Overview IHCA vs Control. Clinical outcomes

Per Egil Kummervold, Norwegian Centre for Telemedicine
Martin Jensen, Norwegian Centre for Telemedicine
Per Hjortdahl, University of Oslo

- Exact numbers in Fig. 05 p 76 of Murray 2004.
- Complete references p26 Murray 2004.

Reference	Bartholomew 2000
Measurement	Functional status
Description	Bartholomew (Table 2, p 275) reports increased functional status. Interpreted correctly.
Conclusion	OK

Reference	Flatley-Brennan 1998
Measurement	Health status
Description	The numbers seems to be from Table 4, p. 501: “Differential decline in health status”. Interpreted correctly.
Conclusion	OK

Reference	Brown 1997
Measurement	HbA1c
Description	Brown (table 1, p 86) reports an increase in HbA1c of 0.86 for intervention group(SD=1.64), and an increase of 0.66 for control group (SD=1.89). This should be reported as a negative effect for intervention group.
Conclusion	Error

Reference	Glascow 2003
Measurement	HbA1c
Description	Glascow (Table 3, p 417) reports a reduction in mean Alc hemoglobin from 7.54 to 7.42 (-0.12) for intervention group (SD=1.68) and an increase for control group (SD=1.56) from 7.35 to 7.68 (+0.33). This equals the numbers reported by Murray. This should however be interpreted as a positive effect in favour of intervention.
Conclusion	Error

Reference	Gustavson 1999
Measurement	Physical function
Description	We have not yet been able to determine how Murray has calculated the change in "physical function", as baseline is not reported in the article. Some of the numbers are reported in Table 1 p 4. Murray probably has more data. There is very little/no difference between the groups, so this is of no significance.
Conclusion	Unconclusive

Reference	Krishna 2003
Measurement	Days with Asthma Symptoms
Description	Krishna (Table 4, p. 507) reports a reduction for intervention group (SD=113.3) in mean days with astma symptoms of -80.6 and a reduction for control group (SD=109.0) of 49.6. This should however be interpreted as a positive health effect for intervention group.
Conclusion	Error

Reference	Lehmann 2003
Measurement	HbA1c
Description	Lehrmann (Table 4A p 14) reports a reduction HbA1c of 0.8 for intervention group, and 0.1 for control group. This should be interpreted as a postivie result for intervention group.
Conclusion	Error

Reference	Ritterband 2003
Measurement	Bowel Accidents per week
Description	Ritterband's abstract is positive in favour of intervention group. In figure 2 it looks like the reduction in “bowel accidents” is largest for intervention group. Unfortunately our copy makes it impossible to read the exact numbers. It is however obvious that this is positive clinical effect in favour of intervention group.
Conclusion	Error

Reference	Turnin 1992
Measurement	HbA1c
Description	Turnin reports a significant reduction in HbA1c for intervention group in abstract. In the text it is reported a reduction in HbA1c level in the intervention group of -0.6, and an increase in mean HbA1c of 0.2 in the control group. This should be interpreted as a positive clinical effect for intervention group.
Conclusion	Error

Reference	Turnin 2001
Measurement	Cholestrol
Description	Turnin reports a reduction in Cholesterol level for intervention group of -0.31, and a reduction for control group of -0.35. This should be interpreted as a negative effect for intervention group.
Conclusion	Error

Reference	Whylie-Rosett 2001
Measurement	BMI
Description	Whylie-Rosett's (Table 2, p 1159) reports mean reduction of BMI for intervention group of 0.8, and reduction for control group of 0.4, This should be reported as a positive effect for intervention group.
Conclusion	Error