

## Appendix K: Evidence Summary

*Typical antipsychotics - treatment; hospital setting review; typical antipsychotics vs placebo / no treatment*

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Meta-analysis details</b>	<b>Summary Statistics</b>	<b>Comments:</b>	<b>GRADE details:</b>	<b>GRADE Comments</b>	<b>GRADE Evidence Rating</b>
Complete response	1 trial; 101 patients; from RCT	RR=3.95 (95%CI 1.75, 8.9)	Statistically significant improvement of delirium in the haloperidol group on clinical global impression scale at 7 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Good</li> <li>● Directness: Indirect outcome - delirium assessment method</li> <li>● Imprecision: Number of events &lt; 300</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	It is unlikely pts blinded because of nature of the intervention (IM vs control); Clinical global impression scale- indirect method of assessment of delirium; Both groups received somatic treatment aiming at delirium. Large effect	Moderate
Duration of delirium	1 trial; 101 patients; from RCT	MD=-1.78 (95%CI 2.86, -0.7)	Statistically significant shorter duration for the haloperidol group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Poor - some confounding</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Wide CI</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	Reported as 'time to take effect'. Duration of delirium was given for responders so potentially biased	very low
Severity of delirium	1 trial; 101 patients; from RCT	MD=-10.4 (95%CI 13.95, -6.85)	Statistically significant: severity lower in the haloperidol group on the DRS (0-32)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Poor - not blinded</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Number of patients &lt; 400</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	DRS scale 0-32; MID (=20% = 6.4), i.e. CI precise, but fairly small number patients. Patients not blinded. Large effect	Moderate
Adverse event (extrapyramidal)	2 trials; 508 patients; from RCT	RR1	Neither study reported any extrapyramidal events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Good</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Number of events &lt; 300</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	Placebo comparison. Adverse events data from prevention trials. No extrapyramidal effects in either study. Smaller study not blinded.	Low
Adverse events (sedation)	1 trial; 430 patients; from RCT	RR1	No sedation in either group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Good</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Number of events &lt; 300</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	Placebo comparison. Adverse events data from prevention trials. No sedation events reported.	Low

***Atypical antipsychotics - treatment; hospital setting review; Atypical antipsychotics vs placebo / no treatment***

<b><i>Outcome</i></b>	<b><i>Meta-analysis details</i></b>	<b><i>Summary Statistics</i></b>	<b><i>Comments:</i></b>	<b><i>GRADE details:</i></b>	<b><i>GRADE Comments</i></b>	<b><i>GRADE Evidence Rating</i></b>
Complete response	1 trial; 103 patients; from RCT	RR=3.68 (95%CI 1.63, 8.33)	Significant difference in favour of the olanzapine group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Poor - not blinded</li> <li>● Directness: Indirect outcome - delirium assessment method</li> <li>● Imprecision: Number of events &lt; 300</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	Measured on clinical global impression scale (GDG said this was indirect). All patients received "somatic treatment aiming at delirium". Patients not blinded; large effect	Moderate
Duration of delirium	1 trial; 103 patients; from RCT	MD=-2.4 (95%CI 3.51, -1.29)	Statistically significant in favour of the olanzapine group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Poor - some confounding</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Wide CI</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	'Time to take effect' only given for responders only - i.e. likely to be confounded; All patients received somatic treatment aiming at delirium	very low
Severity of delirium	1 trial; 103 patients; from RCT	MD=-11.1 (95%CI 14.51, -7.69)	Statistically significant difference on the DRS (0-32); some uncertainty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Poor - not blinded</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Number of patients &lt; 400</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	All patients received somatic treatment aiming at delirium; precise in terms of GRADE.. Patients not blinded; large effect	Moderate
Adverse events (sedation)	1 trial; 79 patients; from Cohort	Proportion (%)30	High proportion of patients with sedation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: ----</li> <li>● Directness: Indirect patients - minor, comorbidity</li> <li>● Imprecision: ----</li> <li>● Inconsistency: ----</li> <li>● Reporting bias: ---</li> </ul>	Olanzapine; Hospitalised cancer patients; clinical examination for adverse events	Low

***Atypical antipsychotics - treatment; hospital setting review; atypical antipsychotic1 vs atypical antipsychotic2***

<b><i>Outcome</i></b>	<b><i>Meta-analysis details</i></b>	<b><i>Summary Statistics</i></b>	<b><i>Comments:</i></b>	<b><i>GRADE details:</i></b>	<b><i>GRADE Comments</i></b>	<b><i>GRADE Evidence Rating</i></b>
Complete response	1 trial; 31 patients; from RCT		No results for this outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Poor - incomplete follow up</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Number of patients &lt; 400</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	Very small study; 25% missing data in 1 arm. No results given	----
Duration of delirium	1 trial; 31 patients; from RCT	MD=-1.1 (95%CI 4.09, 1.89)	No significant difference between amisulpride and quetiapine groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Poor - incomplete follow up</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Wide CI</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	Lower Conf limit crosses 4x MID	very low
Severity of delirium	1 trial; 31 patients; from RCT	MD=0 (95%CI 1.48, 1.48)	No significant difference on the DRS-R-98(0-39) between amisulpride and quetiapine groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Poor - incomplete follow up</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Number of patients &lt; 400</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	Very small study; 25% missing data in 1 arm	Low

***HT3 inhibitors- treatment; hospital setting review; typical antipsychotics vs placebo***

<b><i>Outcome</i></b>	<b><i>Meta-analysis details</i></b>	<b><i>Summary Statistics</i></b>	<b><i>Comments:</i></b>	<b><i>GRADE details:</i></b>	<b><i>GRADE Comments</i></b>	<b><i>GRADE Evidence Rating</i></b>
Incidence of delirium-sensitivity analysis	1 trial; 430 patients; from RCT	RR=0.91 (95%CI 0.59, 1.42)	No significant difference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Good</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Precise</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	Patients also received proactive geriatric consultation; Use of rescue meds may have led to confounding	High

***Cross review - treatment; hospital setting review; typical antipsychotic vs atypical antipsychotic***

<b><i>Outcome</i></b>	<b><i>Meta-analysis details</i></b>	<b><i>Summary Statistics</i></b>	<b><i>Comments:</i></b>	<b><i>GRADE details:</i></b>	<b><i>GRADE Comments</i></b>	<b><i>GRADE Evidence Rating</i></b>
Complete response	2 trials; 219 patients; from Meta analysis of RCTs	RR=0.99 (95%CI 0.8, 1.21); p=0.24; I2 =27%	No significant difference between haloperidol and olanzapine groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Poor - not blinded</li> <li>● Directness: Indirect outcome - delirium assessment method</li> <li>● Imprecision: Number of events &lt; 300</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	Haloperidol vs olanzapine. One study [32.4% weight] inadeq sequence generation & allocation concealment, funding, and outcome possibly inadequate. Patients unblinded in major study and indirect outcome measure	Low
Duration of delirium	1trial; 146 patients; from RCT	MD=0.62 (95%CI 0.06, 1.18)	Significantly shorter time to take effect for the olanzapine group compared to the haloperidol group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Very Poor</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Number of patients &lt; 400</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	Reported as 'time to take effect' in responders only - likely to be biased	very low
Severity of delirium	1trial; 146 patients; from RCT	MD=0.7 (95%CI 0.45, 1.85)	No significant difference between the haloperidol and the olanzapine groups on the DRS (0-32)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Poor - not blinded</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Number of patients &lt; 400</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	All patients received somatic treatment aiming at delirium; DRS scale 0-32, narrow CI, but fairly small trial. Patients not blinded.	Moderate
Adverse event (extrapyramidal)	1trial; 73 patients; from Quasi RCT	RR=8.2 (95%CI 0.48, 140.09)	No significant difference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Study quality: Very Poor</li> <li>● Directness: Direct</li> <li>● Imprecision: Wide CI</li> <li>● Inconsistency: consistent</li> <li>● Reporting bias: Adequate</li> </ul>	Haloperidol vs olanzapine; quasi randomised design; wide CI. Adverse events carefully recorded; not blinded	very low