## Appendix 1

Search date: 20/04/2022

# [Search strategy for MEDLINE / EMBASE / PsycINFO/ CINAHL via OvidSP]

- l. exp Frailty/
- 2. frailty.mp.
- 3. exp Frail Elderly/
- 4. Frail Elderly.sh,kf.
- 5. Frail Older People.mp.
- 6. Frailty syndrome.mp.
- 7. (Frailty adj2 syndrome).mp.
- 8. (Frail\* or geriatric syndrome\* or geriatric disorder\*).ti,ab.
- 9. ((elder\* or old\* or senior\* or geriatric\*) adj4 function\* adj4 (declin\* or impair\*)).af.
- 10. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9
- 11. exp Advance Care Planning/
- 12. (advance\* care adj plan\*).tw.
- 13. (advance\* adj (medical plan\* or statement\*)).tw.
- 14. acp.tw.
- 15. Statement of wishes.tw.
- 16. Terminal Care/
- 17. terminal care.tw.
- 18. ((end of life or EOL) adj5 (care or discuss\* or decision\* or plan\* or preference\*)).tw.
- 19. Living Wills/
- 20. living will\*.tw.
- 21. 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20
- 22. 10 and 21
- 23. limit 22 to (english language and yr="2003 2022" and "all aged (50 and over)")

#### PubMed

(((Frail Elderly[MeSH Terms]) OR (Elderly, Frail[Title/Abstract] OR Frail Elders[Title/Abstract] OR Elder, Frail[Title/Abstract] OR Frail Elders[Title/Abstract] OR Frail[Title/Abstract] OR Frail[Title/Abstract] OR Frail Elders[Title/Abstract] OR Functionally-Impaired Elderly[Title/Abstract] OR Elderly, Functionally-Impaired[Title/Abstract] OR Functionally Impaired Elderly[Title/Abstract] OR Frail Older Adults[Title/Abstract] OR Adult, Frail Older[Title/Abstract] OR Frail Older Adults[Title/Abstract] OR Older Adult, Frail[Title/Abstract] OR Older Adults, Frail[Title/Abstract])) AND (Advance Care Planning[MeSH Terms])) OR (Advance Health Care Planning[Title/Abstract] OR Advance Medical Planning[Title/Abstract] OR Planning, Advance Medical[Title/Abstract] OR Advance Directives[Title/Abstract] OR Living Wills[Title/Abstract] OR Terminal Care[Title/Abstract]) AND ((aged[Filter]) AND (2003:2022[pdat]))

### Cochrane library

- #1 (advance care planning):ti,ab,kw OR (Advance Directive):ti,ab,kw OR (Living will):ti,ab,kw OR (advance\* NEAR/3 plan\*):ti,ab,kw OR (future care planning):ti,ab,kw
- #2 (Anticipatory care plan\*):ti,ab,kw OR (end of life NEXT (discuss\* or conversation\* or decision\* or plan\* or preference\*)):ti,ab,kw OR (Medical treatment order):ti,ab,kw OR (Statement of wishes):ti,ab,kw OR (Medical directive):ti,ab,kw
- #3 (advance\* NEXT (medical plan\* or statement\*)):ti,ab,kw
- #4 advance care planning
- #5 Advance Directive
- #6 Living will
- #7 (Frail Elderly):ti,ab,kw OR (Frail):ti,ab,kw OR (Elderly):ti,ab,kw OR (Frailty syndrome):ti,ab,kw
- #8 #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6

#9 #8 and #7

#### **CINAHL** complete

- S1 "advance\* care plan\*"
- "Anticipatory care plan\*" S2
- S3 "future care planning"
- S4 (MH "Advance Care Planning")
- S5 "Advance Care Planning"
- S6 "Living Wills"
- S7 (MH "Advance Directives+") OR (MH "Living Wills")
- S8 "Advance Directives"
- S9 "Resuscitation Orders"
- S10 "Medical treatment order"
- S11 "Statement of wishes"
- S12 "Medical directive"
- S13 "end of life discuss\*"
- S14 "end of life conversation\*"
- S15 "end of life decision\*"
- S16 "end of life plan\*"
- S17 "end of life preference\*"
- S18 "advance\* medical plan\*"
- S19 "advance\* statement\*"
- S20 S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 OR S5 OR S6 OR S7 OR S8 OR S9 OR S10 OR S11 OR S12 OR S13 OR
- S14 OR S15 OR S16 OR S17 OR S18 OR S19
- S21 (MH "Frailty") OR (MH "Frail Elderly")
- S22 " frailty" S23 "Frailty syndrome"
- S24 "Frail Older People"
- S25 S21 OR S22 OR S23 OR S24
- S26 S20 AND S25
- S27 (AG "50 and over") AND (DT "2003 2022") AND (ZL "English")
- S28 S26 AND S27

Appendix 2

Table 2a. Methodological quality of included randomized controlled trial

	Rebecca L	Anouk	Li-Hwa Lin	Hillary D.
	et al, 2018	Overbeek	et al, 2021	Lum
		et al, 2019		et al, 2020
1. Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. Was allocation to treatment groups concealed?	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear
3. Were treatment groups similar at the baseline?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4. Were participants blind to treatment assignment?	No	No	Unclear	No
5. Were those delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment?	Yes	No	Unclear	No
6. Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?	Yes	No	Unclear	No
7. Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
9. Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
10. Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
11. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
12. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
13. Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
(individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial?				
Overall quality	Moderate	Low	Low	Low

Table 2b. Critical appraisal results for included quasi-experimental studies or mixed methods studies or no randomized controlled trial

	Huei-Chuan	Wallace Chi	Renli Deng	Debra	Hiroko Okada
	Sung	Ho Chan	et al, 2020	K.Litzelman	et al, 2022
	et al, 2019	et al, 2021		et al, 2017	
1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect'	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
(i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?					
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving	No	No	No	No	No
similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of					
interest?					
4. Was there a control group?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
post the intervention/exposure?					

6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes
groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and					
analyzed?					
7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Overall quality	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low

Table 2c. Critical appraisal results for included qualitative studies

	Francesca Ingravallo et al, 2018	Sheng-Yu Fan et al, 2019	Sarah Combes et al, 2021	Carrie Bernard et al, 2020	Sok Shin Yap et al, 2021	Jeanine Yonashiro-Cho et al, 2016	Jolien J. Glaudemans et al, 2020	Debra K.Litzelman et al, 2017
1. Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes
5. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6. Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?	No	No	No	Unclear	No	No	No	No
7. Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice- versa, addressed?	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear
8. Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

9. Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
10. Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Overall quality	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate

Table 2d. Critical appraisal results for included cross sectional studies

	Helen YL Chan et al, 2007
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	Yes
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	Yes
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	Yes
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	Yes
5. Were confounding factors identified?	Unclear
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	No
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	Yes
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Yes
Overall quality	Moderate