 persons (33.3%)	P = 0.8645	Very serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Hospitalisation (admissions)	24 months	n=56; 31 admissons	n=57; 31 admissions		Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more)	24 months	n=169; 90 persons (53.3%)	n=182; 83 persons (45.6%)		Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	Hospitalisation (admissions)	24 months	n=169; 141 admissions	n=182; 138 admissions		Very serious concerns
Phelan 2007[79]	mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospitalisation (pts hospitalised once or more/ last 12 mth)	24 months	n=130; 30 persons (23.1%)	n=169; 28 persons (16.6%)		Very serious concerns

Table 15. Care-home placement: other short-term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Challis 2004[15]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Care-home placement (including deaths)	6 months	n=129; 54 persons (41.9%)	n=127; 59 persons (46.5%)		No serious concerns
Fernandez-Barres 2017[80]	hmcr & ntr	hmcr	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	6 months	n=86; 8 persons (9.3%)	n=62; 1 person (1.6%)		Serious concerns
Hendriksen 1984[46]	mfar	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths)	6 months	n=285; 2 persons (0.7%)	n=287; 2 persons (0.7%)		Serious concerns
King 2012[47]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	7 months	n=85; 4 persons (4.7%)	n=84; 2 persons (2.4%)		Serious concerns
Melis 2008[31]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Nursing home (days per person)	6 months	n=85; mean (SD): 4 (16)	n=66; mean (SD): 5 (23)		Serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	6 months	n=49; 10 persons (20.4%)	n=45; 16 persons (35.6%)		Serious concerns
Rooijackers 2021[41]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	6 months	n=122; 4 persons (3.3%)	n=123; 3 persons (2.4%)		Serious concerns
Whitehead 2016[8]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-	hmcr & mfa-	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	8 months	n=10; 1 person (10.0%)	n=12; 1 person (8.3%)		Serious concerns

Table 16. Care-home placement: other medium-term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Cameron 2013[55]	exrc & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths)	12 months	n=120; 16 persons (13.3%)	n=121; 21 persons (17.4%)		No serious concerns
Kukkonen-Harjula 2017[56]	ADL & ntr & exrc	ac	Nursing home (long-term) (days per person-years)	12 months	n=150; mean ± SE: 5.2 ± 2.09	n=149; mean ± SE: 3.04 ± 1.15	IRR: 1.71 (95% CI 0.58 to 5.04)	No serious concerns
van Hout 2010[38]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths) and time to institutionalisation	18 months	n=331; 23 persons (6.9%)	n=320; 20 persons (6.3%)	HR: 1.04 (95% CI 0.07 to 16.6)	No serious concerns
Bernabei 1998[60]	hmcr & mfar(w/med)	hmcr	Nursing home (long-term) (pts)	12 months	n=99; 10 persons (10.1%)	n=100; 15 persons (15.0%)	HR: 0.81 (95% CI 0.57 to 1.16); P = 0.30	Serious concerns
Bernabei 1998[60]	hmcr & mfar(w/med)	hmcr	Nursing home (long-term) (days per year)	12 months	n=99; 1087	n=100; 2121		Serious concerns
Brettschneider 2015[81]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths)	18 months	n=133; 8 persons (6.0%)	n=145; 15 persons (10.3%)	HR: 0.55 (95% CI 0.23 to 1.3); P = 0.17	Serious concerns
Dalby 2000[62]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	14 months	n=63; 0 person (0.0%)	n=66; 1 person (1.5%)		Serious concerns
Hay 1998[40]	Ac (Control 2 arm)	Ac (Control 1 arm)	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	12 months	n=135; 1 person (0.7%)	n=191; 2 persons (1.0%)		Serious concerns
Hendriksen 1984[46]	mfar	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths)	12 months	n=285; 7 persons (2.5%)	n=287; 9 persons (3.1%)		Serious concerns
Mann WC 1999[58]	hmcr & aids	hmcr	Care Home (days)	18 months	n=52; mean (SD): 7.4 (35.6); median: 0; range: 0 to 209	n=49; mean (SD): 11.9 (59.2); median: 0; range: 0 to 394	SMD: 0.09	Serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	12 months	n=28; 16 persons (57.1%) (Data extracted from Kaplan Meier curves in primary report)	n=37; 21 persons (56.8%) (Data extracted from Kaplan Meier curves in primary report)		Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Rockwood 2000[1]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths)	12 months	n=95; 13 persons (13.7%)	n=87; 8 persons (9.2%)	P = 0.416	Serious concerns
van Rossum 1993[57]	mfar	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths)	12 months	n=292; 3 persons (1.0%)	n=288; 0 person (0.0%)		Serious concerns
Blom 2016[39]	mfa-(w/med+slfm)	ac	Nursing home (long-term) (days)	12 months	n=288; mean: 7.2	n=1091; mean: 6.1	MD values: 1.1 (95% CI -6.4 to 8.5); P = 0.78	Very serious concerns
Blom 2016[39]	mfa-(w/med+slfm)	ac	Residential care home (long-term) (days)	12 months	n=288; mean: 38.2	n=1091; mean: 48.6	MD values: -10.4 (95% CI -48.2 to 17.3); P = 0.59	Very serious concerns
van Lieshout 2018[82]	ADL & med & ntr & sst	ac	Nursing home (short-term) (pts) Adjusted for age, gender, education, marital status, financial status, disability at baseline, frailty at baseline.	12 months	n=139; 41 persons (29.5%)	n=142; 35 persons (24.6%)	OR: 1.25 (95% CI 0.59 to 2.65); P = 0.57	Very serious concerns

Table 17. Care-home placement: other long-term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Bouman 2008[69]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths) GEE analysis	24 months	n=160; 10 persons (6.3%)	n=170; 11 persons (6.5%)	IRR: 1 (95% CI 0.94 to 1.06); P = 0.96	No serious concerns
Fischer 2009[2]	eng & mfa-(w/slfm)	ac	Nursing home (long-term) (months)	43 months	n=1281; mean (SD): 0.62 (3.98); range: 0 to 43	n=2884; mean (SD): 0.42 (3.05); range: 0 to 41	P = 0.270	No serious concerns
Kukkonen-Harjula 2017[56]	ADL & ntr & exrc	ac	Nursing home (long-term) (days per person-years)	24 months	n=150; mean ± SE: 6.48 ± 2.44	n=149; mean ± SE: 7.14 ± 1.99	IRR: 0.91 (95% CI 0.36 to 2.27)	No serious concerns
Liimatta 2019[71]	exrc & mfa-(w/med)	ac	Nursing home (long-term) (days per person-years)	24 months	n=211; mean ± SE: 1.11 ± 0.74	n=211; mean ± SE: 1.36 ± 1.25		No serious concerns
Bouman 2008[69]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Nursing home (long-term) (days)	24 months	n=160; mean (SD): 13.7 (69.98); range: 0 to 623	n=170; mean (SD): 13.71 (70.62); range: 0 to 596	HR: 1.02 (95% CI 0.42 to 2.48); P = 0.96	No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Stuck 1995[42]	educ & mfar(w/med)	ac	Nursing home (long-term) (days/100 persons/year)	36 months	n=215; 128	n=199; 820		No serious concerns
van Rossum 1993[57]	mfar	ac	Nursing home (long-term) (months)	24 months	n=292; 25	n=288; 9		No serious concerns
Carpenter 1990[73]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths)	3 years	n=272; 4 persons (1.5%)	n=267; 14 persons (5.2%)		Serious concerns
Hall 1992[3]	hmcr & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfar	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	24 months	n=71; 2 persons (2.8%)	n=72; 12 persons (16.7%)		Serious concerns
Hay 1998[40]	mfa-	ac (Control 1 arm)	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	24 months	n=121; 1 person (0.8%)	n=108; 1 person (0.9%)		Serious concerns
Hay 1998[40]	ac (Control 2 arm)	ac (Control 1 arm)	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	24 months	n=108; 1 person (0.9%)	n=130; 2 persons (1.5%)		Serious concerns
Hendriksen 1984[46]	mfar	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths)	24 months	n=285; 15 persons (5.3%)	n=287; 16 persons (5.6%)		Serious concerns
Kono 2012[4]	mfar (Preventive home visit arm)	mfar (Contorl arm)	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	24 months	n=144; 5 persons (3.5%)	n=136; 3 persons (2.2%)		Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Care Home (days)	24 months	n=134; mean (SD): 2.1 (12)	n=119; mean (SD): 2.1 (10.8)	MD values: 0.1 (95% CI -2.74 to 2.94); P = 0.95	Serious concerns
Pathy 1992[76]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths)	3 years	n=340; 20 persons (5.9%)	n=338; 28 persons (8.3%)		Serious concerns
Stuck 1995[42]	educ & mfar(w/med)	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths)	36 months	n=215; 9 persons (4.2%)	n=199; 20 persons (10.1%)	OR: 0.4 (95% CI 0.2 to 0.9); P = 0.02	Serious concerns
Stuck 2000[83]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Care-home placement (including deaths)	3 years	n=264; 34 persons (12.9%)	n=527; 45 persons (8.5%)	OR: 1.4 (95% CI 0.8 to 2.4)	Serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	24 months	17 persons	22 persons	HR: 0.67 (95% CI 0.35 to 1.28); P = 0.2261	Very serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	Care-home placement (survivors/follow-up)	24 months	n=76; 17 persons (22.4%)	n=71; 29 persons (40.8%)	HR: 0.57 (95% CI 0.35 to 0.92); P = 0.0206	Very serious concerns

Table 18. Homecare usage: results in the short term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
King 2012[47]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	Homecare (visits per month)	7 months	n=87; mean: 5.8	n=85; mean: 6.3	P = 0.4	No serious concerns
King 2012[47]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	Homecare (hours per visit)	7 months	n=87; mean: 1.5	n=85; mean: 1.4	P = 0.2	No serious concerns
Whitehead 2016[8]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-	hmcr & mfa-	Homecare (pts/ last 3 mth)	8 months	n=10; 6 persons (60.0%)	n=12; 6 persons (50.0%)		Serious concerns

Table 19. Homecare usage: results in the medium term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Kukkonen-Harjula 2017[56]	ADL & ntr & exrc	ac	Homecare (visits/ per person-years)	12 months	n=150; mean ± SE: 117.2 ± 19.3	n=149; mean ± SE: 160.5 ± 24.8	IRR: 0.73 (95% CI 0.47 to 1.14)	No serious concerns
Bernabei 1998[60]	hmcr & mfar(w/med)	hmcr	Homecare (hours/ person/ year)	12 months	n=99; mean (SD): 120 (20) n assumed=numbers of persons randomised	n=100; mean (SD): 154 (29) n assumed=numbers of persons randomised		Serious concerns
Kerse 2014[9]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Homecare - domestic care only (pts)	18 months	n=1787; 538 persons (30.1%)	n=1619; 426 persons (26.3%)		Serious concerns
Kerse 2014[9]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Homecare - personal care only (pts)	18 months	n=1787; 102 persons (5.7%)	n=1619; 79 persons (4.9%)		Serious concerns
Monteserin Nadal 2008[84]	educ & rsk-mfa-	ac	Homecare (pts)	18 months	n=234; 17 persons (7.3%)	n=232; 19 persons (8.2%)		Serious concerns
Newbury 2001[85]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Homecare (pts)	12 months	n=45; 6 persons (13.3%)	n=44; 5 persons (11.4%)		Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Thomas 2007[86]	mfar(w/med) (RAI-HC Assessment)	ac	Homecare (pts)	12 months	n=147; 4 persons(2.7%)	n=143; 4 persons (2.8%)		Serious concerns
Thomas 2007[86]	mfar(w/med) (RAI-HC Assessment Plus Referral)	ac	Homecare (pts)	12 months	n=152; 7 persons (4.6%)	n=143; 4 persons (2.8%)		Serious concerns
Blom 2016[39]	mfa-(w/med+slfm)	ac	Homecare (pts)	12 months	n=185; 84 persons (45.4%)	n=657; 292 persons (44.4%)		Very serious concerns
Blom 2016[39]	mfa-(w/med+slfm)	ac	Homecare (hours)	12 months	n=288; mean: 137	n=1091; mean: 140	MD values: -2 (95% CI -128 to 123); P = 0.97	Very serious concerns
Lewin 2013[68]	hmcr & educ & mfar	hmcr	Homecare - personal care only (pts)	12 months	n=262; 67 persons (25.6%)	n=254; 151 persons (59.4%)	P <0.001	Very serious concerns

Table 20. Homecare usage: results in the long term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Bouman 2008[69]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Homecare - personal care only (hours)	24 months	n=160; mean (SD): 42.06 (124.25); range: 0 to 907	n=170; mean (SD): 34.09 (109.12); range: 0 to 1130		No serious concerns
Bouman 2008[69]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Homecare - domestic care only (hours)	24 months	n=160; mean (SD): 86.65 (143.99); range: 0 to 627	n=170; mean (SD): 81.79 (138.47)		No serious concerns
Kukkonen-Harjula 2017[56]	ADL & ntr & exrc	ac	Homecare (visits/ per person-years)	24 months	n=150; mean ± SE: 141.2 ± 22.6	n=149; mean ± SE: 185.2 ± 27.1	IRR: 0.76 (95% CI 0.5 to 1.17)	No serious concerns
Liimatta 2019[71]	exrc & mfa-(w/med)	ac	Homecare (visits/ per person-years)	24 months	n=211; mean ± SE: 6.73 ± 1.93	n=211; mean ± SE: 11.81 ± 4.26		No serious concerns
von Bonsdorff 2008[12]	exrc	ac	Homecare (pts)	2 years	n=290; 15 persons (5.2%)	n=274; 26 persons (9.5%)	HR: 0.51 (95% CI 0.27 to 0.97)	No serious concerns
Howel 2019[87]	wlfr	ac	Homecare (Only pts receiving care/ hours per week)	24 months	n=42; mean (SD): 53.7 (66.3)	n=52; mean (SD): 42 (56)	MD values: 26.3 (95% CI 0.8 to 56.1)	Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Howel 2019[87]	wlfr	ac	Homecare (pts)	24 months	n=283; 42 persons (14.8%)	n=279; 52 persons (18.6%)		Serious concerns
Kerse 2014[9]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Homecare - domestic care only (pts)	3 years	n=1553; 627 persons (40.4%)	n=1428; 502 persons (35.2%)		Serious concerns
Kerse 2014[9]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Homecare - personal care only (pts)	3 years	n=1553; 104 persons (6.7%)	n=1428; 80 persons (5.6%)		Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Homecare (hours)	24 months	n=134; mean (SD): 228.2 (288.5)	n=119; mean (SD): 220.2 (319.9)	MD values: 8 (95% CI -67.3 to 83.36); P = 0.83	Serious concerns
Pathy 1992[76]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Homecare (pts)	3 years	n=223; 46 persons (20.6%)	n=196; 34 persons (17.3%)		Serious concerns
Thomas 2007[86]	mfar(w/med) (RAI-HC Assessment arm)	ac	Homecare (pts)	2 years	n=127; 6 persons (4.7%)	n=122; 1 person (0.8%)		Serious concerns
Thomas 2007[86]	mfar(w/med) (RAI-HC Assessment Plus Referral arm)	ac	Homecare (pts)	2 years	n=126; 8 persons (6.3%)	n=122; 1 person(0.8%)		Serious concerns

Table 21. Health status: results in the short-term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Clark 2012[88]	eng & educ	ac	SF-36: Mental Component Summary (MCS) score (larger is better)	6 Months	n=187; mean (SD): 48.64 (10.63); Δ mean ± SE: 1.79 ± 0.87	n=172; mean (SD): 47.45 (12.01); Δ mean ± SE: 0.04 ± 0.86		No serious concerns
Clark 2012[88]	eng & educ	ac	SF-36: Physical Component Summary (PCS) score (larger is better)	6 Months	n=187; mean (SD): 41.86 (10.68); Δ mean ± SE: 1.02 ± 0.65	n=172; mean (SD): 41.53 (9.99); Δ mean ± SE: 0.07 ± 0.64		No serious concerns
Jing 2018[25]	exrc & psyc	psyc	Health self-evaluation (4-point Likert scale: 4=healthy, 1=unhealthy) (larger is better)	6 Months	n=39; mean (SD): 3.44 (0.75)	n=40; mean (SD): 2.7 (1.32)	P <0.05	No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
King 2012[47]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	EQ-5D EQ-VAS (0-10) (larger is better)	7 Months	n=76; mean ± SE: 6.2 ± 0.2	n=81; mean ± SE: 6.6 ± 0.2	P = 0.88	No serious concerns
King 2012[47]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	SF-36: Mental Component Summary (MCS) score (larger is better)	7 Months	n=76; mean ± SE: 67.7 ± 1.4	n=81; mean ± SE: 66.4 ± 1.4	P = 0.05	No serious concerns
King 2012[47]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	SF-36: Physical Component Summary (PCS) score (larger is better)	7 Months	n=76; mean ± SE: 46.4 ± 1.5	n=81; mean ± SE: 45.4 ± 1.5	P = 0.22	No serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	EQ-5D EQ-VAS (Health today 0-100) (larger is better)	6 Months	n=169; Δ mean ± SE: 3.24 ± 1.4	n=182; Δ mean ± SE: 0.08 ± 1.35	MD values: -3.16 (95% CI -6.96 to 0.64)	No serious concerns
Stewart 2005[16]	mfa- (Social Worker-led assessment arm)	mfa- (Occupational Therapist-led assessment arm)	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	8 Months	n=131; mean (SD): 0.49 (0.29)	n=133; mean (SD): 0.45 (0.29)	MD values: 0.04 (95% CI -0.03 to 0.11); P = 0.29	No serious concerns
Stewart 2005[16]	mfa- (Social Worker-led assessment arm)	mfa- (Occupational Therapist-led assessment arm)	EQ-5D EQ-VAS (Health today 0-100) (larger is better)	8 Months	n=131; mean (SD): 62.5 (19.9)	n=133; mean (SD): 58.8 (15.6)	MD values: 3.74 (95% CI -0.74 to 8.2); P = 0.10	No serious concerns
Tuntland 2015[89]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	COOP/ Wonca Charts - Overall health chart (Holm & Steen, 2005; van Weel, 1993) (smaller is better)	9 Months	n=25; mean: 2.8 (95% CI 2.4 to 3.1)	n=26; mean: 2.9 (95% CI 2.6 to 3.3)	MD values: -0.2 (95% CI -0.6 to 0.2); P = 0.40	No serious concerns
van der Pols-Vijlbrief 2017[17]	hmcr & ntr & mfar	hmcr	QALY from EQ-5D-3L (larger is better)	6 Months			MD values: 0.01 (95% CI -0.02 to 0.03)	No serious concerns
van der Pols-Vijlbrief 2017[17]	hmcr & ntr & mfar	hmcr	SF-12: mental component summary (larger is better)	6 Months	n=79; mean: 60.69	n=76; mean: 52.29	MD values: 8.79 (95% CI 3.31 to 14.27)	No serious concerns
van der Pols-Vijlbrief 2017[17]	hmcr & ntr & mfar	hmcr	SF-12: Physical component summary (larger is better)	6 Months	n=79; mean: 39.51	n=76; mean: 34.38	MD values: 2.46 (95% CI -2.84 to 7.76)	No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Auvinen 2020[44]	hmcr & med	hmcr	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	6 Months	n=229; mean (SD): 0.57 (0.29); Δ mean: -0.017 [95% CI -0.019 to -0.016]	n=220; mean (SD): 0.56 (0.27); Δ mean: -0.023 [95% CI -0.026 to -0.02]	P = 0.589 (treatment-time-sex interaction from LMM predicted values indicate mean)	Serious concerns
Auvinen 2020[44]	hmcr & med	hmcr	EQ-5D EQ-VAS (Health today 0-100) (larger is better)	6 Months	n=229; mean (SD): 56.4 (17.4)	n=220; mean (SD): 54.7 (17.8)		Serious concerns
Cutchin 2009[28]	mfar	ac	SF-12: mental component summary (larger is better)	7 Months	n=56; mean: 55.7 (95% CI 53.4 to 58)	n=54; mean: 56.2 (95% CI 53.8 to 58.5)	MD change: 0.09 (95% CI -3.01 to 3.2); P = 0.952	Serious concerns
Cutchin 2009[28]	mfar	ac	SF-12: Physical component summary (larger is better)	7 Months	n=56; mean: 35 (95% CI 32.8 to 37.2)	n=54; mean: 34.3 (95% CI 32.1 to 36.5)	MD change: 0.1 (95% CI -3.28 to 3.48); P = 0.952	Serious concerns
Gustafson 2021[30]	aids & educ & comm	ac	PROMIS Global Mental Health (GMH) [Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System Global Health scale Mental Health summary score] (larger is better)	6 Months	n=197; mean (SD): 3.42 (0.73)	n=193; mean (SD): 3.36 (0.74)		Serious concerns
Gustafson 2021[30]	aids & educ & comm	ac	PROMIS Global Physical Health (GPH) [Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System Global Health scale Physical Health summary score] (larger is better)	6 Months	n=197; mean (SD): 3.42 (0.66)	n=193; mean (SD): 3.44 (0.67)		Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	6 Months	n=171; mean (SD): 0.63 (0.22)	n=145; mean (SD): 0.69 (0.19)	MD values: -0.02 (95% CI -0.05 to 0.01); P = 0.20	Serious concerns
Morgan 2019[51]	exrc	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	6 Months	n=28; median: 0.77 (IQR 0.68 to 1)	n=16; median: 0.84 (IQR 0.77 to 0.88)		Serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	EQ-5D EQ-VAS (Health today 0-100) (larger is better)	6 Months	n=56; Δ mean ± SE: 3.08 ± 3.25	n=57; Δ mean ± SE: -3.76 ± 3.44	MD values: -6.84 (95% CI -16.18 to 2.5)	Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Parsons J 2012[90]	hmcr & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	SF-36: Mental Component Summary (MCS) score (larger is better)	6 Months	n=106; mean ± SE: 63.46 ± 3.31	n=91; mean ± SE: 58.52 ± 3.1		Serious concerns
Parsons J 2012[90]	hmcr & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	SF-36: Physical Component Summary (PCS) score (larger is better)	6 Months	n=106; mean ± SE: 54.04 ± 3.52	n=91; mean ± SE: 51.31 ± 3.42		Serious concerns
Szanton 2011[91]	ADL&aids&educ& exrc& mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	EQ-5D EQ-VAS (Health today 0-100) (larger is better)	24 Weeks	n=24; mean (SD): 75.8 (15.04)	n=16; mean (SD): 62.5 (24.9)	MD change: 0.48	Serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	6 Months	n=1209; mean: 0.76 (95% CI 0.75 to 0.77)	n=1074; mean: 0.76 (95% CI 0.75 to 0.77)	MD values: 0 (95% CI -0.02 to 0.01); P = 0.72	Serious concerns
Takahashi 2012[65]	mntr-mfa-	ac	SF-12: mental component summary (larger is better)	6 Months	n=77; mean (SD): 56.8 (7.2); Δ mean (SD): 0.95 (7.3)	n=89; mean (SD): 59.1 (6.5); Δ mean (SD): 2 (7.6)	P = 0.04	Serious concerns
Takahashi 2012[65]	mntr-mfa-	ac	SF-12: Physical component summary (larger is better)	6 Months	n=77; mean (SD): 35.2 (11); Δ mean (SD): -2 (9)	n=89; mean (SD): 35.8 (11.6); Δ mean (SD): 0.2 (9.2)	P = 0.72	Serious concerns
Takahashi 2012[65]	mntr-mfa-	ac	Health Perception (EVGFP / 1-5, SF-36) (smaller is better)	6 Months	n=77; mean (SD): 3.1 (1); Δ mean (SD): 0 (0.86)	n=89; mean (SD): 3.1 (0.88); Δ mean (SD): -0.06 (0.8)	P = 0.92	Serious concerns
van Dongen 2020[53]	ntr & exrc	ac	EQ-5D EQ-VAS (Health today 0-100) (larger is better)	24 Weeks	n=82; mean: 81.9 (95% CI 79.2 to 84.6)	n=86; mean: 84.3 (95% CI 81.8 to 86.9)	MD change: -2.4 (95% CI -5.7 to 0.9); P = 0.19	Serious concerns
van Dongen 2020[53]	ntr & exrc	ac	EQ-5D-5L (self-completion) (larger is better)	24 Weeks	n=82; mean: 0.87 (95% CI 0.84 to 0.89)	n=86; mean: 0.87 (95% CI 0.84 to 0.89)	MD change: 0 (95% CI -0.03 to 0.03); P = 0.32	Serious concerns
van Dongen 2020[53]	ntr & exrc	ac	QALY from EQ-5D-5L (larger is better)	24 Weeks	n=82; mean (SD): 0.37 (0.06)	n=86; mean (SD): 0.37 (0.06)	MD change: 0 (95% CI -0.03 to 0.03); P = 0.32	Serious concerns
van Hout 2010[38]	mfar(w/med)	ac	SF-36: Mental Component Summary (MCS) score (larger is better)	6 Months	n=320; mean (SD): 44.5 (10.5)	n=331; mean (SD): 45.4 (10.6)		Serious concerns
van Hout 2010[38]	mfar(w/med)	ac	SF-36: Physical Component Summary (PCS) score (larger is better)	6 Months	n=320; mean (SD): 31.4 (9.3)	n=331; mean (SD): 32.1 (9.4)		Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Walters 2017[92]	mfar(w/slfm)	ac	EQ-5D-5L (self-completion) (larger is better)	6 Months	n=25; mean (SD): 0.73 (0.16)	n=23; mean (SD): 0.7 (0.21)		Serious concerns
Walters 2017[92]	mfar(w/slfm)	ac	QALY from EQ-5D-5L (larger is better)	6 Months	n=25; mean: 0.362 (95% CI 0.349 to 0.374)	n=23; mean: 0.347 (95% CI 0.334 to 0.36)		Serious concerns
Whitehead 2016[8]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-	hmcr & mfa-	SF-36: Mental Component Summary (MCS) score (larger is better)	8 Months	n=12	n=10	MD change: 3.39±4.9 (95% CI -6.88 to 13.66)	Serious concerns
Whitehead 2016[8]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-	hmcr & mfa-	SF-36: Physical Component Summary (PCS) score (larger is better)	8 Months	n=12	n=10	MD change: 0.09±5.33 (95% CI -11.06 to 11.24)	Serious concerns
Whitehead 2016[8]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-	hmcr & mfa-	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	8 Months	n=10	n=12	MD change: 0.23±0.22 (95% CI -0.23 to 0.69)	Serious concerns
Wong 2019[54]	mfar(w/slfm)	ac	QALY from SF-12 (larger is better)	6 Months	n=230; mean: 0.0252 (95% CI 0.0171 to 0.0333)	n=229; mean: 0.0219 (95% CI 0.0141 to 0.0297)	MD values: 0.0033 (95% CI 0.0031 to 0.0034); P = 0.380	Serious concerns
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa- (UPRIM+U-CARE)	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	6 Months	n=1282; mean: 0.78 (95% CI 0.7 to 0.8)	n=771; mean: 0.8 (95% CI 0.7 to 0.8)		Very serious concerns
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa- (UPRIM screening)	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	6 Months	n=701; mean: 0.75 (95% CI 0.7 to 0.8)	n=771; mean: 0.8 (95% CI 0.7 to 0.8)		Very serious concerns

Table 22. Health status: results in the medium term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Borrows 2013[19]	aids	mfa-	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=15; mean (SD): 0.3 (0.36)	n=16; mean (SD): 0.28 (0.33)	MD values: 0.03; P = 0.77	No serious concerns
Cameron 2013[55]	exrc & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=119; mean (SD): 0.49 (0.32)	n=119; mean (SD): 0.47 (0.34)		No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Cameron 2013[55]	exrc & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	QALY from EQ-5D-3L (larger is better) (Calculated using trapezoidal integration)	12 Months	n=119; mean (SD): 0.52 (0.26)	n=119; mean (SD): 0.54 (0.27)	MD values: -0.022 (95% CI -0.088 to 0.459)	No serious concerns
Liimatta 2019[71]	exrc & mfa-(w/med)	ac	15D HRQoL (15-75) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=211; mean (SD): 0.827 (0.126)	n=211; mean (SD): 0.819 (0.12)	MD change: 0.015 (95% CI 0.002 to 0.028); P = 0.02	No serious concerns
van Rossum 1993[57]	mfar	ac	Self-rated Health (Dutch educational system; 10-point scale) (larger is better)	18 Months	n=255; mean: 7.2	n=255; mean: 7.1	MD values: 0.1 (95% CI -0.2 to 0.4)	No serious concerns
Brettschneider 2015[81]	mfar(w/med)	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	18 Months	n=133; mean (SD): 0.5563 (0.3068)	n=145; mean (SD): 0.5503 (0.3165)		Serious concerns
Brettschneider 2015[81]	mfar(w/med)	ac	QALY from EQ-5D-3L (larger is better)	18 Months	n=133; mean (SD): 0.8256 (0.4029)	n=145; mean (SD): 0.827 (0.4097)	MD values: 0.0061±0.0388; P = 0.88	Serious concerns
Counsell 2007[13]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	SF-36: Physical Component Summary (PCS) score (larger is better)	24 Months	n=474; Δ mean (SD): -1.1 (8.9)	n=477; Δ mean (SD): -1.6 (8.8)	MD change: 0.5; P = 0.38	Serious concerns
Cutchin 2009[28]	mfar	ac	SF-12: mental component summary (larger is better)	15 Months	n=56; mean: 55.2 (95% CI 52.5 to 57.8)	n=54; mean: 54.5 (95% CI 51.9 to 57.1)	MD change: 1.21 (95% CI -2.03 to 4.46); P = 0.460	Serious concerns
Cutchin 2009[28]	mfar	ac	SF-12: Physical component summary (larger is better)	15 Months	n=56; mean: 34.5 (95% CI 32.3 to 36.7)	n=54; mean: 34.9 (95% CI 32.8 to 37.1)	MD change: -0.98 (95% CI -4.06 to 2.09); P = 0.528	Serious concerns
Hogg 2009[10]	mfar(w/med)	ac	SF-36: Mental Component Summary (MCS) score (larger is better)	15 Months	n=109; Δ mean: -1.2	n=114; Δ mean: -0.1	MD change: -1.1 (95% CI -3.7 to 1.6); P = 0.44	Serious concerns
Hogg 2009[10]	mfar(w/med)	ac	SF-36: Physical Component Summary (PCS) score (larger is better)	15 Months	n=109; Δ mean: 2.7	n=114; Δ mean: 1.1	MD change: 1.6 (95% CI -0.8 to 4.1); P = 0.18	Serious concerns
Howel 2019[87]	wlfr	ac	CASP-19 (0-57) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=300; mean (SD): 38.2 (10)	n=295; mean (SD): 37.4 (10.6)	MD values: 0.6 (95% CI -0.7 to 1.8)	Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Gustafson 2021[30]	aids & educ & comm	ac	PROMIS Global Physical Health (GPH) [Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System Global Health scale Physical Health summary score] (larger is better)	12 Months	n=197; mean (SD): 3.42 (0.78)	n=193; mean (SD): 3.46 (0.79)		Serious concerns
Gustafson 2021[30]	aids & educ & comm	ac	PROMIS Global Mental Health (GMH) [Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System Global Health scale Mental Health summary score] (larger is better)	12 Months	n=197; mean (SD): 3.45 (0.83)	n=193; mean (SD): 3.4 (0.84)		Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=171; mean (SD): 0.64 (0.21)	n=145; mean (SD): 0.68 (0.19)	MD values: -0.01 (95% CI -0.04 to 0.03); P = 0.69	Serious concerns
Newcomer 2004[93]	educ & mfar(w/med)	ac	SF-12: mental component summary (larger is better)	12 Months	n=1196; mean (SD): 52.4 (9.8); Δ mean (SD): -0.4 (9.1)	n=1259; mean (SD): 52.3 (10.1); Δ mean (SD): -0.2 (9)		Serious concerns
Newcomer 2004[93]	educ & mfar(w/med)	ac	SF-12: Physical component summary (larger is better)	12 Months	n=1196; mean (SD): 38.3 (11.5); Δ mean (SD): -1.1 (9)	n=1259; mean (SD): 38.4 (11.7); Δ mean (SD): -0.9 (9)		Serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	EQ-5D EQ-VAS (Health today 0-100) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=169; Δ mean ± SE: 5.13 ± 1.48	n=182; Δ mean ± SE: 4.55 ± 1.45	MD values: -0.58 (95% CI -4.63 to 3.48)	Serious concerns
Ploeg 2010[63]	educ & mfar(w/med)	ac	Health Perception (EVGFP / 1-5, SF-36) (smaller is better)	12 Months	n=328; Δ mean (SD): 0.031 (0.856); Δ median: 0 (IQR -1 to 1) (Imputed data not used)	n=310; Δ mean (SD): 0.068 (0.955); Δ median: 0 (IQR 0 to 1) (Imputed data not used)	MD values: -0.015 (95% CI -0.158 to 0.127); P = 0.832 (Imputed data used; interclass correlation= 0.110)	Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Ploeg 2010[63]	educ & mfar(w/med)	ac	QALY from HUI-3 (larger is better) (Quality adjustment weight=Health Utilities Index Mark three HROoL scores)	12 Months	n=287; mean (SD): 0.5554 (0.2621); median: 0.5876 (IQR 0.3557 to 0.7495)	n=267; mean (SD): 0.5079 (0.282); median: 0.5465 (IQR 0.2966 to 0.7368)	MD values: 0.017 (95% CI -0.022 to 0.056); P = 0.388 (Interclass correlation= 0.297)	Serious concerns
Siemonsma 2018[37]	ADL	mfa-	Health Perception (EVGFP / 1-5, SF-36) (smaller is better)	12 Months	n=44; mean (SD): 3.68 (0.674); median: 4 (IQR 3 to 4)	n=55; mean (SD): 3.85 (0.524); median: 4 (IQR 4 to 4)	P = 0.019	Serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=1209; mean: 0.74 (95% CI 0.73 to 0.75)	n=1074; mean: 0.74 (95% CI 0.72 to 0.75)	MD values: 0 (95% CI -0.01 to 0.02); P = 0.84	Serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	QALY from EQ-5D-3L (larger is better)	12 Months	n=1209	n=1074	MD values: 0.004 (95% CI -0.009 to 0.017)	Serious concerns
Takahashi 2012[65]	mntr-mfa-	ac	SF-12: Mental component summary (larger is better)	12 Months	n=77; mean (SD): 56 (8.9); Δ mean (SD): 1 (9.6)	n=89; mean (SD): 58.1 (7.6); Δ mean (SD): 1.2 (8.7)	P = 0.10	Serious concerns
Takahashi 2012[65]	mntr-mfa-	ac	SF-12: Physical component summary (larger is better)	12 Months	n=77; mean (SD): 32.8 (10.6); Δ mean (SD): -4.3 (9.3)	n=89; mean (SD): 34.2 (10.2); Δ mean (SD): -1.2 (8.5)	P = 0.39	Serious concerns
Thomas 2007[86]	mfar(w/med) (RAI-HC Assessment)	ac	Self-rated health (5-point scale) (smaller is better)	1 Years	n=147; mean (SD): 2.4 (1)	n=143; mean (SD): 2.5 (0.9)	P >0.05	Serious concerns
van Hout 2010[38]	mfar(w/med)	ac	SF-36: Mental Component Summary (MCS) score (larger is better)	18 Months	n=331; mean (SD): 43.9 (11.2)	n=320; mean (SD): 45.2 (11.2)		Serious concerns
van Hout 2010[38]	mfar(w/med)	ac	SF-36: Physical Component Summary (PCS) score (larger is better)	18 Months	n=331; mean (SD): 30.7 (9.2)	n=320; mean (SD): 32.2 (9.3)		Serious concerns
Wolter 2013[22]	hmcr & mfar(w/med)	hmcr	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	13 Months	n=268; mean: 0.319; Δ mean: 0.014	n=216; mean: 0.384; Δ mean: 0.024	MD values: 0.0053 (95% CI -0.06 to 0.07)	Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Yamada 2003[94]	mfar(w/med)	ac	EQ-5D-5L (self-completion) (larger is better)	18 Months	n=160; mean: 0.685 (95% CI 0.657 to 0.714); Δ mean: -0.004 [95% CI -0.031 to 0.024]	n=149; mean: 0.666 (95% CI 0.633 to 0.699); Δ mean: -0.029 [95% CI -0.058 to 0.001]	MD values: 0.02 (95% CI -0.024 to 0.063) MD change: 0.025 (95% CI -0.015 to 0.065)	Serious concerns
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa- (UPRIM+U-CARE arm)	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=1147; mean: 0.7 (95% CI 0.7 to 0.8)	n=714; mean: 0.7 (95% CI 0.7 to 0.8)		Very serious concerns
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa- (UPRIM screening arm)	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=628; mean: 0.7 (95% CI 0.7 to 0.8)	n=714; mean: 0.7 (95% CI 0.7 to 0.8)		Very serious concerns
Blom 2016[39]	mfa- (w/med+slfm)	ac	QALY from EQ-5D EQ-VAS (0-100) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=288; mean: 0.735	n=1091; mean: 0.686	MD values: 0.049 (95% CI -0.365 to 0.462); P = 0.82	Very serious concerns
Henderson 2005[67]	mfar	ac	Health Perception Scale (3 items, Likert scale of 3-4 points, total of 10 points) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=61; mean (SD): 6.49 (1.67); pBaseline: 0.014	n=63; mean (SD): 6.51 (1.78); pBaseline: 0.011	P = 0.688	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	EQ-5D EQ-VAS (Health today 0-100) (larger is better)	12 Months	n=56; Δ mean ± SE: -1.75 ± 4.48	n=57; Δ mean ± SE: 2.64 ± 4.71	MD values: 4.39 (95% CI -8.46 to 17.24)	Very serious concerns
van Lieshout 2018[82]	ADL & med & ntr & sst	ac	SF-12: Mental component summary (larger is better)	12 Months	n=139; mean: 48.2 (95% CI 45.71 to 50.77)	n=142; mean: 47.1 (95% CI 45 to 49.19)	P = 0.15	Very serious concerns
van Lieshout 2018[82]	ADL & med & ntr & sst	ac	SF-12: Physical component summary (larger is better)	12 Months	n=139; mean: 45.6 (95% CI 42.76 to 48.46)	n=142; mean: 45 (95% CI 42.43 to 47.55)	P = 0.48	Very serious concerns

Table 23. Health status: results in the long term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Howel 2019[87]	wlfr	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	24 Months	n=280; mean (SD): 0.68 (0.296)	n=273; mean (SD): 0.674 (0.318)	MD values: -0.015 (95% CI -0.057 to 0.028)	No serious concerns

Howel 2019[87]	wlfr	ac	QALY from EQ-5D-3L (larger is better)	24 Months	n=293; mean (SD): 1.24 (0.562)	n=282; mean (SD): 1.242 (0.613)	MD values: 0.009 (95% CI -0.038 to 0.055); P = 0.966	No serious concerns
Liimatta 2019[71]	exrc & mfa-(w/med)	ac	15D HRQoL (15-75) (larger is better)	24 Months	n=211; mean (SD): 0.825 (0.116)	n=211; mean (SD): 0.816 (0.12)	MD change: 0.0093 (95% CI -0.013 to 0.031); P = 0.41	No serious concerns
Liimatta 2019[71]	exrc & mfa-(w/med)	ac	QALY from 15D (larger is better)	24 Months	n=211; mean (SD): 0.819 (0.112)	n=211; mean (SD): 0.812 (0.114)	MD values: 0.007 (95% CI 0.029 to -0.015); P = 0.52	No serious concerns
Bouman 2008[69]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Self-rated Health (Dutch educational system; 10-point scale) (larger is better)	24 Months	n=139; mean (SD): 5 (1.51)	n=154; mean (SD): 5 (1.65)	MD values: -0.02 (95% CI -0.38 to 0.33); P = 0.9	Serious concerns
Counsell 2007[13]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	SF-36: Mental Component Summary (MCS) score (larger is better)	24 Months	n=474; Δ mean (SD): 2.1 (10.2)	n=477; Δ mean (SD): -0.3 (10.8)	MD change: 2.4; P <0.001	Serious concerns
Howel 2019[87]	wlfr	ac	CASP-19 (0-57) (larger is better)	24 Months	n=279; mean (SD): 42.9 (10.1)	n=276; mean (SD): 42.4 (10.4)	MD values: 0.3 (95% CI -0.8 to 1.5)	Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	24 Months	n=171; mean (SD): 0.63 (0.19)	n=145; mean (SD): 0.65 (0.21)	MD values: 0 (95% CI -0.04 to 0.04); P = 0.98	Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	QALY from EQ-5D-3L (larger is better) (UK tariff)	24 Months	n=171; mean (SD): 1.3 (0.32)	n=145; mean (SD): 1.36 (0.34)	MD values: -0.06 (95% CI -0.14 to 0.02); P = 0.15	Serious concerns
Pathy 1992[76]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Health Status (10-point Likert scale; 0=very worst possible, 10=very best possible) (larger is better)	3 Years	n=223; mean (SD): 6.9 (2.7)	n=196; mean (SD): 6.4 (2.9)	MD values: 0.5 (95% CI 0.2 to 0.8); P <0.05	Serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	EQ-5D-3L (self-completion) (larger is better)	24 Months	n=1209; mean: 0.73 (95% CI 0.72 to 0.74)	n=1074; mean: 0.72 (95% CI 0.71 to 0.73)	MD values: 0.01 (95% CI -0.01 to 0.03); P = 0.29	Serious concerns
Thomas 2007[86]	mfar(w/med) (RAI-HC Assessment)	ac	Self-rated health (used in Thomas 2007) (smaller is better)	2 Years	n=127; mean (SD): 2.5 (1)	n=122; mean (SD): 2.6 (1)	P >0.05	Serious concerns

Thomas 2007[86]	mfar(w/med) (RAI-HC Assessment Plus Referral)	ac	Self-rated health (used in Thomas 2007) (smaller is better)	2 Years	n=126; mean (SD): 2.5 (1)	n=122; mean (SD): 2.6 (1)	P >0.05	Serious concerns
van Rossum 1993[57]	mfar	ac	Self-rated Health (Dutch educational system; 10-point scale) (larger is better)	36 Months	n=245; mean: 6.9	n=231; mean: 6.8	MD values: 0.1 (95% CI -0.2 to 0.4)	Serious concerns
Balaban 1988[78]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Quality of Well-being (QWB) Scale (larger is better)	2 Years	n=40; mean (SD): 0.608 (0.14)	n=46; mean (SD): 0.632 (0.1)	P >0.30	Very serious concerns
Meng 2005[14]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Health Perception (EVGFP / 5-1) - RAND Medical Outcome Study (MOS) (larger is better)	22 Months	n=218	n=234	P = 0.74 Ordered logit: coefficient (B) 0.06, (Huber-White) SE B 0.18, z/t 0.33	Very serious concerns
Meng 2005[14]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	SF-36: Mental Component Summary (MCS) score (larger is better)	22 Months	n=218	n=234	P = 0.34 linear regression: coefficient (B) 0.81, (Huber-White) SE B 0.85, z/t 0.96	Very serious concerns
Meng 2005[14]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	SF-36: Physical Component Summary (PCS) score (larger is better)	22 Months	n=218	n=234	P = 0.86 linear regression: coefficient (B) 0.14, (Huber-White) SE B 0.77, z/t 0.17	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	EQ-5D EQ-VAS (Health today 0-100) (larger is better)	24 Months			MD values: -3.07 (95% CI -9.47 to 3.33)	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	EQ-5D EQ-VAS (Health today 0-100) (larger is better)	24 Months			MD values: -1.162 (95% CI -3.52 to 0.2); P >0.05	Very serious concerns

Table 24. Depression: short-term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Challis 2004[15]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS) (Long version, 30 questions) (Yesavage *et al.*, 1983) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=103; Δ mean (SD): -0.84 (3.38)	n=93; Δ mean (SD): -0.81 (3.35)		No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Clark 2012[88]	eng & educ	ac	SF-36: Mental Health (larger is better)	6 months	n=187; mean (SD): 49.07 (10.7); Δ mean ± SE: 2.31 ± 0.87	n=172; mean (SD): 47.16 (11.81); Δ mean ± SE: 0.48 ± 0.86		No serious concerns
Clark 2012[88]	eng & educ	ac	CES-D depression scale (20 items; Radloff 1977) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=186; mean (SD): 12.47 (9.68); Δ mean ± SE: -1.69 ± 0.75	n=173; mean (SD): 13.53 (11.17); Δ mean ± SE: -0.08 ± 0.74		No serious concerns
Jing 2018[25]	exrc & psyc	psyc	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS 15) (Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=39; mean (SD): 3.46 (1.75)	n=40; mean (SD): 4.8 (1.29)	P <.05	No serious concerns
King 2012[47]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	SF-36: Mental Health (larger is better)	7 months	n=76; mean ± SE: 70.9 ± 1.4	n=81; mean ± SE: 70.9 ± 1.3		No serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	Depression Rating Scale (DRS) (Burrows *et al.*, 2000) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=169; Δ mean ± SE: -0.31 ± 0.14	n=182; Δ mean ± SE: -0.11 ± 0.13	MD values: 0.2 (95% CI -0.18 to 0.57)	No serious concerns
Auvinen 2020[44]	hmcr & med	hmcr	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS 15) (Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=229; mean (SD): 5.27 (3.18); Δ mean: -0.1 [95% CI -0.14 to -0.05]	n=220; mean (SD): 5 (3.03); Δ mean: 0.14 [95% CI 0.13 to 0.14]	P = 0.121	Serious concerns
Cutchin 2009[28]	mfar	ac	CES-D depression scale (10 items; Andresen *et al.*, 1994 & Irwin *et al.*, 1999) (smaller is better)	7 months	n=56; mean: 8.7 (95% CI 7.7 to 9.7)	n=54; mean: 9.4 (95% CI 8.4 to 10.4)	MD change: 0.21 (95% CI -1.43 to 1.84); P = 0.802	Serious concerns
Fernandez-Barres 2017[80]	hmcr & ntr	hmcr	Geriatric Depression Scale 5-item version (smaller is better)	6 months	n=63; mean (SD): 1.8 (1)	n=48; mean (SD): 2.1 (1.4)		Serious concerns
Gustafson 2021[30]	aids & educ & comm	ac	Patient Health Questionnaire 8 (PHQ-8) [1-4] (smaller is better)	6 months	n=197; mean (SD): 0.72 (0.19)	n=193; mean (SD): 0.72 (0.19)		Serious concerns
Markle-Reid 2006[95]	hmcr & mfar(w/med+slfm)	hmcr & mfar	CES-D depression scale (20 items; Radloff 1977) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=113; mean (SD): 11.94 (10.18); Δ mean (SD): -3.89 (8.68)	n=115; mean (SD): 11.77 (10.73); Δ mean (SD): 1.17 (9.24)	MD change: -2.72 (95% CI -5.07 to -0.39); P = 0.022	Serious concerns
Markle-Reid 2006[95]	hmcr & mfar(w/med+slfm)	hmcr & mfar	SF-36: Mental Health (larger is better)	6 months	n=118; mean (SD): 71.06 (23.88)	n=122; mean (SD): 73.75 (22.83)	MD change: 7.46 (95% CI 2.32 to 12.6); P = 0.005	Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Melis 2008[31]	mfar(w/med)	ac	SF-20: Mental Health (larger is better)	6 months	n=73; mean (SD): 61.5 (20.4)	n=51; mean (SD): 53.2 (20.1)	MD values: 9.1 (95% CI 2.4 to 15.6)	Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (depression subscore) (HADS-D) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=171; mean (SD): 5.72 (3.49)	n=145; mean (SD): 5.82 (3.88)	MD values: -0.11 (95% CI -0.8 to 0.58); P = 0.76	Serious concerns
Morgan 2019[51]	exrc	ac	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS 15) (Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=28; median: 2 (IQR 0 to 9)	n=16; median: 2 (IQR 1 to 6)	MD values: -0.5 (95% CI -1.63 to 0.63); P = 0.38	Serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Depression Rating Scale (DRS) (Burrows *et al.*, 2000) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=56; Δ mean ± SE: -1.77 ± 0.48	n=57; Δ mean ± SE: -0.28 ± 0.52	MD values: 1.49 (95% CI 0.1 to 2.89)	Serious concerns
Takahashi 2012[65]	mntr-mfa-	ac	Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=77; mean (SD): 1 (3.2); Δ mean (SD): -3 (4.5)	n=89; mean (SD): 1.2 (1.9); Δ mean (SD): -2.2 (3.1)	P = 0.76	Serious concerns
Teut 2013[66]	hmcr & hmnt & exrc	hmcr	Nurses Observation Scale for Geriatric Patients (NOSGER) - Depressed mood (smaller is better)	6 months	n=29; mean: 5.2 (95% CI 3.2 to 7.3)	n=29; mean: 6.3 (95% CI 4.5 to 8)	SMD: 0.31 (95% CI -0.09 to 0.7)	Serious concerns
Wallace 1998[96]	exrc & mfar	ac	CES-D depression scale (20 items; Radloff 1977) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=45; mean: 4.1	n=45; mean: 8.4	P = 0.001	Serious concerns
Wallace 1998[96]	exrc & mfar	ac	SF-36: Mental Health (larger is better)	6 months	n=45; mean: 82.9	n=45; mean: 74.8	P = 0.001	Serious concerns
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa- (UPRIM screening)	ac	SF-36: Mental Health (larger is better)	6 months	n=701; mean: 70.7 (95% CI 69.8 to 71.6)	n=771; mean: 69.9 (95% CI 69 to 70.8)		Very serious concerns
Bleijenberg 2016[23]	rsk-mfa- (UPRIM+U-CARE)	ac	SF-36: Mental Health (larger is better)	6 months	n=1282; mean: 70.2 (95% CI 69.4 to 71.1)	n=771; mean: 69.9 (95% CI 69 to 70.8)		Very serious concerns
Clark 1997[97]	eng & educ	ac	SF-36: Mental Health (larger is better)	9 months	mean (SD): 83.5 (12.7)	mean (SD): 74.7 (18.4)		Very serious concerns
Clark 1997[97]	eng & educ	ac	CES-D depression scale (20 items; Radloff 1977) (smaller is better)	9 months	n=101; mean (SD): 10.8 (8.2); Δ mean ± SE: -0.1 ± 0.7	n=203; mean (SD): 13.6 (9.8); Δ mean ± SE: -0.2 ± 0.7		Very serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Walters 2017[92]	mfar(w/slfm)	ac	General Health Questionnaire 12 items (GHQ-12) (smaller is better)	6 months	n=25; mean (SD): 9.52 (5.75)	n=23; mean (SD): 13.17 (4.76)	MD values: -3.923; P = 0.01	Very serious concerns

Table 25. Depression: other results in the medium term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Bouman 2008[69]	mfar(w/med)	ac	SF-20: Mental Health (larger is better)	12 months	n=139; mean (SD): 55 (20.7)	n=154; mean (SD): 53 (22.4)	MD values: -0.1 (95% CI -4.2 to 4)	Serious concerns
Coleman 1999[70]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	CES-D depression scale (20 items; Radloff 1977) (smaller is better)	12 months	mean: 16 n=unclear (total of 2 arms=108)	mean: 14.5 n=unclear (total of 2 arms=108)	P = 0.12	Serious concerns
Holland 2005[98]	educ & exrc & mfar(w/slfm)	ac	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS 15) (Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=248; Δ mean (SD): 0 (1.9)	n=236; Δ mean (SD): -0.1 (1.7)	P = 0.63	No serious concerns
Kerse 2014[9]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS 15) (Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986) (smaller is better)	18 months	mean (SD): 1.9 (2) n=unclear	mean (SD): 2 (2.1) n=unclear	P = 0.053	No serious concerns
Kono 2012[4]	mfar (Preventive home visit arm)	mfar (Control arm)	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS 15) (Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=161; mean (SD): 6.7 (4.1)	n=162; mean (SD): 6.9 (4)		Serious concerns
Leveille 1998[20]	educ & exrc & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	CES-D depression scale (20 items; Radloff 1977) (smaller is better)	12 months	n=95; Δ mean: -0.03	n=93; Δ mean: 0.06		No serious concerns
Phelan 2007[79]	mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Mental Health Index-5 (MHI-5) (larger is better)	12 months	n=130; mean: 78.8	n=169; mean: 77.3		Very serious concerns
Shapiro 2002[99]	hmcr & mfar	ac	CES-D depression scale (12 items; Shapiro 2002 bespoke selection) (smaller is better)	18 months	n=32; mean: 12.38; Δ mean (SD): -6.36 (0.29)	n=21; mean: 19.1; Δ mean (SD): 2.19 (0.42)		Very serious concerns

Table 26. Depression: results in the long term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Kerse 2014[9]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS 15) (Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986) (smaller is better)	3 years	mean (SD): 2 (2.1) n=unclear	mean (SD): 2.1 (2.1) n=unclear	P = 0.053	No serious concerns
Rubenstein 2007[64]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS 15) (Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986) (smaller is better)	24 months	n=298; mean (SD): 4.15 (3.17)	n=309; mean (SD): 4.11 (3.63)	P >0.05	No serious concerns
Bouman 2008[69]	mfar(w/med)	ac	SF-20: Mental Health (larger is better)	24 months	n=139; mean (SD): 56 (20.4)	n=154; mean (SD): 51 (20.8)	MD values: 2.9 (95% CI -1.1 to 7); P = 0.15	Serious concerns
Coleman 1999[70]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	CES-D depression scale (20 items; Radloff 1977) (smaller is better)	24 months	mean: 14.8 n=unclear (total of 2 arms=90)	mean: 12.4 n=unclear (total of 2 arms=90)	P = 0.19	Serious concerns
Counsell 2007[13]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	SF-36: Mental Health (larger is better)	24 months	n=474; Δ mean (SD): 3.6 (18.5)	n=477; Δ mean (SD): -0.3 (18.2)	MD change: 3.9 (SD 18.3); P = 0.001	Serious concerns
Howel 2019[87]	wlfr	ac	Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) (smaller is better)	24 months	n=278; mean (SD): 3.9 (4.8)	n=276; mean (SD): 3.9 (4.7)	MD values: 0.2 (95% CI -0.4 to 0.9)	Serious concerns
Kono 2012[4]	mfar (Preventive home visit arm)	mfar (Control arm)	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS 15) (Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986) (smaller is better)	24 months	n=132; mean (SD): 7.1 (4)	n=127; mean (SD): 7.2 (3.8)		Serious concerns
Kono 2016[11]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Geriatric Depression Scale 5-item version (smaller is better)	24 months	n=179; mean: 2.4 (95% CI 2.2 to 2.6)	n=181; mean: 2.2 (95% CI 2 to 2.4)		Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (depression subscore) (HADS-D) (smaller is better)	24 months	n=171; mean (SD): 5.97 (4.18)	n=145; mean (SD): 6.1 (3.78)	MD values: -0.07 (95% CI -0.9 to 0.77); P = 0.87	Serious concerns
Moll van Charante 2016[43]	educ & mfar(w/slfm)	ac	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS 15) (Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986) (smaller is better)	6 years	n=1490; mean (SD): 1.8 (2.2)	n=1333; mean (SD): 1.7 (2.2)	MD values: 0.01 (95% CI -0.09 to 0.12); P = 0.79	Serious concerns
Balaban 1988[78]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Beck Depression Inventory-Short Form (BDI-SF) (smaller is better)	2 years	n=40; mean (SD): 6.6 (7.2)	n=46; mean (SD): 7.2 (7.6)	P >0.70	Very serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	Depression Rating Scale (DRS) (Burrows *et al.*, 2000) (smaller is better)	24 months			MD values: 0.181 (95% CI -0.07 to 0.43); P >0.05	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Depression Rating Scale (DRS) (Burrows *et al.*, 2000) (smaller is better)	24 months			MD values: 0.75 (95% CI -0.27 to 1.77); P >.05	Very serious concerns
Phelan 2007[79]	mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Mental Health Index-5 (MHI-5) (larger is better)	24 months	n=130; mean: 79.9	n=169; mean: 76.1		Very serious concerns

Table 27. Loneliness: results in the short term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Jing 2018[25]	exrc & psyc	psyc	Loneliness (3-point Likert scale; 3=often lonely; 2=sometimes lonely; 1=not lonely) (smaller is better)	6 Months	n=39; Mean (SD): 1.41 (0.68)	n=40; Mean (SD): 1.85 (0.7)	P<0.05	No serious concerns
de Craen 2006[29]	mfa-	ac	Loneliness (de Jong-Gierveld Scale) (0-11) (smaller is better)	6 Months	n=175; Δ mean (SE): -0.1±0.2	n=176; Δ mean (SE): -0.1±0.2	MD change: -0.1; 95% CI: -0.5 to 0.4; P=0.78	Serious concerns

Table 28. Loneliness: results in the medium term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Bouman 2008[69]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Loneliness (de Jong-Gierveld Scale) (0-11) (smaller is better)	18 Months	n=139; Mean (SD): 3.5 (2.98);	n=154; Mean (SD): 4.0 (3.39);	MD values: 0.44; 95% CI: -0.37 to 1.24; P=0.29	Serious concerns
Blom 2016 2016[39]	mfa- (w/med+slfm)	ac	Loneliness (de Jong-Gierveld Scale) (0-11) (smaller is better)	12 Months	n=288;	n=1091; pBaseline: 0.410;; Δ mean: -0.1 (95% CI -0.3 to 0.1)	MD change: -0.1; 95% CI: -0.5 to 0.3; P=0.661	Very serious concerns
Sherman 2016 2016[100]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Loneliness (in Health Index) (1 item, 4-point scale) (larger is better)	1 Year	n=173; pBaseline: 0.03; Mean: 3.3	n=255; pBaseline: 0.03; Mean: 3.4	P=0.57 (Wilcoxon rank-sum test)	Very serious concerns

Table 29. Loneliness: results in the long term

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
de Craen 2006[29]	mfa-	ac	Loneliness (de Jong-Gierveld Scale) (0-11) (smaller is better)	24 Months	n=143; Δ mean (SE): 0.1±0.2	n=154; Δ mean (SE): 0.1±0.2	MD change: 0.0 (95% CI: -0.7 to 0.6); p: 0.92	Serious concerns
van Rossum 1993 1993[57]	mfar	ac	Loneliness (de Jong-Gierveld Scale) (0-11) (smaller is better)	36 Months	n=232; Mean: 2.1	n=221; Mean: 1.9	MD values: 0.2 (95% CI: -0.2 to 0.6)	Serious concerns

Table 30. Falls: short term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Rooijackers 2021[41]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 6 mths)	6 months	n=117; 42 fallers (35.9%)	n=117; 37 fallers (31.6%)	MD values: 0 (95% CI -0.7 to 0.6); P = .930	No serious concerns
Walters 2017[92]	mfar(w/slfm)	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more)	6 months	n=25; 6 fallers (24.0%)	n=23; 7 fallers (30.4%)		No serious concerns
King 2012[47]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 3 mths)	7 months	n=93; 17 fallers (18.3%)	n=90; 23 fallers (25.7%)		Serious concerns
Ng 2015[52]	cgn & ntr & exrc	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more)	6 months	n=47; 1 faller (2.1%)	n=47; 5 fallers (10.6%)	P = 0.38	Serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Falls (incidents / last 6 mths) Estimated incidence rates adjusted for baseline age, sex, socio-economic status, level of education, and score of outcome. Two other ratios available without adjustment and with baseline adjustment only.	6 months	n=1017; mean: 0.25 (95% CI 0.21 to 0.29)	n=918; mean: 0.22 (95% CI 0.18 to 0.26)		Serious concerns
Whitehead 2016[8]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-	hmcr & mfa-	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 3 mths)	8 months	n=10; 2 fallers (20.0%)	n=12; 6 fallers (50.0%)		Serious concerns
Whitehead 2016[8]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-	hmcr & mfa-	Falls (incidents / only pts that fell / last 3 mths)	8 months	n=10; mean (SD): 1 (0)	n=12; mean (SD): 1.5 (1.22)		Serious concerns

Table 31. Falls: medium term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Cameron 2013[55]	exrc & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Falls (incidents)	12 months	n=120; 183 falls; mean (SD): 1.54 (2.58)	n=121; 178 falls; mean (SD): 1.5 (2.39)		No serious concerns
Gill 2002[7]	ADL & exrc	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more)	12 months	n=92; 51 fallers (55.4%)	n=92; 53 fallers (57.6%)	P = 0.77	No serious concerns
Rubenstein 2007[64]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 3 mths)	12 months	n=334; 79 fallers (23.7%)	n=360; 75 fallers (20.8%)	P >0.05	No serious concerns
Brettschneider 2015[81]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Falls (incidents / last 12 mths)	18 months	n=121; mean (SD): 2.2 (2.5); Δ mean ± SE: 0.63 ± 0.1 [95% CI 0.47 to 0.86]	n=119; mean (SD): 3.7 (4.2); Δ mean ± SE: 1.96 ± 0.29 [95% CI 1.46 to 2.63]	IRR: 0.32±0.07 (95% CI 0.22 to 0.49); P <0.001 Poisson regression	Serious concerns
Coleman 1999[70]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 12 mths)	12 months	n=79	n=63	P = 0.27	Serious concerns
Dorresteijn 2016[36]	ADL	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 12 mths)	12 months	n=166; 94 fallers (56.6%)	n=180; 106 fallers (58.9%)	OR: 0.79 (95% CI 0.5 to 1.23); P = 0.292	Serious concerns
Dorresteijn 2016[36]	ADL	ac	Falls (incidents / last 12 mths)	12 months	n=166; 362 falls (218.1%)	n=180; 429 falls (238.3%)	IRR: 0.86 (95% CI 0.65 to 1.13); P = 0.273	Serious concerns
Fabacher 1994[61]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more)	1 years	n=100, 14%	n=95, 23%		Serious concerns
Kono 2016[11]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 12 mths)	12 months	n=154; 38 fallers (24.7%)	n=151; 42 fallers (27.8%)		Serious concerns
Monteserin Nadal 2008[84]	educ & rsk-mfa-	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more)	18 months	n=217; 50 fallers (23.0%)	n=213; 44 fallers (20.7%)		Serious concerns
Newbury 2001[85]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 12 mths)	12 months	n=45; 12 fallers (26.7%)	n=44; 17 fallers (38.6%)	OR: 0.58 (95% CI 0.21 to 1.55); P = 0.32	Serious concerns
Ng 2015[52]	cgn & ntr & exrc	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more)	12 months	n=46; 2 fallers (4.3%)	n=46; 5 fallers (10.9%)	P = 0.67	Serious concerns
Rooijackers 2021[41]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 6 mths)	12 months	n=102; 36 fallers (35.3%)	n=99; 27 fallers (27.3%)	MD values: 0 (95% CI -0.7 to 0.4); P = 0.951	Serious concerns
Serra-Prat 2017[101]	ntr & exrc	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 3 mths)	12 months	n=61; 11 fallers (18.0%)	n=72; 14 fallers (19.4%)	OR: 0.87 (95% CI 0.36 to 2.11); P = 0.76	Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Falls (incidents / last 6 mths)	12 months	n=936; mean: 0.26 (95% CI 0.21 to 0.3)	n=817; mean: 0.22 (95% CI 0.19 to 0.26)		Serious concerns
Henderson 2005[67]	mfar	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more)	12 months	n=61; 11 fallers (18.0%)	n=63; 21 fallers (33.3%)		Very serious concerns
Henderson 2005[67]	mfar	ac	Falls (incidents)	12 months	n=61; mean (SD): 0.25 (0.65); range: 0 to 4	n=63; mean (SD): 0.51 (1.05); range: 0 to 7	P = 0.098, F=2.778, df=1,108	Very serious concerns

Table 32. Falls: long term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Carpenter 1990[73]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Falls (incidents / last 1 mth)	3 years	n=206; 12 falls (5.8%)	n=213; 36 falls (16.9%)	P <0.05	Serious concerns
Coleman 1999[70]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 12 mths)	24 months	n=78, 43.5%	n=49, 35.6%	P = 0.63	Serious concerns
Jitapunkul 1998[75]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 3 mths)	3 years	n=57, 5.3%	n=59, 10.2%		Serious concerns
Kono 2016[11]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 12 mths)	24 months	n=138; 41 fallers (29.7%)	n=142; 48 fallers (33.8%)		Serious concerns
Profener 2016[102]	educ & mfar	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 12 mths)	2 years	n=134; 59 fallers (44.0%)	n=259; 123 fallers (47.5%)		Serious concerns
Rubenstein 2007[64]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Falls (pts fell once or more / last 3 mths)	24 months	n=298; 81 fallers (27.2%)	n=309; 71 fallers (23.0%)	P >0.05	Serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Falls (incidents / last 6 mths)	24 months	n=924; mean: 0.29 (95% CI 0.24 to 0.34)	n=812; mean: 0.25 (95% CI 0.21 to 0.3)	IRR: 1.15 (95% CI 0.98 to 1.34); P = 0.08	Serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	Falls (incidents)	24 months	n=169; 152 falls (89.9%)	n=182; 175 falls (96.2%)		Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	Falls (pts fell once or more)	24 months	n=169; 69 fallers (40.8%)	n=182; 77 fallers (42.3%)		Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Falls (pts fell once or more)	24 months	n=56; 24 fallers (42.9%)	n=57; 23 fallers (40.4%)	P = 0.8503	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Falls (incidents)	24 months	n=56; 63 falls (112.5%)	n=57; 43 falls (75.4%)		Very serious concerns

Table 33. Mortality: short term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Auvinen 2020[44]	hmcr & med	hmcr	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=253; 20 events (7.9%)	n=250; 23 events (9.2%)		No serious concerns
Barenfeld 2018[103]	educ	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=53; 1 event (1.9%)	n=74; 1 event (1.4%)		Very serious concerns
Challis 2004[15]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Deaths (from routine data)	6 months	n=129; 17 events (13.2%)	n=127; 21 events (16.5%)		No serious concerns
Hattori 2019[45]	educ & mfar(w/slfm)	mfar	Deaths (pre-specified outcome, method of ascertainment unspecified)	8 months	n=190; 2 events (1.1%)	n=185; 3 events (1.6%)	P = 0.976 Chi-square test	No serious concerns
Hendriksen 1984[46]	mfar	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	6 months	n=285; 14 events (4.9%)	n=287; 14 events (4.9%)		No serious concerns
Jing 2018[25]	exrc & psyc	psyc	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=40; 1 event (2.5%)	n=40; 0 events (0.0%)		No serious concerns
Morgan 2019[51]	exrc	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=32; 1 event (3.1%)	n=17; 0 events (0.0%)		No serious concerns
Ploeg 2010[63]	educ & mfar(w/med)	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=361; 5 events (1.4%)	n=358; 4 events (1.1%)		No serious concerns
Rooijackers 2021[41]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=133; 11 events (8.3%)	n=130; 7 events (5.4%)		No serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	6 months	n=1209; 25 events (2.1%)	n=1074; 23 events (2.1%)		No serious concerns
Szanton 2011[91]	ADL&aids&educ&exrc&mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	24 weeks	n=23; 1 event (4.3%)	n=16; 0 events (0.0%)		No serious concerns
Tuntland 2015[89]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	9 months	n=29; 4 events (13.8%)	n=29; 3 events (10.3%)		No serious concerns
van Rossum 1993[57]	mfar	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	6 months	n=292; 6 events (2.1%)	n=288; 8 events (2.8%)		No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Whitehead 2016[8]	hmcr & ADL & aids & mfa-	hmcr & mfa-	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	8 months	n=15; 5 events (33.3%)	n=13; 1 event (7.7%)		No serious concerns
Clark 2012[88]	eng & educ	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=219; 3 events (1.4%)	n=209; 4 events (1.9%)		Serious concerns
Counsell 2007[13]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Deaths (pre-specified outcome, method of ascertainment unspecified)	6 months	n=457; 5 events (1.1%)	n=437; 8 events (1.8%)		Serious concerns
de Craen 2006[29]	mfa-	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=180; 5 events (2.8%)	n=179; 3 events (1.7%)		Serious concerns
Fernandez-Barres 2017[80]	hmcr & ntr	hmcr	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=97; 11 events (11.3%)	n=66; 4 events (6.1%)		Serious concerns
Imhof 2012[48]	mfar	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=220; 7 events (3.2%)	n=226; 5 events (2.2%)		Serious concerns
King 2012[47]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	7 months	n=85; 3 events (3.5%)	n=84; 2 events (2.4%)		Serious concerns
Kukkonen-Harjula 2017[56]	ADL & ntr & exrc	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=147; 4 events (2.7%)	n=145; 4 events (2.8%)		Serious concerns
Melis 2008[31]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Deaths (pre-specified outcome, method of ascertainment unspecified)	6 months	n=84; 5 events (6.0%)	n=61; 4 events (6.6%)		Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=189; 4 events (2.1%)	n=152; 2 events (1.3%)		Serious concerns
Ng 2015[52]	cgn & ntr & exrc	ac	Deaths (pre-specified outcome, method of ascertainment unspecified)	6 months	n=49; 0 events (0.0%)	n=48; 0 events (0.0%)		Serious concerns
Parsons J 2012[90]	hmcr & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=108; 0 events (0.0%)	n=97; 4 events (4.1%)		Serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=152; 9 events (5.9%)	n=161; 13 events (8.1%)		Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Deaths (from routine data)	6 months	n=50; 6 events (12.0%)	n=51; 12 events (23.5%)		Serious concerns
Stewart 2005[16]	mfa- (Social Worker-led assessment arm)	mfa- (Occupational Therapist-led assessment arm)	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	8 months	n=151; 19 events (12.6%)	n=151; 17 events (11.3%)		Serious concerns
Takahashi 2012[65]	mntr-mfa-	ac	Deaths (pre-specified outcome, method of ascertainment unspecified)	6 months	n=91; 4 events (4.4%)	n=95; 1 event (1.1%)		Serious concerns
van der Pols-Vijlbrief 2017[17]	hmcr & ntr & mfar	hmcr	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=74; 4 events (5.4%)	n=72; 3 events (4.2%)		Serious concerns
Liddle 1996[18]	aids & mfar	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=52; 1 event (1.9%)	n=53; 2 events (3.8%)		Very serious concerns
Wong 2019[54]	mfar(w/slfm)	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	6 months	n=248; 2 events (0.8%)	n=251; 5 events (2.0%)		Very serious concerns

Table 34. Mortality: long-term results

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Carpenter 1990[73]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	3 years	n=261; 66 events (25.3%)	n=254; 54 events (21.3%)		No serious concerns
Fischer 2009[2]	eng & mfa- (w/slfm)	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	43 months	n=1281; 134 events (10.5%)	n=2886; 331 events (11.5%)	P = 0.340 Chi-square test	No serious concerns
Ford 1971[74]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	24 months	n=150; 48 events (32.0%)	n=150; 39 events (26.0%)		No serious concerns
Gitlin 2006[21]	ADL & aids & exrc	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	24 months	n=160; 9 events (5.6%)	n=159; 21 events (13.2%)	P = 0.016 Log-rank test	No serious concerns
Hall 1992[3]	hmcr & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfar	Deaths (from routine data)	24 months	n=81; 10 events (12.3%)	n=86; 14 events (16.3%)		No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Hendriksen 1984[46]	mfar	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	24 months	n=285; 42 events (14.7%)	n=287; 49 events (17.1%)		No serious concerns
Kono 2012[4]	mfar (Preventive home visit arm)	mfar (Control arm)	Deaths (pre-specified outcome, method of ascertainment unspecified)	24 months	n=155; 11 events (7.1%)	n=156; 20 events (12.8%)		No serious concerns
Kukkonen-Harjula 2017[56]	ADL & ntr & exrc	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	24 months	n=150; 18 events (12.0%)	n=149; 19 events (12.8%)		No serious concerns
Liimatta 2019[71]	exrc & mfa-(w/med)	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	24 months	n=211; 5 events (2.4%)	n=211; 8 events (3.8%)	HR: 2.4 (95% CI 0.7 to 9.1); P = 0.19	No serious concerns
Pathy 1992[76]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	3 years	n=340; 67 events (19.7%)	n=338; 86 events (25.4%)	difference 6.0% [95%CI 0.1-11.9%], p=0.05	No serious concerns
Profener 2016[102]	educ & mfar	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	2 years	n=174; 14 events (8.0%)	n=379; 31 events (8.2%)	P = 0.003 Chi-square test	No serious concerns
Rubenstein 2007[64]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	24 months	n=380; 49 events (12.9%)	n=412; 51 events (12.4%)		No serious concerns
Stuck 1995[42]	educ & mfar(w/med)	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	36 months	n=215; 24 events (11.2%)	n=199; 26 events (13.1%)	OR: 0.8 (95% CI 0.5 to 1.5); P = 0.8	No serious concerns
Stuck 2000[83]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Deaths (pre-specified outcome, method of ascertainment unspecified)	3 years	n=264; 47 events (17.8%)	n=527; 67 events (12.7%)	OR: 1.4 (95% CI 0.9 to 2.2)	No serious concerns
Suijker 2016[33]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	24 months	n=1209; 82 events (6.8%)	n=1074; 97 events (9.0%)	P = 0.36 Log rank test	No serious concerns
van Rossum 1993[57]	mfar	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	24 months	n=292; 33 events (11.3%)	n=288; 32 events (11.1%)		No serious concerns
Vass 2005[72]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Deaths (from routine data)	2 years	n=2104; 189 events (9.0%)	n=1956; 167 events (8.5%)		No serious concerns
Vetter 1984[104]	mfar	ac	Deaths (pre-specified outcome, method of ascertainment unspecified)	2 years	n=577; 80 events (13.9%)	n=571; 105 events (18.4%)		No serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
von Bonsdorff 2008[12]	exrc	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	2 years	n=318; 8 events (2.5%)	n=313; 8 events (2.6%)		No serious concerns
Bouman 2008[69]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	24 months	n=144; 29 events (20.1%)	n=167; 23 events (13.8%)		Serious concerns
Coleman 1999[70]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	24 months	n=91; 15 events (16.5%)	n=71; 12 events (16.9%)		Serious concerns
Counsell 2007[13]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Deaths (pre-specified outcome, method of ascertainment unspecified)	24 months	n=419; 38 events (9.1%)	n=404; 37 events (9.2%)	P = 0.64 Chi-square test	Serious concerns
de Craen 2006[29]	mfa-	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	24 months	n=143; 28 events (19.6%)	n=178; 24 events (13.5%)		Serious concerns
Fischer 2009[2]	eng & mfa-(w/slfm)	ac	Survival time / Time to death	43 months			HR: 0.91 (95% CI 0.744 to 1.112); P = 0.355	Serious concerns
Gustafsson 2013[105]	educ & mfa-	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	2 years	n=161; 12 events (7.5%)	n=96; 6 events (6.3%)		Serious concerns
Gustafsson 2013[105]	educ	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	2 years	n=161; 10 events (6.2%)	n=96; 6 events (6.3%)		Serious concerns
Hay 1998[40]	mfa-	ac (Control arm 1)	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	24 months	n=126; 5 events (4.0%)	n=139; 11 events (7.9%)		Serious concerns
Hay 1998[40]	mfa-	ac (Control arm 2)	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	24 months	n=126; 5 events (4.0%)	n=118; 11 events (9.3%)		Serious concerns
Howel 2019[87]	wlfr	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	24 months	n=336; 18 events (5.4%)	n=349; 18 events (5.2%)	OR: 1.11 (95% CI 0.5 to 2.3)	Serious concerns
Jitapunkul 1998[75]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Deaths (pre-specified outcome, method of ascertainment unspecified)	3 years	n=70; 13 events (18.6%)	n=72; 13 events (18.1%)		Serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Kerse 2014[9]	rsk-mfa-	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	3 years	n=1853; 162 events (8.7%)	n=1674; 162 events (9.7%)		Serious concerns
Kono 2016[11]	mfar(w/med)	mfar	Deaths (pre-specified outcome, method of ascertainment unspecified)	24 months	n=173; 15 events (8.7%)	n=175; 7 events (4.0%)		Serious concerns
Metzelthin 2013[32]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	24 months	n=164; 15 events (9.1%)	n=144; 10 events (6.9%)		Serious concerns
Moll van Charante 2016[43]	educ & mfar(w/slfm)	ac	Survival time / Time to death	4 years	n=1792	n=1482	HR: 0.86 (95% CI 0.65 to 1.13); P = 0.272	Serious concerns
Moll van Charante 2016[43]	educ & mfar(w/slfm)	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	4 years	n=1792; 98 events (5.5%)	n=1482; 101 events (6.8%)	P = 0.123 Fisher's exact test	Serious concerns
Phelan 2007[79]	mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	24 months	n=130; 11 events (8.5%)	n=169; 12 events (7.1%)		Serious concerns
Stuck 2015[106]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	2 years	n=874; 35 events (4.0%)	n=1410; 74 events (5.2%)		Serious concerns
Tulloch 1979[77]	mfar(w/med)	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	24 months	n=148; 34 events (23.0%)	n=151; 42 events (27.8%)		Serious concerns
Balaban 1988[78]	mfa-(w/med)	ac	Deaths (from routine data)	2 years	n=102; 31 events (30.4%)	n=94; 20 events (21.3%)	P = 0.20 Chi-square test	Very serious concerns
Lewin 2013[68]	hmcr & educ & mfar	hmcr	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	24 months	n=375; 117 events (31.2%)	n=375; 139 events (37.1%)	P = 0.113	Very serious concerns
Meng 2005[14]	educ & mfar(w/med+slfm)	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	22 months	n=309; 75 events (24.3%)	n=335; 74 events (22.1%)		Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2017[5]	hmcr & ADL & mfar(w/slfm)	hmcr & mfa-	Deaths (from routine data)	24 months	13 events	16 events	HR: 0.72 (95% CI 0.34 to 1.51); P = 0.3789	Very serious concerns
Parsons M 2012[6]	hmcr & mfar	hmcr & mfa-	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	24 months	n=86; 27 events (31.4%)	n=79; 37 events (46.8%)	HR: 0.9 (95% CI 0.54 to 1.5); P = 0.6754	Very serious concerns

Study	Intervention 1	Intervention 2	Outcome measure	Timepoint	Group 1 result	Group 2 result	Comparison	RoB assessment
Tomita 2007[107]	aids	ac	Deaths (reported as loss to follow-up)	24 months	n=44; 6 events (13.6%)	n=66; 6 events (9.1%)		Very serious concerns

References

1. Rockwood K, Stadnyk K, Carver D, MacPherson KM, Beanlands HE, Powell C*, et al.* A clinimetric evaluation of specialized geriatric care for rural dwelling, frail older people. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2000;**48**:1080-5. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2000.tb04783.x

2. Fischer G, Sandholzer H, Perschke-Hartmann C. *Final report of the scientific support of "Getting Healthy Elderly (GÄW)". A prevention project of the AOK Lower Saxony.)[German] (Abschlussbericht der wissenschaftlichen Begleitung von "Gesund Älter Werden (GÄW)")*. unpublished: AOK Niedersachsen; 2009.

3. Hall N, De Beck P, Johnson D, Mackinnon K, Gutman G, Glick N. Randomized trial of a health promotion program for frail elders. *Can J Aging* 1992;**11**:72-91.

4. Kono A, Kanaya Y, Fujita T, Tsumura C, Kondo T, Kushiyama K*, et al.* Effects of a preventive home visit program in ambulatory frail older people: a randomized controlled trial. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2012;**67**:302-9. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glr176

5. Parsons M, Senior H, Kerse N, Chen MH, Jacobs S, Anderson C. Randomised trial of restorative home care for frail older people in New Zealand. *Nurs Older People* 2017;**29**:27-33. https://doi.org/10.7748/nop.2017.e897

6. Parsons M, Senior H, Kerse N, Chen MH, Jacobs S, Vanderhoorn S*, et al.* Should care managers for older adults be located in primary care? A randomized controlled trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2012;**60**:86-92. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03763.x

7. Gill TM, Baker DI, Gottschalk M, Peduzzi PN, Allore H, Byers A. A program to prevent functional decline in physically frail, elderly persons who live at home. *N Engl J Med* 2002;**347**:1068-74. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa020423

8. Whitehead PJ, Walker MF, Parry RH, Latif Z, McGeorge ID, Drummond AE. Occupational Therapy in HomEcare Re-ablement Services (OTHERS): results of a feasibility randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open* 2016;**6**:e011868. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011868

9. Kerse N, McLean C, Moyes SA, Peri K, Ng T, Wilkinson-Meyers L*, et al.* The cluster-randomized BRIGHT trial: Proactive case finding for community-dwelling older adults. *Ann Fam Med* 2014;**12**:514-24. https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.1696

10. Hogg W, Lemelin J, Dahrouge S, Liddy C, Armstrong CD, Legault F*, et al.* Randomized controlled trial of anticipatory and preventive multidisciplinary team care: for complex patients in a community-based primary care setting. *Can Fam Physician* 2009;**55**:e76-85.

11. Kono A, Izumi K, Yoshiyuki N, Kanaya Y, Rubenstein LZ. Effects of an updated preventive home visit program based on a systematic structured assessment of care needs for ambulatory frail older adults in Japan: A randomized controlled trial. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2016;**71**:1631-7. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glw068

12. von Bonsdorff MB, Leinonen R, Kujala UM, Heikkinen E, Törmäkangas T, Hirvensalo M*, et al.* Effect of physical activity counseling on disability in older people: A 2-year randomized controlled trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2008;**56**:2188-94. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2008.02000.x

13. Counsell SR, Callahan CM, Clark DO, Tu W, Buttar AB, Stump TE*, et al.* Geriatric care management for low-income seniors: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2007;**298**:2623-33. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.298.22.2623

14. Meng H, Friedman B, Wamsley BR, Mukamel D, Eggert GM. Effect of a consumer-directed voucher and a disease-management-health-promotion nurse intervention on home care use. *Gerontologist* 2005;**45**:167-76. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/45.2.167

15. Challis D, Clarkson P, Williamson J, Hughes J, Venables D, Burns A*, et al.* The value of specialist clinical assessment of older people prior to entry to care homes. *Age Ageing* 2004;**33**:25-34. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afh007

16. Stewart S, Harvey I, Poland F, Lloyd-Smith W, Mugford M, Flood C. Are occupational therapists more effective than social workers when assessing frail older people? Results of CAMELOT, a randomised controlled trial. *Age Ageing* 2005;**34**:41-6. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afh230

17. van der Pols-Vijlbrief R, Wijnhoven HAH, Bosmans JE, Twisk JWR, Visser M. Targeting the underlying causes of undernutrition. Cost-effectiveness of a multifactorial personalized intervention in community-dwelling older adults: A randomized controlled trial. *Clin Nutr* 2017;**36**:1498-508. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2016.09.030

18. Liddle J, March L, Carfrae B, Finnegan T, Druce J, Schwarz J*, et al.* Can occupational therapy intervention play a part in maintaining independence and quality of life in older people? A randomised controlled trial. *Aust N Z J Public Health* 1996;**20**:574-8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-842x.1996.tb01068.x

19. Borrows A, Holland R. Independent living centre occupational therapy (OT) versus routine community OT. *Int J Ther Rehabil* 2013;**20**:187-94. https://doi.org/10.12968/ijtr.2013.20.4.187

20. Leveille SG, Wagner EH, Davis C, Grothaus L, Wallace J, LoGerfo M*, et al.* Preventing disability and managing chronic illness in frail older adults: a randomized trial of a community-based partnership with primary care. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1998;**46**:1191-8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.1998.tb04533.x

21. Gitlin LN, Winter L, Dennis MP, Corcoran M, Schinfeld S, Hauck WW. A randomized trial of a multicomponent home intervention to reduce functional difficulties in older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2006;**54**:809-16. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2006.00703.x

22. Wolter A, Stolle C, Roth G, Rothgang H. Does the resident care assessment instrument improve long-term home care? - results of a nation-wide study in Germany. [German]. *Gesundheitswesen* 2013;**75**:29-32. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0032-1309013

23. Bleijenberg N, Drubbel I, Schuurmans MJ, Dam HT, Zuithoff NP, Numans ME*, et al.* Effectiveness of a proactive primary care program on preserving daily functioning of older people: a cluster randomized controlled trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2016;**64**:1779-88. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.14325

24. Dupuy L, Froger C, Consel C, Sauzeon H. Everyday functioning benefits from an assisted living platform amongst frail older adults and their caregivers. *Front Aging Neurosci* 2017;**9**:302. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2017.00302

25. Jing L, Jin Y, Zhang X, Wang F, Song Y, Xing F. The effect of Baduanjin qigong combined with CBT on physical fitness and psychological health of elderly housebound. *Medicine* 2018;**97**:e13654. https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000013654

26. Alegria M, Frontera W, Cruz-Gonzalez M, Markle SL, Trinh-Shevrin C, Wang Y*, et al.* Effectiveness of a Disability Preventive Intervention for Minority and Immigrant Elders: The Positive Minds-Strong Bodies Randomized Clinical Trial. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2019;**27**:1299-313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jagp.2019.08.008

27. Morey MC, Peterson MJ, Pieper CF, Sloane R, Crowley GM, Cowper PA*, et al.* The Veterans Learning to Improve Fitness and Function in Elders Study: a randomized trial of primary care–based physical activity counseling for older men. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2009;**57**:1166-74. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2009.02301.x

28. Cutchin MP, Coppola S, Talley V, Svihula J, Catellier D, Shank KH. Feasibility and effects of preventive home visits for at-risk older people: design of a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Geriatr* 2009;**9**:54. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2318-9-54

29. de Craen AJ, Gussekloo J, Blauw GJ, Willems CG, Westendorp RG. Randomised controlled trial of unsolicited occupational therapy in community-dwelling elderly people: the LOTIS trial. *PLoS Clin Trials* 2006;**1**:e2. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pctr.0010002

30. Gustafson DH, Kornfield R, Mares M-L, Johnston DC, Cody OJ, Yang EF*, et al.* Effect of an eHealth intervention on older adults' quality of life and health-related outcomes: a randomized clinical trial. *J Gen Intern Med* 2021;**37**:521-30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-021-06888-1

31. Melis RJ, van Eijken MI, Teerenstra S, van Achterberg T, Parker SG, Borm GF*, et al.* A randomized study of a multidisciplinary program to intervene on geriatric syndromes in vulnerable older people who live at home (Dutch EASYcare Study). *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2008;**63**:283-90. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/63.3.283

32. Metzelthin SF, Van Rossum E, De Witte LP, Ambergen AW, Hobma SO, Sipers W*, et al.* Effectiveness of interdisciplinary primary care approach to reduce disability in community dwelling frail older people: Cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2013;**347**:f5264. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.f5264

33. Suijker JJ, van Rijn M, Buurman BM, Ter Riet G, Moll van Charante EP, de Rooij SE. Effects of nurse-led multifactorial care to prevent disability in community-living older people: Cluster randomized trial. *PLoS One* 2016;**11**:e0158714. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158714

34. Hebert R, Robichaud L, Roy PM, Bravo G, Voyer L. Efficacy of a nurse-led multidimensional preventive programme for older people at risk of functional decline. A randomized controlled trial. *Age Ageing* 2001;**30**:147-53. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/30.2.147

35. Williams EI, Greenwell J, Groom LM. The care of people over 75 years old after discharge from hospital: an evaluation of timetabled visiting by Health Visitor Assistants. *J Public Health Med* 1992;**14**:138-44. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.pubmed.a042711

36. Dorresteijn TA, Zijlstra GA, Ambergen AW, Delbaere K, Vlaeyen JW, Kempen GI. Effectiveness of a home-based cognitive behavioral program to manage concerns about falls in community-dwelling, frail older people: results of a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Geriatr* 2016;**16**:2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-015-0177-y

37. Siemonsma PC, Blom JW, Hofstetter H, van Hespen ATH, Gussekloo J, Drewes YM*, et al.* The effectiveness of functional task exercise and physical therapy as prevention of functional decline in community dwelling older people with complex health problems. *BMC Geriatr* 2018;**18**:164. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-018-0859-3

38. van Hout HP, Jansen AP, van Marwijk HW, Pronk M, Frijters DF, Nijpels G. Prevention of adverse health trajectories in a vulnerable elderly population through nurse home visits: a randomized controlled trial [ISRCTN05358495]. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2010;**65**:734-42. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glq037

39. Blom J, den Elzen W, van Houwelingen AH, Heijmans M, Stijnen T, Van den Hout W*, et al.* Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of a proactive, goal-oriented, integrated care model in general practice for older people. A cluster randomised controlled trial: Integrated Systematic Care for older People--the ISCOPE study. *Age Ageing* 2016;**45**:30-41. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afv174

40. Hay WI, van Ineveld C, Browne G, Roberts J, Bell B, Mills M*, et al.* Prospective care of elderly patients in family practice. Is screening effective? *Can Fam Physician* 1998;**44**:2677-87.

41. Rooijackers TH, Kempen GIJM, Zijlstra GAR, van Rossum E, Koster A, Lima Passos V*, et al.* Effectiveness of a reablement training program for homecare staff on older adults' sedentary behavior: A cluster randomized controlled trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2021;**69**:2566-78. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.17286

42. Stuck AE, Aronow HU, Steiner A, Alessi CA, Bula CJ, Gold MN*, et al.* A trial of annual in-home comprehensive geriatric assessments for elderly people living in the community. *N Engl J Med* 1995;**333**:1184-9. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199511023331805

43. Moll van Charante EP, Richard E, Eurelings LS, van Dalen JW, Ligthart SA, van Bussel EF*, et al.* Effectiveness of a 6-year multidomain vascular care intervention to prevent dementia (preDIVA): a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2016;**388**:797-805. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30950-3

44. Auvinen K, Voutilainen A, Jyrkkä J, Lönnroos E, Mäntyselkä P. Interprofessional medication assessment among home care patients: any impact on functioning? Results from a randomised controlled trial. *BMC Geriatr* 2020;**20**:390-. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-020-01796-1

45. Hattori S, Yoshida T, Okumura Y, Kondo K. Effects of reablement on the independence of community-dwelling older adults with mild disability: A randomized controlled trial. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019;**16**. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16203954

46. Hendriksen C, Lund E, Stromgard E. Consequences of assessment and intervention among elderly people: a three year randomised controlled trial. *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed)* 1984;**289**:1522-4. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.289.6457.1522

47. King AII, Parsons M, Robinson E, Jorgensen D. Assessing the impact of a restorative home care service in New Zealand: A cluster randomised controlled trial. *Health Soc Care Community* 2012;**20**:365-74. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2524.2011.01039.x

48. Imhof L, Naef R, Wallhagen MI, Schwarz J, Mahrer-Imhof R. Effects of an advanced practice nurse in-home health consultation program for community-dwelling persons aged 80 and older. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2012;**60**:2223-31. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.12026

49. Leung AC-t, Liu C-p, Chow NW-s, Chi I. Cost-Benefit Analysis of a Case Management Project for the Community-Dwelling Frail Elderly in Hong Kong. *J Appl Gerontol* 2004;**23**:70-85. https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464804263088

50. Mann J, Thompson F, McDermott R, Esterman A, Strivens E. Impact of an integrated community-based model of care for older people with complex conditions on hospital emergency presentations and admissions: a step-wedged cluster randomized trial. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2021;**21**:701. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-06668-x

51. Morgan GS, Haase AM, Campbell RM, Ben-Shlomo Y. A pilot randomised controlled trial of physical activity facilitation for older adults: feasibility study findings. *Pilot Feasibility Stud* 2019;**5**:40. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40814-019-0414-9

52. Ng TP, Feng L, Nyunt MS, Feng L, Niti M, Tan BY*, et al.* Nutritional, physical, cognitive, and combination interventions and frailty reversal among older adults: A randomized controlled trial. *Am J Med* 2015;**128**:1225-36.e1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2015.06.017

53. van Dongen EJ, Haveman-Nies A, Doets EL, Dorhout BG, de Groot LC. Effectiveness of a diet and resistance exercise intervention on muscle health in older adults: ProMuscle in Practice. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2020;**21**:1065-72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2019.11.026

54. Wong AKC, Wong FKY, Chang K. Effectiveness of a community-based self-care promoting program for community-dwelling older adults: A randomized controlled trial. *Age Ageing* 2019;**48**:852-8. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afz095

55. Cameron ID, Fairhall N, Langron C, Lockwood K, Monaghan N, Aggar C*, et al.* A multifactorial interdisciplinary intervention reduces frailty in older people: randomized trial. *BMC Med* 2013;**11**:65. https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-11-65

56. Kukkonen-Harjula K, Karmeniemi P, Suikkanen S, Kaaria S, Sipila S, Pitkala K*, et al.* Long-term home-based physiotherapy for older people with signs of frailty-RCT (NCT02305433) [P-229]. *Eur Geriatr Med* 2017;**8**:S105. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1878-7649(17)30179-1

57. van Rossum E, Frederiks CM, Philipsen H, Portengen K, Wiskerke J, Knipschild P. Effects of preventive home visits to elderly people. *BMJ* 1993;**307**:27-32. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.307.6895.27

58. Mann WC, Ottenbacher KJ, Fraas L, Tomita M, Granger CV. Effectiveness of assistive technology and environmental interventions in maintaining independence and reducing home care costs for the frail elderly. A randomized controlled trial. *Arch Fam Med* 1999;**8**:210-7. https://doi.org/10.1001/archfami.8.3.210

59. Fristedt S, Nystedt P, Skogar O. Mobile geriatric teams - a cost-effective way of improving patient safety and reducing traditional healthcare utilization among the frail elderly? A randomized controlled trial. *Clin Interv Aging* 2019;**14**:1911-24. https://doi.org/10.2147/CIA.S208388

60. Bernabei R, Landi F, Gambassi G, Sgadari A, Zuccala G, Mor V*, et al.* Randomised trial of impact of model of integrated care and case management for older people living in the community. *BMJ* 1998;**316**:1348-51. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.316.7141.1348

61. Fabacher D, Josephson K, Pietruszka F, Linderborn K, Morley JE, Rubenstein LZ. An in-home preventive assessment program for independent older adults: a randomized controlled trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1994;**42**:630-8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.1994.tb06862.x

62. Dalby DM, Sellors JW, Fraser FD, Fraser C, van Ineveld C, Howard M. Effect of preventive home visits by a nurse on the outcomes of frail elderly people in the community: a randomized controlled trial. *CMAJ* 2000;**162**:497-500.

63. Ploeg J, Brazil K, Hutchison B, Kaczorowski J, Dalby DM, Goldsmith CH*, et al.* Effect of preventive primary care outreach on health related quality of life among older adults at risk of functional decline: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2010;**340**:c1480. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.c1480

64. Rubenstein LZ, Alessi CA, Josephson KR, Trinidad Hoyl M, Harker JO, Pietruszka FM. A randomized trial of a screening, case finding, and referral system for older veterans in primary care. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007;**55**:166-74. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2007.01044.x

65. Takahashi PY, Pecina JL, Upatising B, Chaudhry R, Shah ND, Van Houten H*, et al.* A randomized controlled trial of telemonitoring in older adults with multiple health issues to prevent hospitalizations and emergency department visits. *Arch Intern Med* 2012;**172**:773-9. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2012.256

66. Teut M, Schnabel K, Baur R, Kerckhoff A, Reese F, Pilgram N*, et al.* Effects and feasibility of an Integrative Medicine program for geriatric patients-a cluster-randomized pilot study. *Clin Interv Aging* 2013;**8**:953-61. https://doi.org/10.2147/CIA.S45242

67. Henderson MJ. *In-home preventive health assessment and telephone case management for over 75s living alone in independent living units: A cluster randomized controlled trial* [PhD thesis]. Queensland: Queensland University of Technology; 2005.

68. Lewin G, De San Miguel K, Knuiman M, Alan J, Boldy D, Hendrie D*, et al.* A randomised controlled trial of the Home Independence Program, an Australian restorative home-care programme for older adults. *Health Soc Care Community* 2013;**21**:69-78. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2524.2012.01088.x

69. Bouman A, van Rossum E, Ambergen T, Kempen G, Knipschild P. Effects of a home visiting program for older people with poor health status: a randomized, clinical trial in The Netherlands. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2008;**56**:397-404. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2007.01565.x

70. Coleman EA, Grothaus LC, Sandhu N, Wagner EH. Chronic Care Clinics: A randomized controlled trial of a model of primary care for frail older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1999;**47**:775-83. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.1999.tb03832.x

71. Liimatta H, Lampela P, Laitinen-Parkkonen P, Pitkala KH. Effects of preventive home visits on health-related quality-of-life and mortality in home-dwelling older adults. *Scand J Prim Health Care* 2019;**37**:90-7. https://doi.org/10.1080/02813432.2019.1569372

72. Vass M, Avlund K, Lauridsen J, Hendriksen C. Feasible model for prevention of functional decline in older people: municipality-randomized, controlled trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2005;**53**:563-8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53201.x

73. Carpenter GI, Demopoulos GR. Screening the elderly in the community: controlled trial of dependency surveillance using a questionnaire administered by volunteers. *BMJ* 1990;**300**:1253-6. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.300.6734.1253

74. Ford AB, Katz S, Downs TD, Adams M. Results of long-term home nursing: the influence of disability. *J Chronic Dis* 1971;**24**:591-6. https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9681(71)90047-6

75. Jitapunkul S. A randomised controlled trial of regular surveillance in Thai elderly using a simple questionnaire administered by non-professional personnel. *J Med Assoc Thai* 1998;**81**:352-6.

76. Pathy MS, Bayer A, Harding K, Dibble A. Randomised trial of case finding and surveillance of elderly people at home. *Lancet* 1992;**340**:890-3. https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736(92)93294-W

77. Tulloch AJ, Moore V. A randomized controlled trial of geriatric screening and surveillance in general practice. *J R Coll Gen Pract* 1979;**29**:733-40.

78. Balaban DJ, Goldfarb NI, Perkel RL, Carlson BL. Follow-up study of an urban family medicine home visit program. *J Fam Pract* 1988;**26**:307-12.

79. Phelan EA, Balderson B, Levine M, Erro JH, Jordan L, Grothaus L, *et al.* Delivering effective primary care to older adults: a randomized, controlled trial of the senior resource team at group health cooperative. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007;**55**:1748-56. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2007.01416.x

80. Fernandez-Barres S, Garcia-Barco M, Basora J, Martinez T, Pedret R, Arija V, *et al.* The efficacy of a nutrition education intervention to prevent risk of malnutrition for dependent elderly patients receiving Home Care: A randomized controlled trial. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2017;**70**:131-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2017.02.020

81. Brettschneider C, Luck T, Fleischer S, Roling G, Beutner K, Luppa M, *et al.* Cost-utility analysis of a preventive home visit program for older adults in Germany. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2015;**15**:141. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-0817-0

82. van Lieshout MRJ, Bleijenberg N, Schuurmans MJ, de Wit NJ. The effectiveness of a PRoactive multicomponent intervention program on disability in independently living older people: A randomized controlled trial. *J Nutr Health Aging* 2018;**22**:1051-9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12603-018-1101-x

83. Stuck AE, Minder CE, Peter-Wuest I, Gillmann G, Egli C, Kesselring A, *et al.* A randomized trial of in-home visits for disability prevention in community-dwelling older people at low and high risk for nursing home admission. *Arch Intern Med* 2000;**160**:977-86. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.160.7.977

84. Monteserin Nadal R, Altimir Losada S, Brotons Cuixart C, Padros Selma J, Santaeugenia Gonzalez S, Moral Pelaez I, *et al.* Randomized clinical trial on the efficacy of global geriatric assessment in primary care. [Spanish]. *Rev Esp Geriatr Gerontol* 2008;**43**:5-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0211-139x(08)71144-2

85. Newbury JW, Marley JE, Beilby JJ. A randomised controlled trial of the outcome of health assessment of people aged 75 years and over. *Med J Aust* 2001;**175**:104-7. https://doi.org/10.5694/j.1326-5377.2001.tb143541.x

86. Thomas R, Worrall G, Elgar F, Knight J. Can they keep going on their own? A four-year randomized trial of functional assessments of community residents. *Can J Aging* 2007;**26**:379-90. https://doi.org/10.3138/cja.26.4.379

87. Howel D, Moffatt S, Haighton C, Bryant A, Becker F, Steer M*, et al.* Does domiciliary welfare rights advice improve health-related quality of life in independent-living, socio-economically disadvantaged people aged >=60 years? Randomised controlled trial, economic and process evaluations in the North East of England. *PLoS One* 2019;**14**:e0209560. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0209560

88. Clark F, Jackson J, Carlson M, Chou C-P, Cherry BJ, Jordan-Marsh M*, et al.* Effectiveness of a lifestyle intervention in promoting the well-being of independently living older people: results of the Well Elderly 2 Randomised Controlled Trial. [Erratum in: J Epidemiol Community Health 2012;66:1079-82]. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2012;**66**:782-90. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2009.099754

89. Tuntland H, Aaslund MK, Espehaug B, Førland O, Kjeken I. Reablement in community-dwelling older adults: a randomised controlled trial. *BMC Geriatr* 2015;**15**:1-11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-015-0142-9

90. Parsons J, Rouse P, Robinson EM, Sheridan N, Connolly MJ. Goal setting as a feature of homecare services for older people: does it make a difference? *Age Ageing* 2012;**41**:24-9. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afr118

91. Szanton SL, Thorpe RJ, Boyd C, Tanner EK, Leff B, Agree E*, et al.* Community aging in place, advancing better living for elders: a bio-behavioral-environmental intervention to improve function and health-related quality of life in disabled older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2011;**59**:2314-20. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03698.x

92. Walters K, Frost R, Kharicha K, Avgerinou C, Gardner B, Ricciardi F*, et al.* Home-based health promotion for older people with mild frailty: the HomeHealth intervention development and feasibility RCT. *Health Technol Assess* 2017;**21**:1-128. https://doi.org/10.3310/hta21730

93. Newcomer R, Maravilla V, Faculjak P, Graves MT. Outcomes of preventive case management among high-risk elderly in three medical groups: a randomized clinical trial. *Eval Health Prof* 2004;**27**:323-48. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163278704270011

94. Yamada Y, Ikegami N. Preventive home visits for community- dwelling frail elderly people based on minimum data set-home care: randomized controlled trial. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2003;**3**:236–42. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1444-1586.2003.00103.x

95. Markle-Reid M, Weir R, Browne G, Roberts J, Gafni A, Henderson S. Health promotion for frail older home care clients. *J Adv Nurs* 2006;**54**:381-95. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2006.03817.x

96. Wallace JI, Buchner DM, Grothaus L, Leveille S, Tyll L, LaCroix AZ*, et al.* Implementation and effectiveness of a community-based health promotion program for older adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 1998;**53**:M301-6. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/53a.4.m301

97. Clark F, Azen SP, Zemke R, Jackson J, Carlson M, Mandel D*, et al.* Occupational therapy for independent-living older adults. A randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 1997;**278**:1321-6. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1997.03550160041036

98. Holland SK, Greenberg J, Tidwell L, Malone J, Mullan J, Newcomer R. Community-based health coaching, exercise, and health service utilization. *J Aging Health* 2005;**17**:697-716. https://doi.org/10.1177/0898264305277959

99. Shapiro A, Taylor M. Effects of a community-based early intervention program on the subjective well-being, institutionalization, and mortality of low-income elders. *Gerontologist* 2002;**42**:334-41. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/42.3.334

100. Sherman H, Soderhielm-Blid S, Forsberg C, Karp A, Tornkvist L. Effects of preventive home visits by district nurses on self-reported health of 75-year-olds. *Prim Health Care Res Dev* 2016;**17**:56-71. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1463423614000565

101. Serra-Prat M, Sist X, Domenich R, Jurado L, Saiz A, Roces A*, et al.* Effectiveness of an intervention to prevent frailty in pre-frail community-dwelling older people consulting in primary care: a randomised controlled trial. *Age Ageing* 2017;**46**:401-7. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afw242

102. Profener F, Anders J, Dapp U, Minder CE, Golgert S, von Renteln-Kruse W. Acceptance of preventive home visits among frail elderly persons : Participants an non-participants in a Follow-up after 2 and 4 years within the LUCAS longitudinal study. [German]. *Z Gerontol Geriatr* 2016;**49**:596-605. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00391-016-1127-9

103. Barenfeld E, Dahlin-Ivanoff S, Wallin L, Gustafsson S. Promoting aging migrants' capabilities: A randomized controlled trial concerning activities of daily living and self-rated health. *AIMS Public Health* 2018;**5**:173-88. https://doi.org/10.3934/publichealth.2018.2.173

104. Vetter NJ, Jones DA, Victor CR. Effect of health visitors working with elderly patients in general practice: a randomised controlled trial. *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed)* 1984;**288**:369-72. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.288.6414.369

105. Gustafsson S, Eklund K, Wilhelmson K, Edberg A-K, Johansson B, Kronlöf GH*, et al.* Long-Term Outcome for ADL Following the Health-Promoting RCT—Elderly Persons in the Risk Zone. *Gerontologist* 2013;**53**:654-63. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gns121

106. Stuck AE, Moser A, Morf U, Wirz U, Wyser J, Gillmann G*, et al.* Effect of health risk assessment and counselling on health behaviour and survival in older people: a pragmatic randomised trial. *PLoS Med* 2015;**12**:e1001889. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001889

107. Tomita MR, Mann WC, Stanton K, Tomita AD, Sundar V. Use of currently available smart home technology by frail elders: process and outcomes. *Top Geriatr Rehabil* 2007;**23**. https://doi.org/10.1097/00013614-200701000-00005