|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Anderson et al (2004), UK  single stroke unit | Demonstrate that the NL results in improved delivery of enteral feed for high risk dysphagic stroke patients | Methodology  Quantitative  Design  6 month prospective audit study  Control Group compare same group of patients before and after NL insertion  Randomisation  No | Sample  n= 14 dysphagic stroke patients  Patient demographics  Age range 67-91 yrs  Mean age = 76 yrs this is stated for NL group only  men – unknown  women – unknown  Type of stroke  n=10 cerebral infarction, n=3 intracerebral haemorrhages  n=1 subdural haematoma – should not be included as a stroke  Stroke severity*-* not stated.  Latency from stroke onset to study day  <28days post-acute stroke | Level 3 Grade D |
| Beavan et al (2010) UK  three stroke units | Evaluate looped NGT feeding in acute stroke patients with dysphagia | Methodology  Quantitative  Design  Randomised Control Trial  Control Group  Yes [NLvs conventional adhesive dressing]  Randomisation  Yes  Blinding  Not possible | Sample  n=104  NL (n = 51); conventional adhesive dressing (n = 53)  Patient demographics  Age range – not stated  men – 20 vs 23  women – 31 vs 30  Type of stroke  TACS 37 vs 35  PACS 12 vs 14  LACS 2 vs 1  POCs 0 vs 3  Stroke severity*-* not stated.  Latency from stroke onset to study day NGT feed - 3 vs 3  Randomisation - 4 vs 4 | Level 1+  Grade A |
| Ciocon et al. (1988) USA  non-acute care facility | Tube Feedings in Elderly Patients  Indications, Benefits, and Complications  Exploring evidence of agitation requiring multiple tube reinsertions and restraint of extremities including wrist restraints and hand mittens | Methodology  Quantitative  Design  Prospective study (includes retrospective data)  Control Group  No | Sample  Study sample n=70 [54 NGT fed; 16 Gastro-jejunal feeding]  7 patients excluded due to COAD; total study sample n=63  Patient demographics  No.men 10  No. women 60  Age range 60-95yrs  Mean age 82yrs  Stroke patients n=14 (18% of total study population)  11/14 stroke patients were NG fed (47% of NG fed patients in the study)  Type of stroke  CVA n=8  Intracerebral haemorrhage n=5  Obtundation from CVA n=1  Stroke severity*-* not stated.  Latency from stroke onset to study day  Not stated | Level 3 Grade D |
| Horsburgh et al (2008) UK  Acute and outpatient settings | Explores the perspectives of patients, relatives and carers about the use of interventions (HM and NL) to prevent NGT tugging following a stroke. | Grounded Theory  Focus groups and interviews | Sample  *Interviews:*  n=8 (n=4 stroke patients and n=4 relatives/carers)  *Focus groups:*  n=17 staff  Patient demographics  Age range –  men –  women –  Type of stroke  Not stated  Stroke severity*-* not stated.  Latency from stroke onset to study day  Not stated | Level 3 Grade D |
| Quill (1989) USA  community hospital | Retrospective chart review in a community hospital looking at use of NGT and restraints to keep tubes in place (non-specific restraint for maintaining NGT position) | Quantitative  Retrospective chart review | Total study sample n=55  Patient demographics  Patients = or >70 yrs  Age range – not stated  No. of men – 21  No. women – 34  Stroke specific details  Total no. stroke patients n=27 (49%) of which number of men/women not stated  Type and severity of stroke  Classified as CVA patients only, type and severity of stroke not stated  Latency from stroke onset to study day - not stated  Control Group - none | Level 4 Grade D |
| Williams (2010) UK  acute hospital setting | Explore the use of hand control mittens (HM) and ascertain their acceptability for use in clinical practice | Mixed Methods  Observational; before and after intervention in the clinical setting  Semi-structured interviews with key staff members | Sample  n= 7 dysphagic patients [n=4 had a stroke]  Patient demographics  Age range 44-90 yrs  Mean age = 70 yrs (not stated)  No. men – 6 (3 stroke)  No. women -1 (stroke)  Stroke specific details:  *N=4 stroke patients*  *Type of stroke* – not stated  *Stroke severity-* not stated.  Latency from stroke onset to study day*-* not stated  Control Group – none | Level 4 Grade D |