Summary of findings: for illustrative purposes, not original

Hip protectors compared to no hip protectors for preventing hip fractures in older people

Patient or population: preventing hip fractures in older people
Settings: institutional/residences
Intervention: hip protectors
Comparison: no hip protectors

Outcomes	Anticipated absolute effects* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	№ of participants (Studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)
	Risk with no hip protectors	**Risk with hip protectors**			
Hip fractures at 1 year assessed with: older people living in the community follow up: range 6-28 months	**Low**		**RR 0.83** (0.54 to 1.29)	1426 (5 RCTs)	⊕⊕◯◯ LOW [2][3]
	20 per 1000 [1]	**17 per 1000 (11 to 26)**			
	High				
	60 per 1000	**50 per 1000 (32 to 77)**			
Pelvic fractures follow up: 6-24 months	**Low**		**RR 1.16** (0.65 to 2.04)	7273 (6 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE [2][4]
	2 per 1000	**2 per 1000 (1 to 4)**			
	High				
	14 per 1000	**16 per 1000 (9 to 29)**			
Falls per person year; rate ratio follow up: 12-24 months	**Moderate**		**Rate Ratio 1.02** (0.9 to 1.16)	11275 (16 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE [2]
	3 per 1000	**3 per 1000 (3 to 3)**			
Quality of Life (scale from 0 to 1, optimal) assessed with: EuroQol -5D (mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, anxiety/ depression) follow up: 6 months	The mean quality of Life (scale from 0 to 1, optimal) in the control group was **0.7 to 0.75**	The mean quality of Life (scale from 0 to 1, optimal) in the intervention group was 0.13 lower (0.23 lower to 0.03 lower)	-	235 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕◯◯ LOW [5][6]
Mortality	**Moderate**		**RR 0.96** (0.84 to 1.1)	1749 (4 RCTs)	⊕⊕◯◯ LOW [2][3]
	120 per 1000	**115 per 1000 (101 to 132)**			
Adherence assessed with: (wearing hip protectors) follow up: range 6-28 months	The proportion of people who adhered to the hip protector intervention ranged from 24% to 80%			9000 (19 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE [7]

***The risk in the intervention group** (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the **relative effect** of the intervention (and its 95% CI).
CI: Confidence interval; **RR:** Risk ratio; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High quality: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect
Moderate quality: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different
Low quality: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect
Very low quality: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

1. Baseline risks reported in large observational studies
2. Unclear or no blinding of participants, investigators and outcome assessors, and loss to follow-up ranging from 0 to 56%.
3. Few events and wide confidence intervals including appreciable benefit and harm (also in absolute effects)
4. Few events, and wide confidence intervals, but absolute effects small in low risk group., therefore not downgraded.
5. Unclear blinding of participants, investigators and assessors, and baseline score was significantly lower in intervention group.
6. Few participants and includes potential for appreciable benefit or little to no effect.
7. Adherence reported with a variety of measures; considerable heterogeneity across studies and imprecise results.