


## Bijlage 6. Forest plots en AMSTAR beoordelingen

Evidence tabellen en GRADE profielen behorende bij de uitgangsvragen die via de GRADE methodiek zijn uitgewerkt.

### 6 - 2.2 Preventie van complexe rouw vóór het overlijden

Onderzoeksvraag: Welke preventieve interventies vóór het overlijden zijn beschikbaar en effectief voor het voorkómen van complexe rouw bij nabestaanden?


#### Forest plots Psychosociale interventies vs standaardzorg



#### Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)
- (G) Other bias


Figuur 1. Complexe rouw zes maanden na overlijden




#### Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)
- (G) Other bias

Figuur 2. Complexe rouw dertien maanden na overlijden



Figuur 3. Symptomen van complexe rouw 6-7 maanden na overlijden



Figuur 4. Symptomen van complexe rouw dertien maanden na overlijden

## 6 - 3.4 Rouwbehandeling en -begeleiding bij volwassen naasten van patiënten in de palliatieve fase

### AMSTAR beoordeling Johannsen [2019]

#### AMSTAR 2 Results

[Printer Friendly Version](#)

Article Name:

#### Johannsen2019 is a Low quality review

1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?	No Yes Yes
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?	YesYesYesYesYesYesYes
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?	Yes Yes
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Partial Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	Yes Yes
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	No

<b>7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?</b>	No
<b>8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</b>	Partial Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	
<b>RCT</b>	No
<b>NRSI</b>	Yes Yes Yes
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	No
<b>11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</b>	
<b>RCT</b>	Yes
<b>NRSI</b>	Yes Yes Yes
<b>12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</b>	Yes Yes Yes
<b>13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?</b>	Yes Yes
<b>14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</b>	Yes Yes
<b>15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</b>	Yes Yes
<b>16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</b>	Yes Yes

To cite this tool: Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, Moher D, Tugwell P, Welch V, Kristjansson E, Henry DA. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. *BMJ*. 2017 Sep 21;358:j4008.

## AMSTAR beoordeling Maass [2020]

### AMSTAR 2 Results

[Printer Friendly Version](#)

Article Name:

---

### Maass2020 is a Critially Low quality review

- |  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?  | Yes<br>Yes<br>Yes<br>Yes<br>Yes  |
| 2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol? | Partial<br>YesYesYesYesYesYesYes |
| 3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?  | Yes<br>Yes                       |
| 4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?  | No<br>Yes<br>Yes                 |
| 5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?  | Yes<br>Yes                       |

6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	Yes Yes
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review? RCT	No
NRSI	0 Yes Yes
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	No
11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results? RCT	Yes
NRSI	Yes Yes
12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?	No
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes Yes
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	Yes Yes
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	Yes Yes
16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	Yes Yes

To cite this tool: Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, Moher D, Tugwell P, Welch V, Kristjansson E, Henry DA. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. BMJ. 2017 Sep 21;358:j4008.