

Vedlegg 1: Sikkerhetsundervisning for forebygging av brannskader hos barn

Author(s): AA + VU

Date: 2012-07-13

Question: Should home safety education be used for child thermal injury prevention?

Settings:

Bibliography: Kendrick 2012

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home safety education	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Safe hot water temperature												
16	randomised trials ¹	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1017/2026 (50.2%)	698/1701 (41%)	OR 1.41 (1.07 to 1.86)	85 more per 1000 (from 16 more to 154 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE	
Possession of a functional smoke alarm												
17	randomised trials ¹	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	2219/2629 (84.4%)	1965/2478 (79.3%)	OR 1.81 (1.30 to 2.52)	81 more per 1000 (from 40 more to 113 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE	
Use of fire guards												
4	randomised trials ⁴	no serious risk of bias	serious ³	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	888/1467 (60.5%)	820/1478 (55.5%)	OR 1.40 (1 to 1.95)	81 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 154 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE	
Keeping hot drinks or food out of reach from children												
6	randomised trials ⁵	serious ⁶	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹⁰	none	790/953 (82.9%)	561/707 (79.3%)	OR 0.95 (0.61 to 1.48)	9 fewer per 1000 (from 93 fewer to 57 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	
Storing of matches and lighters												
6	randomised trials ⁴	serious ⁷	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹⁰	none	610/1086 (56.2%)	615/1093 (56.3%)	OR 1.03 (0.63 to 1.68)	7 more per 1000 (from 115 fewer to 121 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	
Possession of a fire extinguisher												
5	randomised trials ⁸	serious ⁶	serious ³	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	459/998 (46%)	372/805 (46.2%)	OR 0.90 (0.53 to 1.51)	26 fewer per 1000 (from 149 fewer to 103 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	

Has a fire escape plan												
4	randomised trials ⁹	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	-	-	OR 2.01 (1.45 to 2.77)	-	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE	

¹ Also included: one CBA study and two NRCT studies

² Most studies had unclear or high risk of bias

³ Unexplained heterogeneity

⁴ Also included: one NRCT study

⁵ Also included: two NRCT studies

⁶ One study with unclear risk of bias and one with high risk of bias.

⁷ Two studies had unclear risk of bias and one had high risk of bias

⁸ Also included: one CBA study

⁹ Also included: two CBA studies

¹⁰ The confidence interval includes both 1) no effect and 2) appreciable benefit and harms

Vedlegg 2: Sikkerhetsundervisning for forebygging av forgiftninger hos barn

Author(s): AA + VU

Date: 2012-07-13

Question: Should homesafety education be used for child poisoning prevention?

Settings:

Bibliography: Kendrick 2012

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Homesafety education	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Storages of medicines out of reach												
13	randomised trials ¹	no serious risk of bias ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1876/2297 (81.7%)	1525/2041 (74.7%)	OR 1.53 (1.27 to 1.84)	72 more per 1000 (from 42 more to 97 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
Storages of cleaning products out of reach												
15	randomised trials ³	no serious risk of bias ⁴	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1566/2484 (63%)	1343/2363 (56.8%)	OR 1.55 (1.22 to 1.96)	103 more per 1000 (from 48 more to 152 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
Having a poison control centre sticker available												
9	randomised trials ¹	serious ⁹	serious ⁵	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	641/935 (68.6%)	361/904 (39.9%)	OR 3.30 (1.70 to 6.39)	288 more per 1000 (from 131 more to 410 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	
Storage of poisons out of reach												
6	randomised trials ⁶	serious ⁷	serious ⁵	no serious indirectness	serious ⁸	none	306/751 (40.7%)	253/699 (36.2%)	OR 0.57 (0.31 to 1.07)	118 fewer per 1000 (from 212	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	

											fewer to 16 more)		
Storage of plants out of reach													
3	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁸	none	311/396 (78.5%)	169/212 (79.7%)	OR 1.18 (0.40 to 3.48)	25 more per 1000 (from 186 fewer to 135 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE		

¹ Also included: one CBA study and one NRCT study

² Five studies with unclear risk of bias

³ Also included: two NRCT studies and one CBA study

⁴ Six studies with unclear risk of bias and one with high risk of bias

⁵ Unexplained heterogeneity

⁶ Also included: one NRCT study

⁷ Three studies with unclear risk of bias

⁸ The confidence interval includes both 1) no effect and 2) appreciable benefit and harms

⁹ Five studies with unclear risk of bias and one with high risk of bias

Vedlegg 3: Sikkerhetsundervisning for forebygging av fall hos barn

Author(s): AA + VU

Date: 2012-07-14

Question: Should home safety education be used for child falls prevention?

Settings:

Bibliography: Kendrick 2012

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home safety education	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Having a fitted stair gate												
12	randomised trials ¹	no serious risk of bias ²	serious ³	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1534/2495 (61.5%)	1381/2492 (55.4%)	OR 1.61 (1.19 to 2.17)	113 more per 1000 (from 42 more to 175 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE	
Possession and use of a baby walker												
9	randomised trials ¹	no serious risk of bias ⁴	serious ³	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	359/1605 (22.4%)	651/1668 (39%)	OR 1.57 (1.18 to 2.09)	111 more per 1000 (from 40 more to 182 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE	
Possession of windows locks, screens or mechanisms to limit opening on at least some windows												
6	randomised trials ⁵	no serious risk of bias ⁶	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁷	none	1422/1877 (75.8%)	1355/1847 (73.4%)	OR 1.17 (0.87 to 1.57)	30 more per 1000 (from 28 fewer to 79 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE	
Possession of non-slip bath mats or decals												
4	randomised	no	no serious	no serious	serious ¹⁰	none	183/344	177/346	OR	24	⊕⊕⊕○	

	ed trials ⁸	serious risk of bias ⁹	inconsistency	indirectness			(53.2%)	(51.2%)	1.10 (0.68 to 1.79)	more per 1000 (from 96 fewer to 141 more)	MODERATE	
Does not leave child unattended on a high surface												
3	randomised trials ⁵	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹⁰	none	233/442 (52.7%)	96/219 (43.8%)	OR 0.84 (0.58 to 1.20)	42 fewer per 1000 (from 127 fewer to 45 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE	

¹ Also included: two NRCT studies

² Three studies with unclear risk of bias

³ Unexplained heterogeneity

⁴ Two studies with unclear risk of bias

⁵ Also included: one NRCT studies

⁶ Two studies with unclear risk of bias

⁷ Decision for downgrading was done based on uncertainty associated with the expected size of effect

⁸ Also included: one CBA study

⁹ One study with unclear risk of bias

¹⁰ The confidence interval includes both 1) no effect and 2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm

Vedlegg 4: Sikkerhetsundervisning for forebygging av elektrisk støt hos barn

Author(s): AA+VU

Date: 2012-07-14

Question: Should home safety education be used for child electrical injuries prevention?

Settings:

Bibliography: Kendrick 2012

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home safety education	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Use of socket covers												
9	randomised trials ¹	no serious risk of bias ²	serious ³	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	599/980 (61.1%)	457/937 (48.8%)	OR 2.69 (1.46 to 4.96)	231 more per 1000 (from 94 more to 338 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE	

¹ Also included: two NRCT studies

² Four studies with unclear risk and one with high risk of bias

³ Unexplained heterogeneity

Vedlegg 5: sikkerhetsundervisning for forebygging av sår og slagskader hos barn

Author(s): AA+VU

Date: 2012-07-14

Question: Should home safety education be used for child lacerations and bruising?

Settings:

Bibliography: Kendrick 2012

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studie	Design	Risk of	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home safety	Control	Relative	Absolute		

s		bias				ns	education		(95% CI)			
Storage of sharp objects out of reach												
7	randomised trials ¹	no serious risk of bias ²	serious ³	no serious indirectness	serious ⁴	none	820/1506 (54.4%)	701/1477 (47.5%)	OR 1.54 (0.90 to 2.64)	107 more per 1000 (from 26 fewer to 230 more)	⊕⊕⊕ O LOW	

¹ Also included: one NRCT study

² Three studies with unclear risk of bias

³ Unexplained heterogeneity

⁴ Confidence interval includes both no effect and important benefits and harms

Vedlegg 6: Sikkerhetsundervisning for forebygging av kvelningsulykker hos barn

Author(s): AA+VU

Date: 2012-07-14

Question: Should homesafety education be used for child suffocation?

Settings:

Bibliography: Kendrick 2012

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Homesafety education	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Storage of small objects out of reach												
6	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias ¹	serious ²	no serious indirectness	serious ³	none	427/1154 (37%)	370/960 (38.5%)	OR 0.79 (0.36 to 1.77)	54 fewer per 1000 (from 201 fewer to 141 more)	⊕⊕⊕ O LOW	

¹ Two studies with unclear risk of bias

² Large heterogeneity across studies

³ Confidence interval includes both no effect and important benefits and harms

Vedlegg 7: Sikkerhetsundervisning for forebygging av drukning hos barn

Author(s): AA+VU

Date: 2012-07-14

Question: Should home safety education be used for child drowning?

Settings:

Bibliography: Kendrick 2012

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home safety education	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Never leaving child alone in bath												
5	randomised trials ¹	no serious risk of bias ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ³	none	902/988 (91.3%)	613/697 (87.9%)	OR 1.21 (0.85 to 1.72)	19 more per 1000 (from 18)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE	

										fewer to 47 more)		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------	--	--

¹ Also includes: two NRCT studies

² Two studies with unclear risk of bias

³ Confidence interval includes both no effect and important benefits and harms