

TABLA DE SÍNTESIS DE LA EVIDENCIA O PERFILES DE EVIDENCIA GRADE

Obtenido de Legg et al, 2017: Terapia ocupacional frente a atención habitual o grupo control en pacientes con ictus (DEM: Pequeño (0,2), Mediano (0,5), Grande (0.8))

Summary of findings for the main comparison. Occupational therapy compared to usual or no care for stroke

Occupational therapy compared to usual or no care for stroke

Patient or population: adults with stroke

Setting: any (with the exception of care- or nursing-home settings). Included studies conducted in: Hong Kong, UK, and USA

Intervention: occupational therapy

Comparison: no intervention or standard care/practice

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Usual or no care	Occupational therapy				
Activities of daily living at end of scheduled follow-up.	The mean activities of daily living score was 80.4 ³	The mean activities of daily living score in the intervention groups was 0.17 standard deviations higher (0.03 to 0.31 higher)		749 (7 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ low 1,2	A standard deviation of 0.17 represents a small difference between groups
Odds of death or a poor outcome at end of scheduled follow-up. Combined odds of death and deterioration, or death and dependence, or death and institutional care	Study population		Peto OR 0.71 (0.52 to 0.96)	771 (5 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ low 1,2	
	440 per 1000	313 per 1000 (229 to 423)				
	Moderate					
Extended Activities of Daily Living at end of scheduled follow-up. Measures of Extended Activities of Daily Living	The mean Extended Activities of Daily Living score was 33.3 ³	The mean Extended Activities of Daily Living score in the intervention groups was 0.22 standard deviations higher (0.07 to 0.37 higher)		665 (5 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ low 1,2	A standard deviation of 0.22 represents a small difference between groups
Mood or distress scores Measures of mood or distress	The mean depression score was 19.8 ³	The mean mood or distress scores in the intervention groups was 0.08 standard deviations higher (-0.09 lower to 0.26 higher)		519 (4 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ low 1,2	A standard deviation of 0.08 represents a small difference between groups

¹ We downgraded the quality of this evidence one level for serious risk of selection, performance and detection biases (the latter only for subjective outcomes)

² We further downgraded by one level for serious imprecision (due to small sample sizes, few events and wide confidence intervals).

³ Data taken from a study (Parker 2001) in the meta-analysis that is representative of the population and intervention and at low risk of bias.