1 Supplementary Materials 6: Tables of results for evidence from the UK

Table 1. Data for clinical outcomes for each study trialling an ERP intervention to improve recovery following colorectal surgery in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD where calculated.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean change (95% CI)	p
Anderson 2003[1]	LOS (days)	14	4.0	1.77	10	7.0	2.07			-1.60 (-2.54 to -.66)	-3.0 (-4.66 to -1.40)	**<.001**
Anderson 2003[1]	Readmissions (n)	14	0		11	0						
Anderson 2003[1]	Mortality (n)	14	0		11	1						.25
Anderson 2003[1]	Patients with postop complications (n)	14	4		11	5				OR: 0.48 (0.09 to 2.52)		.38
Gatt 2005[2]	GP assessments <30 days (%)	19	5.2		20	0						.30
Dhruva Rao[3]	Postop LOS (days)	282	5 (median)	1 to 60 (range)	224	6 (median)	2 to 61 (range)					
Dhruva Rao[3]	Minor complications %)	282	8.8		224	13.8				-.53 (-.71 to -.35)	-6.0 (-7.99 to -4.01)	.07
Dhruva Rao[3]	Major complications: (%)	282	3.9		224	5.8				-.41 (-.59 to -.24)	-2.0 (-2.85 to -1.15)	.32
Dhruva Rao[3]	Mortality <30 days (%)	282	1.4		224	4				-1.75 (-1.96 to -1.54)	-5.0 (-5.50 to -4.50)	.07
Khan 2013[4]	Complications (n)	42	3		41	4				OR: 0.71 (0.15 to 3.4)		.67
Khoo 2007[5]	Postop LOS (days)	35	5 (median)	3 to 37 (range)	35	7 (median)	4 to 63 (range)					
Khoo 2007[5]	Postop stay including readmissions (days)	35	5 (median)	3 to 37 (range)	35	7 (median)	4 to 63 (range)					
Khoo 2007[5]	GP advice sought: outcome = advice only (n)	35	4		35	7				OR: 0.48 (0.13 to 1.82)		.27

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean change (95% CI)	p
Khoo 2007[5]	GP advice sought: outcome = prescription given (n)	35	4		35	3				OR: 1.29 (0.27 to 6.26)		.75
Khoo 2007[5]	GP advice sought: outcome = readmitted (n)	35	3		35	3				OR: 1.0 (0.19 to 5.33)		1.0
Khoo 2007[5]	Patient called ward for advice (n)	35	4		35	4				OR: 1.0 (0.23 to 4.36)		1.0
Khoo 2007[5]	Mortality (n)	35	0		35	2						.15
Khoo 2007[5]	Total number of complications (n)	35	9		35	18				OR: 0.33 (0.12 to 0.89)		**<.05**
King 2006[6]	Postop LOS (days)	60	5.8		86	10.7						
King 2006[6]	Re-operations <30 days (n)	60	5		86	9				OR: 0.78 (0.25 to 2.45)		.67
King 2006[6]	Readmissions <30 days (n)	60	7		86	8				OR: 1.29 (0.44 to 3.76)		.64
King 2006[6]	Major complications (n)	60	11		86	24				OR: 0.58 (0.26 to 1.3)		.18
King 2006[6]	Number of 30 day and in hospital deaths	60	2		86	6				OR: 0.46 (0.09 to 2.36)		.34
King 2006[6]	Postop LOS - stoma (days)	60	8.3		86	12.6						
King 2006[6]	Postop LOS – non-stoma (days)	60	4.8		86	9.1						
King 2006[6]	Postop + convalescent stay (days)	60	5.9		86	12.4						
King 2006[6]	Postop + convalescent stay + readmission	60	6.3		86	12.9						

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean change (95% CI)	p
	stay (days)											
Lidder 2013[7]	Actual postop discharge day (days)	27	7 (median)	5 to 10 (IQR)	30	8.5 (median)	6 to 13.3 (IQR)	7.3 (3.9)	9.3 (5.7)	-.39 (-.92 to .13)	-1.93 (-4.55 to .69)	.13
Lidder 2013[7]	Total number of complications by POD5 (n)	27	15		30	20				OR: 0.63 (0.21 to 1.83)		.39
Lidder 2013[7]	Patients with complications by POD5 (n)	27	10		30	13				OR: 0.77 (0.27 to 2.23)		.63
Lidder 2013[7]	Total number of complications by day 30 (n)	27	15		30	27				OR: 0.14 (0.03 to 0.57)		**<.01**
Lidder 2013[7]	Patients with complications by day 30 (n)	27	10		30	15				OR: 0.59 (0.2 to 1.7)		.33

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs for continuous data, imputed where necessary. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for dichotomous data. P-values are from independent samples t-tests (for continuous data) or z-scores (for dichotomous data). LOS=Length of stay; OR=Odds Ratio; SE=Standard Error; IQR=Interquartile range; POD=Post-operative day; SD=Standard deviation; CI=Confidence interval; Postop=Postoperative; n=sample size

Table 2. Data for patient-reported outcomes for each study trialling an ERP intervention to improve recovery from colorectal surgery in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD where calculated.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study, intervention	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* (95% CI)	Mean change (95% CI)	p
Anderson 2003[1]	Return of gastrointestinal function (postop hours)	14	48 (median)	33 to 55 (IQR)	11	76	70 to 110 (IQR)	45.3 (18.1)	85.3 (33.9)	-1.53 (-2.43 to -.66)	-40.0 (-61.8 to -18.2)	**<.001**
Anderson 2003[1]	Walked to toilet unaided (postop hours)	14	46 (median)	37 to 54 (IQR)	11	69 (median)	44 to 121 (IQR)	45.7 (14.0)	78.0 (65.3)	-.65 (-1.46 to .16)	-32.3 (-69.3 to 4.6)	.08
Gatt 2005[2]	Time out of bed on POD1 (mins)	19	105 (median)	34 to 225 (range)	20	8 (median)	0 to 38 (range)					
Khoo 2007[5]	Tolerating solid diet (POD)	35	1 (median)	0 to 6 (range)	35	4 (median)	2 to 9 (range)					
Khoo 2007[5]	Independent mobility (POD)	35	2 (median)	1 to 10 (range)	35	4 (median)	2 to 32 (range)					
Khoo 2007[5]	Passage of first stool (POD)	35	3 (median)	1 to 5 (range)	35	5 (median)	0 to 23 (range)					
Khoo 2007[5]	Patient felt they would benefit from longer stay (n)	35	3		35	24				OR: 0.1 (0.01 to 0.79)		**<.05**
Lidder 2013[7]	Fit for discharge (POD)	27	7 (median)	5 to 10 (IQR)	30	8 (median)	6 to 13 (IQR)	7.3 (3.9)	9.0 (5.5)	-.35 (-.87 to .17)	-1.67 (-4.21 to .88)	.19

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs, imputed where necessary. P-values are from independent samples t-tests. SD=Standard Deviation; CI=Confidence Interval; POD=Postoperative Day; IQR=Interquartile Range; postop=Postoperative; n=sample size

Table 3. Data for clinical outcomes for each study trialling an ERP intervention to improve recovery from lower limb arthroplasty in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD where calculated.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Dwyer 2012[8]	LOS (days)	64	5.3		63	8.3						
Dwyer 2012[8]	LOS: preoperative Hb levels ≥ 14g/dl (days)	64	4.37		63	6.6						
Dwyer 2012[8]	LOS: preoperative Hb levels ≤ 14g/dl (days)	64	6.02		63	9.16						
Dwyer 2012[8]	LOS: preadmission scores (AMA): 1 or 2 (days)	64	4.72		63	7.86						
Dwyer 2012[8]	LOS: preadmission scores (AMA): 3 (days)	64	6.79		63	9.46						
Dwyer 2012[8]	LOS: BMI preadmission scores < 30 (days)	64	4.8		63	8.6						
Dwyer 2012[8]	LOS: BMI preadmission scores > 30 (days)	64	6.3		63	7.7						
Dwyer 2012[8]	Readmissions (n)	64	4		63	5				OR: 0.77 (0.2 to 3.02)		.71
Gordon 2011[9],	LOS: Knee and Hips combined	278	7.3	6.4	266	9.6	8.1			-.32 (-.49 to -.15)	-2.3 (-3.53 to -1.07)	**<.001**

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
ERP	(days)											
Gordon 2011[9], ERP+JRS	LOS: Knee and Hips combined (days)	303	6.3	5.8	266	9.6	8.1			-.47 (-.64 to -.31)	-3.3 (-4.45 to -2.15)	**<.001**
Gordon 2011[9], ERP	LOS: Knees only (days)	132	5.75	3.9	147	8.5	7.5			-.45 (-.69 to -.22)	-2.75 (-4.18 to -1.32)	**<.001**
Gordon 2011[9], ERP+JRS	LOS: Knees only (days)	168	5.9	5.1	147	8.5	7.5			-.41 (-.63 to -.19)	-2.6 (-4.01 to -1.19)	**<.001**
Gordon 2011[9], ERP	LOS: Hips only (days)	146	8.7	7.7	119	11.0	8.5			-.29 (-.53 to -.04)	-2.3 (-4.26 to -.34)	**<.05**
Gordon 2011[9], ERP+JRS	LOS: Hips only (days)	135	6.4	6.6	119	11.0	8.5			-.61 (-.86 to -.36)	-4.6 (-4.67 to -2.73)	**<.001**
Harari 2007[10]	LOS (days)	54	11.5	5.2	54	15.8	13.2			-.43 (-.81 to -.05)	-4.3 (-8.13 to -.47)	**<.05**
Harari 2007[10]	Delayed discharge due to all reasons (%)	54	24.1		54	70.4				OR: 0.13 (0.06 to 0.31)		**<.001**
Harari 2007[10]	Delayed discharge due to medical complication (%)	54	13		54	37				OR: 0.25 (0.1 to 0.67)		**<.01**
Harari 2007[10]	Delayed discharge due to slow rehabilitation (%)	54	7.4		54	13				OR: 0.53 (0.15 to 1.95)		.34

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Harari 2007[10]	Delayed discharge due to wait for OT and/or equipment (%)	54	3.7		54	20.4				OR: 0.15 (0.03 to 0.71)		**<.01**
Harari 2007[10]	Complications (including multidisciplinary issues) (n)	54	47		54	159						**<.001**
Harari 2007[10]	Complications (excluding multidisciplinary issues) (n)	54	22		54	70						**<.001**
Harari 2007[10]	Readmission <28 days (%)	54	3.7		54	3.7				OR: 1 (0.14 to 7.38)		1.0
Harari 2007[10]	Death <30 days (%)	54	0		54	1.9						.31
Hunt 2009[11], BEL v LIV	Postop LOS (days)	316	3 (median)	1 to 49 (range)	87	6 (median)	3 to 19 (range)					
Hunt 2009[11], BEL v SWLEOC	Postop LOS (days)	316	3 (median)	1 to 49 (range)	119	5 (median)	1 to 13 (range)					
Khan 2014[12]	LOS (days)	2680	3 (median)	0 to 82 (range)	2639	6 (median)	1 to 125 (range)					
Khan 2014[12]	Readmissions (%)	2680	4.6		2639	4.7				OR: 0.98 (0.76 to 1.26)		.86
Khan 2014[12]	Return to theatre (%)	2680	1.3		2639	2				OR: 0.65 (0.42 to 0.99)		**<.05**
Khan 2014[12]	Stroke <30 days (%)	2680	0.2		2639	0.5				OR: 0.4 (0.15 to 1.09)		.06

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Khan 2014[12]	Gastrointestinal bleed (%)	2680	0.4		2639	0.6				OR: 0.67 (0.31 to 1.45)		.30
Khan 2014[12]	Myocardial infarction (%)	2680	0.4		2639	0.9				OR: 0.44 (0.21 to 0.91)		**<.05**
Khan 2014[12]	DVT <60 days (%)	2680	0.5		2639	0.8				OR: 0.62 (0.31 to 1.24)		.17
Khan 2014[12]	Pulmonary Embolism (%)	2680	1.1		2639	1.2				OR: 0.92 (0.55 to 1.52)		.73
Khan 2014[12]	Pneumonia <30 days (%)	2680	1.2		2639	0.9				OR: 1.34 (0.78 to 2.28)		.28
Khan 2014[12]	Death <30 days (%)	2680	0.2		2639	0.5				OR: 0.4 (0.15 to 1.09)		.06
Khan 2014[12]	Death <90 days (%)	2680	0.5		2639	0.8				OR: 0.62 (0.31 to 1.24)		.17
Maempel 2015[13]	Postop LOS (days)	84	3 (median)	2 to 14 (range)	81	4 (median)	2 to 16 (range)					
Maempel 2015[13]	Patients developing postoperative complication within 6 months (n)	84	3		81	6				OR: 0.46 (0.11 to 1.92)		.28
Maempel 2015[13]	Manipulation under anaesthesia within 1 year (n)	84	5		81	1				OR: 5.06 (0.58 to 44.32)		.11
Maempel 2015[13]	Number of blood transfusions (n)	84	4		81	4				OR: 0.96 (0.23 to 3.99)		.96
Maempel 2016[14]	Postop LOS (days)	550	3 (median)	2 to 4 (IQR)	608	5 (median)	4 to 6 (IQR)	3.0 (1.5)	5.0 (1.5)	-1.35 (-1.47 to -1.22)	-2.0 (-2.17 to -1.83)	**<.001**
Maempel 2016[14]	Dislocation: 1 year follow up	611	0.91		582	1.03				OR: 0.79 (0.24 to 2.61)		.70

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
	(%)											
Maempel 2016[14]	Death: 1 year follow up (%)	522	0.6		605	1.5				OR: 0.38 (0.1 to 1.42)		.14
Malviya 2011[15]	Death <30 days (n)	1500	1		3000	15				OR: 0.13 (0.02 to 1.01)		**<.05**
Malviya 2011[15]	Death <90 days (n)	1500	3		3000	25				OR: 0.24 (0.07 to 0.79)		**<.05**
Malviya 2011[15]	LOS (days)	1500	4.8		3000	8.5						
Malviya 2011[15]	Readmissions (n)	1500	72		3000	140				OR: 1.03 (0.77 to 1.38)		.84
Malviya 2011[15]	Complications (n)	1500	69		3000	191				OR: 0.71 (0.53 to 0.94)		**<.05**
Mertes 2013[16]	Total LOS: Hips (days)	138	5.52	3.11	170	6.94	3.33			-.44 (-.67 to -.21)	-1.42 (-2.15 to -.69)	**<.001**
Mertes 2013[16]	Postop LOS: Hips (days)	138	5.34	3	170	5.92	3.35			-.18 (-.41 to .04)	-.58 (-1.30 to .41)	.11
Mertes 2013[16]	Total LOS: Knees (days)	137	5.64	2.72	162	6.44	2.65			-.3 (-.53 to -.07)	-.8 (-1.41 to -.19)	**<.05**
Mertes 2013[16]	Postop LOS: Knees (days)	137	5.24	2.67	162	5.43	2.64			-.07 (-.3 to .16)	-.19 (-.80 to .42)	.54
Reilly 2005[17]	LOS (days)	21	1.5	0.7	20	4.3	1.3			-3.00 (-3.91 to -2.10)	-2.8 (-3.46 to -2.14)	**<.001**
Reilly 2005[17]	Patients who developed complications post discharge (n)	21	3		20	1				OR: 3.17 (0.3 to 33.31)		.32
Reilly 2005[17]	Major complications	32	2		20	1				OR: 0.95 (0.06 to 16.29)		.97

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
	(n)											
Starks 2014[18]	LOS: Hips, >85yrs (days)	61	5		71	9						
Starks 2014[18]	LOS: Knees, >85yrs (days)	55	5		63	8						
Starks 2014[18]	Long LOS: Hips & Knees (%)	2128	4.4		2065	20.0				OR: 0.18 (0.15 to 0.23)		**<.001**
Starks 2014[18]	Long LOS: Hips & Knees, >85 (%)	116	13.8		134	54.5				OR: 0.13 (0.07 to 0.25)		**<.001**
Starks 2014[18]	Emergency readmissions <30 days: Hips & Knees (%)	2128	4.7		2065	5.5				OR: 0.85 (0.64 to 1.12)		.24
Starks 2014[18]	Emergency readmissions <30 days: Hips & Knees, >85 (%)	116	5.2		134	6				OR: 0.86 (0.29 to 2.55)		.78
Starks 2014[18]	Mortality within 30 days (%)	2128	0		2065	0.10						
Starks 2014[18]	Mortality within 30 days, >85 (%)	116	0		134	0						

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs for continuous data, imputed where necessary. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for dichotomous data. P-values are from independent samples t-tests (for continuous data) or z-scores (for dichotomous data). LOS=Length of stay; OR=Odds Ratio; SD=Standard deviation; CI=Confidence interval; BEL=Belfast; LIV=Liverpool; SWLEOC=South West London Elective Orthopaedic Centre; IQR=Interquartile Range; DVT=Deep Vein Thrombosis; BMI=Body Mass Index; AMA=American Association of Anaesthesiologists; n=sample size

Table 4. Data for patient-reported outcomes for each study trialling an ERP intervention to improve recovery from lower limb arthroplasty in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD where calculated.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean change (95% CI)	p
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v LIV	Oxford Hip Score (raw score)	316	26.5	25.7 to 27.3 (95% CI)	87	31.6	29.6 to 33.5 (95% CI)	26.5 (7.2)	31.6 (9.1)	-.66 (-.91 to -.42)	-5.1 (-6.93 to -3.27)	**<.001**
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v LIV	WOMAC Pain (raw score)	316	4.4	4.0 to 4.8 (95% CI)	87	5.3	4.3 to 6.3 (95% CI)	4.4 (3.6)	5.3 (4.7)	-.23 (-.47 to .01)	-.9 (-1.82 to .02)	.06
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v LIV	WOMAC Stiffness (raw score)	316	2.7	2.5 to 2.9 (95% CI)	87	3	2.6 to 3.4 (95% CI)	2.7 (1.8)	3 (1.9)	-.16 (-.4 to .07)	-.3 (-.73 to .13)	.17
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v LIV	WOMAC Function (raw score)	316	23.5	21.9 to 25.1 (95% CI)	87	24	21.4 to 26.6 (95% CI)	23.5 (14.5)	24 (12.2)	-.04 (-.27 to .2)	-.5 (-3.83 to 2.83)	.77
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v LIV	SF-12 (raw score)	316	38	36.8 to 39.2 (95% CI)	87	36.2	34.4 to 38 (95% CI)	38 (10.8)	36.2 (8.4)	.17 (-.06 to .41)	1.8 (-.67 to 4.27)	.15
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v LIV	SF-12 (raw score)	316	49.9	48.7 to 51.1 (95% CI)	87	49.5	47.1 to 51.9 (95% CI)	49.9 (10.8)	49.5 (11.3)	.04 (-.2 to .27)	.4 (-2.20 to 3.00)	.76
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v LIV	EuroQol Index (raw score)	316	0.72	0.7 to 0.74 (95% CI)	87	0.7	0.66 to 0.74 (95% CI)	0.7 (0.2)	0.7 (0.2)	.11 (-.13 to .35)	.02 (-.02 to .06)	.37
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v LIV	EuroQol VAS (raw score)	316	72	70.2 to 73.8 (95% CI)	87	70.1	66 to 74.2 (95% CI)	72 (16.3)	70.1 (19.2)	.11 (-.13 to .35)	1.9 -2.13 to 5.93	.35

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean change (95% CI)	p
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v SWLEOC	Oxford Hip Score (raw score)	316	26.5	25.7 to 27.3 (95% CI)	119	29.8	28.2 to 31.4 (95% CI)	26.5 (7.2)	29.8 (8.8)	-.43 (-.64 to -.22)	-3.3 (-4.93 to -1.67)	**<.001**
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v SWLEOC	WOMAC Pain (raw score)	316	4.4	4 to 4.8 (95% CI)	119	4.7	3.9 to 5.5 (95% CI)	4.4 (3.6)	4.7 (4.4)	-.08 (-.29 to .13)	-.3 (-1.11 to .51)	.41
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v SWLEOC	WOMAC Stiffness (raw score)	316	2.7	2.5 to 2.9 (95% CI)	119	2.4	2.2 to 2.6 (95% CI)	2.7 (1.8)	2.4 (1.1)	.18 (-.03 to .39)	.3 (-.05 to .65)	.09
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v SWLEOC	WOMAC Function (raw score)	316	23.5	21.9 to 25.1 (95% CI)	119	20.3	18.1 to 22.5 (95% CI)	23.5 (14.5)	20.3 (12.1)	.23 (.02 to .44)	3.2 (.27 to 6.12)	**<.05**
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v SWLEOC	SF-12 (raw score)	316	38	36.8 to 39.2 (95% CI)	119	36.6	35 to 38.2 (95% CI)	38 (10.8)	36.6 (8.8)	.14 (-.08 to .35)	1.4 (-.78 to 3.58)	.20
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v SWLEOC	SF-12 (raw score)	316	49.9	48.7 to 51.1 (95% CI)	119	50.3	48.3 to 52.3 (95% CI)	49.9 (10.8)	50.3 (11)	-.04 (-.25 to .17)	-.4 (-2.70 to 1.90)	.73
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v SWLEOC	EQ-5D Index (raw score)	316	0.72	0.7 to 0.74 (95% CI)	119	0.74	0.7 to 0.78 (95% CI)	0.7 (0.2)	0.7 (0.2)	-.1 (-.31 to .11)	-.02 (-.06 to .02)	.33
Hunt 2009,[11] BEL v SWLEOC	EQ-5D VAS (raw score)	316	72	70.2 to 73.8 (95% CI)	119	73.9	71.1 to 76.7 (95% CI)	72 (16.3)	73.9 (15.4)	-.12 (-.33 to .09)	-1.9 (-5.29 to 1.49)	.27
Salmon 2013,[11, 19] BEL v LIV	EoHAQ: Care Problems = None (%)	316	65.2		125	46.4				OR: 0.44 (0.28 to 0.69)		**<.001**

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean change (95% CI)	p
Salmon 2013,[11, 19] BEL v LIV	EoHAQ: Care Problems = > 1 (n)	316	34.8		125	53.6				OR: 0.16 (0.1 to 0.27)		**<.001**
Salmon 2013,[11, 19] BEL v LIV	EoHAQ: Recovery Problems = 0 (n)	316	13.0		125	11.2				OR: 0.44 (0.19 to 1)		**<.05**
Salmon 2013,[11, 19] BEL v LIV	EoHAQ: Recovery Problems = > 1 (n)	316	87.0		125	88.8				OR: 0.15 (0.1 to 0.24)		**<.001**
Salmon 2013,[11, 19] BEL v SWLEOC	EoHAQ: Care Problems = None (n)	316	65.2		119	38.7				OR: 0.54 (0.34 to 0.86)		**<.01**
Salmon 2013,[11, 19] BEL v SWLEOC	EoHAQ: Care Problems => 1 (n)	316	34.8		119	61.3				OR: 0.12 (0.07 to 0.19)		**<.001**
Salmon 2013,[11, 19] BEL v SWLEOC	EoHAQ: Recovery Problems = 0 (n)	316	13.0		119	13.4				OR: 0.34 (0.15 to 0.75)		**<.01**
Salmon 2013,[11, 19] BEL v SWLEOC	EoHAQ: Recovery Problems => 1 (n)	316	87.0		119	86.6				OR: 0.14 (0.09 to 0.23)		**<.001**
Maempel 2015[13]	Change in AKSK functioning (raw score)	83	52.8 (median)	-3 to 86.6 (range)	78	57 (median)	-25.4 to 85 (range)					
Maempel 2015[13]	Change in ROM (degrees)	83	5.8	19.2	78	6.5	19.5			-.04 (-.35 to .27)	-.7 (-6.73 to 5.33)	.82
Maempel 2015[13]	Change in AKSF functioning: Mean improvement (raw score)	45	5.9	21.6	55	6.9	18.2			-.05 (-.44 to .34)	-1.0 (-8.90 to 6.90)	.80

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean change (95% CI)	p
Maempel 2016[14]	Harris Hip Score (raw score)	483	95 (median)	86 to 99 (IQR)	548	94 (median)	86 to 99 (IQR)	93.3 (9.7)	93 (9.7)	.03 (-.09 to .16)	.33 (-.85 to 1.52)	.58
Reilly 2005[17]	Oxford Knee Assessment (raw score)	21	43.7	3.7	20	42.2	7.1			.27 (-.35 to .88)	1.5 (-2.05 to 5.05)	.40
Reilly 2005[17]	AKSS Objective (raw score)	21	88.4	10.4	20	89.4	17.5			-.07 (-.68 to .54)	-1.0 (-10.0 to 8.04)	.82
Reilly 2005[17]	AKSS Functional (raw score)	21	90.9	11.7	20	90	13.3			.07 (-.54 to .68)	.9 (-7.00 to 8.80)	.81
Reilly 2005[17]	Knee flexion ROM (degrees)	21	124.7	5.5	20	119.8	6.8			.79 (.16 to 1.43)	4.9 (1.0 to 8.8)	**<.05**
Reilly 2005[17]	Knee extension ROM (degrees)	21	-3.10	3.5	20	-2.3	3.5			-.23 (-.84 to .39)	-.8 (-3.01 to 1.41)	.47

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs for continuous data, imputed where necessary. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for dichotomous data. P-values are from independent samples t-tests (for continuous data) or z-scores (for dichotomous data). OR=Odds Ratio; SD=Standard Deviation; CI=Confidence Interval; BEL=Belfast; LIV=Liverpool; SWLEOC=South West London Elective Orthopaedic Centre; IQR=Interquartile Range; ROM=Range of Movement; AKSS=American Knee Society Score; AKSF=American Knee Society Functioning; WOMAC=Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index; SF-12=Short Form 12; EoHAQ=Experience of Hip Arthroplasty Questionnaire; n=sample size

Table 5. Data for all effectiveness outcomes for each study trialling a Prehabilitation intervention to improve recovery from lower limb arthroplasty in the UK. Mean and standard deviation (SD) are presented throughout (there was no requirement to impute data).

		Intervention			Comparator					
Study, intervention	Outcome (units)	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD	*d* (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
McGregor 2004[20]	LOS (days)	19	15		20	18				
McGregor 2004[20]	Pain (VAS 1-10)	19	7.8	1.5	20	7.6	2.0	.11 (-.52 to .74)	.2 (-.95 to 1.35)	.73
McGregor 2004[20]	WOMAC Pain (raw score)	19	10.2	2.7	20	10.3	4.1	-.03 (-.66 to .60)	-.1 (-2.37 to 2.17)	.93
McGregor 2004[20]	WOMAC Stiffness (raw score)	19	4.3	1.3	20	4.1	1.7	.13 (-.50 to .76)	.2 (-.79 to 1.19)	.68
McGregor 2004[20]	WOMAC Function (raw score)	19	35.8	12.0	20	41.0	10	-.47 (-1.11 to .17)	-5.2 (-12.4 to 1.95)	.15
McGregor 2004[20]	Harris Hip score (raw score)	19	45.4	11.5	20	43.2	16.2	.16 (-.47 to .78)	2.2 (-6.96 to 11.4)	.63
McGregor 2004[20]	Barthel ADL (raw score)	19	19.2	1.3	20	19.0	1.3	.15 (-.48 to .78)	.2 (-.64 to 1.04)	.64
Williamson 2007[21]	LOS (days)	60	6.5	1.99	61	6.6	2.62	-.04 (-.40 to .31)	-.11 (-.95 to .73)	.81
Williamson 2007[21]	Oxford Knee Score (raw score)	60	28.3	9.78	61	26.7	7.45	.18 (-.17 to .54)	1.6 (-1.53 to 4.73)	.31
Williamson 2007[21]	Time to walk 50 m (s)	60	46.6	11.4	61	44.1	6.91	.27 (-.09 to .62)	2.5 (-.89 to 5.89)	.15
Williamson 2007[21]	Pain (VAS 1-10)	60	3.9	2.59	61	3.95	2.59	-.04 (-.39 to .32)	-.09 (-1.02 to .84)	.92
Williamson 2007[21]	WOMAC (raw score)	60	26	17.7	61	24.6	16.8	.08 (-.27 to .44)	1.4 (-4.81 to 7.61)	.66
Williamson 2007[21]	HADS Anxiety (raw score)	60	4.3	4.04	61	2.4	2.39	.58 (.21 to .94)	1.84 (.65 to 3.03)	**<.01**
Williamson 2007[21]	HADS Depression (raw score)	60	3.43	2.54	61	3.68	2.93	-.11 (-.47 to .25)	-.25 (-1.24 to .74)	.62

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs. P-values are from independent samples t-tests. HADS=Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale; m=metres; VAS=Visual Analogue Scale; WOMAC=Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index; Barthel ADL=Barthel Activities of Daily Living; LOS=Length of Stay; n=sample size

Table 6. Data for all effectiveness outcomes for the study trialling a Rehabilitation intervention to improve recovery from lower limb arthroplasty in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD where calculated.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Pengas 2015[22]	LOS: Hips (days)	114	4.95	0.14 (SE)	353	5.22	0.09 (SE)	4.9 (1.5)	5.2 (1.7)	-.17 (-.38 to .05)	-.28 (-.63 to .08)	.12
Pengas 2015[22]	LOS: Knees (days)	78	5.04	0.19 (SE)	243	5.45	0.11 (SE)	5 (1.7)	5.5 (1.6)	-.25 (-.51 to .0)	-.42 (-.84 to .01)	.05
Pengas 2015[22]	Day to mobilise with two sticks: Hips	113	3.11	0.13 (SE)	357	3.53	0.08 (SE)	3.1 (1.4)	3.5 (1.5)	-.29 (-.51 to -.08)	-.42 (-.73 to -.12)	**<.01**
Pengas 2015[22]	Day to mobilise with two sticks: Knees	77	3.29	0.13 (SE)	240	3.87	0.10 (SE)	3.3 (1.1)	3.9 (1.5)	-.41 (-.67 to -.15)	-.58 (-.94 to -.22)	**<.01**
Pengas 2015[22]	Time to achieve 90 degrees flexion : Knees (days)	NR	2.49		NR	2.99						
Pengas 2015[22]	Days to achieve straight leg raise (Hips and Knees)	NR	2.49		NR	2.75						
Pengas 2015[22]	Knee ROM on discharge: Knees (degrees)	NR	86.19		NR	87.72						

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs (imputed where necessary). P-values are from independent samples t-tests. LOS=Length of Stay; SE=Standard Error CI=Confidence Interval; ROM=Range of Movement; NR=Not Reported; n=sample size

Table 7. Data for all effectiveness outcomes for the study trialling a Specialist Ward intervention to improve recovery from lower limb arthroplasty in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Barlow 2013[23]	LOS: Hips (days)	91	5.88	5.35 to 6.41 (95% CI)	114	7.50	6.96 to 8.04 (95% CI)	5.9 (2.2)	7.5 (2.9)	-1.03 (-1.32 to -.74)	-1.62 (-2.34 to -.90)	**<.001**
Barlow 2013[23]	LOS: Knees (days)	100	5.48	4.90 to 6.06 (95% CI)	108	7.72	6.95 to 8.49 (95% CI)	5.5 (2.9)	7.7 (4.0)	-1.02 (-1.31 to -.73)	-2.24 (-3.21 to -1.27)	**<.001**

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs (imputed where necessary). P-values are from independent samples t-tests. LOS=Length of Stay; CI=Confidence Interval; n=sample size

Table 8. Data for clinical outcomes for studies trialling Prehabilitation interventions to improve recovery after cardiac surgery in in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD where calculated.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Furze 2009[24]	LOS (days)	100	7.61	2.69	104	8.24	4.96			-.16 (-.43 to .12)	-.63 (-1.74 to .48)	.26
Furze 2009[24]	Non-fatal cardiac events (n)	100	1		104	2				OR: 0.52 (0.05 to 5.77)		.58
Furze 2009[24]	Deaths (n)	100	1		104	1				OR: 1.04 (0.06 to 16.86)		.98
Furze 2009[24]	No. of visits to NHS GP during 8 week follow up = 3 or above (%)	100	4		104	2.9				OR: 1.4 (0.31 to 6.43)		.66
Furze 2009[24]	No. admissions to NHS hospital during 8 week follow up = 0 (%)	100	99		104	97.1				OR: 2.94 (0.3 to 28.75)		.33
Furze 2009[24]	No. admissions to NHS hospital during 8 week follow up = 1 (%)	100	1		104	2.9				OR: 0.34 (0.03 to 3.33)		.33
Furze 2009[24]	QALY*	88	0.109	0.003	94	0.103	0.003			-2.0 (-2.36 to -1.64)	.006 (.005 to -.007)	**<.001**
Furze 2009[24]	Cardiac Depression Scale (raw score)	100	81.69		104	93.37						
Furze 2009[24]	CLASP Mobility subscale (raw score)	100	8.1		104	9.05						
Goodman 2008[25]	LOS (days)	91	8.5 (median)	6.88 to 10.13 (IQR)	90	9 (median)	7.5 to 10.5 (IQR)	8.5 (2.4)	9 (2.3)	-.21 (-.5 to .08)	-.50 (-1.19 to .19)	.16

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs for continuous data, imputed where necessary. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for dichotomous data. P-values are from independent samples t-tests (for continuous data) or z-scores (for dichotomous data). LOS=Length of stay; OR=Odds Ratio; SD=Standard deviation; CI=Confidence interval; ICU=Intensive Care Unit; IQR=Interquartile range; *Quality Adjusted Life Years: Calculated using EQ-5D questionnaire using area under the curve method; CLASP=Cardiovascular Limitations and Symptoms Profile; n=sample size

Table 9. Data for all effectiveness outcomes reported by studies trialling Specialist Ward and ERP interventions to improve recovery from cardiac surgery in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD where calculated.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study, intervention	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	LOS (days)	52	6 (median)	4 to 7 (IQR)	53	6 (median)	5 to 9 (IQR)	5.7 (2.3)	6.7 (3.0)	-.37 (-.76 to .02)	-1.0 (-2.04 to .04)	.06
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Patients with complications (n)	52	10		53	27				OR: 0.23 (0.1 to 0.55)		**<.01**
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Mortality (n)	52	1		53	2				OR: 0.5 (0.04 to 5.69)		.57
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	First postoperative intake of enteral solids: Cumulative number by POD1	52	42		53	29						
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	First postoperative intake of enteral solids: Cumulative number by POD2	52	47		53	39						
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	First postoperative intake of enteral solids: Cumulative number by POD3	52	51		53	47						
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	First postoperative intake of enteral liquids: Cumulative number by POD1	52	50		53	48						

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study, intervention	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	First postoperative intake of enteral liquids: Cumulative number by POD2	52	51		53	50						
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	First postoperative intake of enteral liquids: Cumulative number by POD3	52	52		53	51						
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Bowels opening: Cumulative number by POD1	52	0		53	3						
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Bowels opening: Cumulative number by POD2	52	12		53	13						
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Bowels opening: Cumulative number by POD3	52	35		53	30						
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Pain Day 1 (Score 0 to 3)	52	1.1	0.9	53	1.7	0.9			-.67 (-1.06 to -.27)	-.6 (-.95 to -.25)	**<.001**
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Pain Day 2 (Score 0 to 3)	52	0.9	0.6	53	1.3	0.8			-.56 (-.96 to -.17)	-.4 (-.67 to -.13)	**<.01**
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Pain Day 3 (Score 0 to 3)	52	0.4	0.7	53	0.9	0.8			-.66 (-1.06 to -.27)	-.5 (-.79 to -.21)	**<.001**
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Nausea: Day 1 (n)	52	22		53	26						
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Nausea: Day 2 (n)	52	11		53	20						
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Nausea: Day 3 (n)	52	9		53	22						

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study, intervention	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Vomiting: Day 1 (n)	52	12		53	14						
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Vomiting: Day 2 (n)	52	4		53	7						
Fleming 2016[26], ERP	Vomiting: Day 3 (n)	52	1		53	5						
Salhiyyah 2011[27], SW	Total LOS (days)	84	8.47	4.69	52	8.22	2.55			.06 (-.28 to .41)	.25 (-1.15 to 1.65)	.72
Salhiyyah 2011[27], SW	Cardiac intensive care unit stay (h)	84	8.61	31.24	52	26.79	11.58			-.71 (-1.07 to -.35)	-18.2 (-27.1 to -9.24)	**<.001**
Salhiyyah 2011[27], SW	Theatre recovery unit stay (h)	84	5.77	1.46	52	0	0					
Salhiyyah 2011[27], SW	Total intensive care unit stay (h)	84	14.38	31.23	52	26.79	11.58			-.48 (-.84 to -.13)	-12.4 (-21.3 to -3.48)	**<.01**
Salhiyyah 2011[27], SW	Progressive care unit stay (h)	84	23.92	14.32	52	8.49	15.72			1.04 (.67 to 1.41)	15.4 (10.2 to 20.6)	**<.001**
Salhiyyah 2011[27], SW	Ward stay (h)	84	137.95	62.51	52	138.9	62.26			-.02 (-.36 to .33)	-.95 (-22.7 to 20.8)	.93
Salhiyyah 2011[27], SW	Total complications (n)	84	81		52	49				OR: 1.65 (0.32 to 8.51)		.54

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs (imputed where necessary). P-values are from independent samples t-tests. ERP=Enhanced Recovery Protocol; SW=Specialist Ward; POD=Postoperative day; LOS=Length of Stay; CI=Confidence Intervals; OR=Odds Ratio; n=sample size

Table 10. Data for clinical outcomes for each study trialling an ERP intervention for recovery from upper abdominal surgery in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD where calculated.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Abu Hilal 2013[28]	Postop LOS: all patients (days)	20	8.5 (median)	7 to 13 (IQR)	24	13 (median)	10.5 to 20.5 (IQR)	9.5 (4.8)	14.7 (7.9)	-.78 (-1.39 to -.16)	-5.17 (-9.24 to -1.10)	**<.05**
Abu Hilal 2013[28]	Postop LOS: patients without complications (days)	20	8 (median)	7 to 10.5 (IQR)	24	12 (median)	10.5 to 13.5 (IQR)	8.5 (2.8)	12.0 (2.4)	-1.36 (-2.02 to -.7)	-3.5 (-5.07 to -1.93)	**<.001**
Abu Hilal 2013[28]	Complications (n)	20	8		24	16				OR: 0.33 (0.1 to 1.14)		.08
Abu Hilal 2013[28]	Readmission <30 days (n)	20	1		24	2				OR: 0.58 (0.05 to 6.9)		.66
Abu Hilal 2013[28]	Mortality <90 days (n)	20	0		24	0						
Dasari 2015[29]	LOS (days)	91	6 (median)	5 to 7 (IQR)	93	6 (median)	5 to 8 (IQR)	6.0 (1.5)	6.3 (2.3)	-.17 (-.46 to .12)	-.33 (-.89 to .23)	.24
Dasari 2015[29]	Readmissions <30 days (n)	91	9		93	12				OR: 0.58 (0.05 to 6.9)		.66
Dasari 2015[29]	Complications (n)	91	30		93	32				OR: 0.94 (0.51 to 1.73)		.84
Jones 2013[30]	Postop LOS (days)	46	4 (median)	3 to 5 (IQR)	45	7 (median)	6 to 8 (IQR)	4.0 (1.5)	7.0 (1.5)	-1.96 (-2.46 to -1.46)	-3.0 (-3.64 to -2.36)	**<.001**
Jones 2013[30]	Readmissions (n)	46	2		45	0						.16
Jones 2013[30]	Mortality (n)	46	1		45	1						1.0
Jones 2013[30]	Total liver complications (n)	46	10		45	8				OR: 1.28 (0.46 to 3.62)		.64
Jones 2013[30]	Patients with liver complications	46	15		45	11				OR: 1.43 (0.41 to 4.91)		.57

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
	(%)											
Jones 2013[30]	Number of general complications (n)	46	4		45	20				OR: 0.12 (0.04 to 0.39)		**<.001**
Jones 2013[30]	Patients with general complications (n)	46	3		45	12				OR: 0.2 (0.05 to 0.75)		**<.05**
Richardson 2015[31]	LOS (days)	22	3 (median)	3 to 4 (IQR)	44	6 (median)	5 to 10 (IQR)	3.3 (0.8)	7.0 (3.8)	-1.16 (-1.71 to -.61)	-3.67 (-5.32 to -2.01)	**<.001**
Richardson 2015[31]	Complications: C-D Grade 3b, 4, 5 (n)	22	0		44	0						
Richardson 2015[31]	Complications: Overall (n)	22	6		44	17				OR: 0.6 (0.19 to 1.82)		.36
Richardson 2015[31]	Readmissions <30 days	22	2		44	8				OR: 0.45 (0.09 to 2.33)		.33
Sutcliffe 2015[32]	Readmissions <30 days (n)	63	5		60	9				OR: 0.49 (0.15 to 1.55)		.22
Sutcliffe 2015[32]	LOS (days)	65	9 (median)	4 to 70 (range)	65	10 (median)	4 to 114 (range)					
Sutcliffe 2015[32]	Mortality <30 days (n)	65	2		65	2				OR: 1 (0.14 to 7.32)		1.0
Sutcliffe 2015[32]	Mortality <60 days (n)	65	2		65	3				OR: 0.66 (0.11 to 4.06)		.65

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs for continuous data, imputed where necessary. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for dichotomous data. P-values are from independent samples t-tests (for continuous data) or z-scores (for dichotomous data). LOS=Length of stay; OR=Odds Ratio; SD=Standard deviation; CI=Confidence interval; PD=Pancreaticoduodenectomy; C-D=Clavien-Dindo; n=sample size

Table 11. Data for patient-reported outcomes for each study trialling an ERP intervention to improve recovery after upper abdominal surgery in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD where calculated.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* (95% CI)	Mean change (95% CI)	p
Abu Hilal 2013[28]	Days to remove nasogastric tube	20	5 (median)	4 to 6 (IQR)	24	7 (median)	6 to 12 (IQR)	5.0 (1.6)	8.3 (4.7)	-.91 (-1.54 to -.29)	-3.33 (-5.57 to -1.10)	**<.01**
Abu Hilal 2013[28]	Days to remove naso-jejunal tube	20	0 (median)		24	7 (median)	6 to 10.5 (IQR)	0.0 (0)	7.8 (3.5)	+	-7.83 (-9.44 to -6.23)	**<.001**
Abu Hilal 2013[28]	Days to start liquid diet	20	2 (median)	2 to 3.5 (IQR)	24	5 (median)	4 to 7 (IQR)	2.5 (1.2)	5.3 (2.4)	-1.47 (-2.14 to -.8)	-2.83 (-4.01 to -1.66)	**<.001**
Abu Hilal 2013[28]	Days to start solid food	20	4 (median)	3 to 5.5 (IQR)	24	9 (median)	6 to 12 (IQR)	4.2 (2.0)	9.0 (4.7)	-1.29 (-1.94 to -.64)	-4.83 (-7.12 to 2.54)	**<.001**
Abu Hilal 2013[28]	Days to pass stool	20	6 (median)	4.5 to 7 (IQR)	24	7 (median)	6 to 10 (IQR)	5.8 (2.0)	7.7 (3.2)	-.68 (-1.29 to -.07)	-1.83 (-3.48 to -.19)	**<.05**
Dasari 2015[29]	Time to discharge criteria (days)	91	5 (median)	4 to 7 (IQR)	93	5 (median)	4 to 7 (IQR)	5.3 (2.3)	5.3 (2.3)	.0 (-.29 to .29)	0.0 (-.66 to .66)	1.0
Jones 2013[30]	Time to being medically fit for discharge (days)	46	3 (median)	3 to 4 (IQR)	45	6 (median)	6 to 7 (IQR)	3.3 (0.8)	6.3 (0.8)	-3.92 (-4.63 to -3.21)	-3.0 (-3.32 to -2.68)	**<.001**
Jones 2013[30]	EQ-5D (Area Under Curve)	46	37.2		45	35.6						
Richardson 2015[31]	Days to mobilise	22	1 (median)	1 to 1 (IQR)	44	2 (median)	1 to 2 (IQR)	1.0 (0.0)	1.7 (0.8)	+	-.67 (-.99 to -.34)	**<.001**
Richardson 2015[31]	Days to removal of nasogastric tube	22	1 (median)	1 to 2 (IQR)	44	1 (median)	1 to 3 (IQR)	1.3 (0.8)	1.7 (1.5)	-.25 (-.76 to .26)	-.33 (-1.03 to .36)	.34
Richardson 2015[31]	Days to start liquid diet	22	1 (median)	1 to 1 (IQR)	44	1 (median)	1 to 2 (IQR)	1.0 (0.0)	1.3 (0.8)	+	-.33 (-.66 to -.01)	**<.05**
Richardson 2015[31]	Days to start solid diet	22	2 (median)	2 to 2 (IQR)	44	3 (median)	2 to 4 (IQR)	2.0 (0.0)	3.0 (1.5)	+	-1.0 (-1.66 to -.34)	**<.01**
Richardson 2015[31]	Days to pass flatus	22	3 (median)	2 to 4 (IQR)	44	4 (median)	2 to 5 (IQR)	3.0 (1.6)	3.7 (2.3)	-.32 (-.83 to .2)	-.67 (-1.76 to .42)	.22
Richardson 2015[31]	Days to pass stool	22	3 (median)	3 to 5 (IQR)	44	5 (median)	5 to 7 (IQR)	3.7 (1.6)	5.7 (1.5)	-1.29 (-1.85 to -.73)	-2.0 (-2.80 to -1.19)	**<.001**

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs, imputed where necessary. P-values are from independent samples t-tests. CI=Confidence Interval; SD=Standard Deviation; HR=High Risk patients; QoL=Quality of Life; +Not calculable due to zero standard deviation; n=sample size

Table 12. Data for all effectiveness outcomes for the one study trialling a Prehabilitation intervention to improve recovery after upper abdominal surgery in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD where calculated.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* (95% CI)	Mean change (95% CI)	p
Dunne 2016[33]	Duration of stay in critical care (days)	19	1 (median)	1 to 2 (IQR)	15	1.5 (median)	1 to 2 (IQR)	1.3 (0.8)	1.5 (0.8)	-.21 (-.89 to .47)	-.17 (-.74 to .40)	.55
Dunne 2016[33]	LOS (days)	19	5 (median)	4 to 6 (IQR)	15	5 (median)	4.5 to 7 (IQR)	5.0 (1.6)	5.5 (2)	-.28 (-.96 to .4)	-.5 (-1.77 to .77)	.43
Dunne 2016[33]	Readmissions (n)	19	4		15	0						.06
Dunne 2016[33]	Oxygen uptake at anaerobic threshold (ml per kg per min)	19	12.2	2.4	16	11.0	2.1			.53 (-.15 to 1.21)	1.2 (-.37 to 2.77)	.13
Dunne 2016[33]	Oxygen uptake at peak (ml per kg per min)	19	19.6	3.8	16	18.7	4.1			.23 (-.44 to .9)	.9 (-1.82 to 3.62)	.51
Dunne 2016[33]	Oxygen pulse at anaerobic threshold (ml/beat)	19	9.6	2.9	16	9.6	3.3			0 (-.67 to .67)	0 (-2.13 to 2.13)	1.0
Dunne 2016[33]	Oxygen pulse at peak (ml/beat)	19	11.6	3.0	16	12.1	3.8			-.15 (-.81 to .52)	-.5 (-2.84 to 1.84)	.67
Dunne 2016[33]	Peak work rate (W)	19	138	35	16	140	39			-.05 (-.72 to .61)	-2.0 -27.5 to 23.5)	.87
Dunne 2016[33]	Heart rate reserve (beats/min)	19	62	20	16	57	17			.27 (-.4 to .94)	5.0 (-7.91 to 17.9)	.44
Dunne 2016[33]	SF-36: Physical health subscale (raw score)	19	72	20	16	68	21			.2 (-.47 to 0.86)	4.0 (-10.1 to 18.1)	.57
Dunne 2016[33]	SF-36: Mental health subscale (raw score)	19	77	19	16	72	23			.24 (-.43 to .91)	5.0 (-9.44 to 19.4)	.49

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* (95% CI)	Mean change (95% CI)	p
Dunne 2016[33]	SF-36: QoL subscale (raw score)	19	77	18	16	71	22			.3 (-.37 to .97)	6.0 (-7.75 to 19.8)	.38
Dunne 2016[33]	High Risk: Oxygen uptake at anaerobic threshold (ml per kg per min)	9	11.9	2.2	8	9.4	1.1			1.41 (.33 to 2.49)	2.5 (.66 to 4.34)	**<.05**
Dunne 2016[33]	High Risk: Oxygen uptake at peak (ml per kg per min)	9	18.9	4.7	8	16	3.5			.69 (-.29 to 1.68)	2.9 (-1.43 to 7.23)	.17
Dunne 2016[33]	High Risk: Oxygen pulse at anaerobic threshold (ml/beat)	9	9.3	2.2	8	7.3	1.7			1.01 (-.01 to 2.03)	2.0 (-.05 to 4.05)	.06
Dunne 2016[33]	High Risk: Oxygen pulse at peak (ml/beat)	9	11.3	2.2	8	9.5	2.0			.85 (-.15 to 1.85)	1.8 (-.38 to 3.98)	.10
Dunne 2016[33]	High Risk: Peak work rate (W)	9	130.0	34.0	8	117	28.0			.41 (-.55 to 1.38)	13.0 (-19.5 to 45.5)	.41
Dunne 2016[33]	High Risk: Heart rate reserve (beats/min)	9	58.0	23.0	8	55.0	22.0			.13 (-.82 to 1.09)	3.0 (-20.3 to 26.3)	.79
Dunne 2016[33]	High Risk: SF-36 Physical health subscale (raw score)	9	66.0	27.0	8	56.0	15.0			.45 (-.52 to 1.42)	10.00 (-13.0 to 33.0)	.37
Dunne 2016[33]	High Risk: SF-36 Mental health subscale (raw score)	9	75.0	24.0	8	61.0	25.0			.57 (-.4 to 1.55)	14.0 (-11.3 to 39.3)	.26
Dunne 2016[33]	High Risk: SF-36 QoL subscale,	9	73.0	23.0	8	59.0	21.0			.63 (-.35 to 1.61)	14.0 (-8.88 to 36.9)	.21

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* (95% CI)	Mean change (95% CI)	p
	(raw score)											

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs, imputed where necessary. P-values are from independent samples t-tests. LOS=Length of Stay; SF-36=Short Form 36; W=Watts; SD=Standard Deviation; CI=Confidence Interval; QoL=Quality of Life; n=sample size

Table 13. Data for clinical outcomes for studies trialling ERP interventions to improve recovery from thoracic surgery in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD where calculated.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Brunelli 2017[34]	LOS (days)	235	5 (median)	3 to 7 (IQR)	365	4 (median)	3 to 7 (IQR)	5.0 (3.0)	4.7 (3.0)	.11 (-.05 to .28)	.33 (-.16 to .82)	.18
Brunelli 2017[34]	LOS > 5 days (%)	235	41		365	35				OR: 1.29 (0.92 to 1.81)		.14
Brunelli 2017[34]	Readmission <30 days (%)	235	7.2		365	7.4				OR: 0.97 (0.52 to 1.82)		.93
Brunelli 2017[34]	Readmission <90 days (%)	235	9.8		365	12.3				OR: 0.77 (0.46 to 1.32)		.35
Brunelli 2017[34]	Relative 90 day readmission (%)	235	2.6		365	4.9				OR: 0.52 (0.2 to 1.32)		.16
Brunelli 2017[34]	Cardiovascular and pulmonary complications	235	53		365	82				OR: 1.01 (0.68 to 1.49)		.98
Brunelli 2017[34]	In-hospital mortality	235	6		365	8				OR: 1.17 (0.4 to 3.41)		.78
Gatenby 2015[35]	Critical Care Unit LOS (days)	27	6 (median)	1 to 26 (range)	35	6 (median)	2 to 41 (range)					
Gatenby 2015[35]	LOS (days)	27	15 (median)	8 to 42 (range)	35	18 (median)	9 to 56 (range)					
Gatenby 2015[35]	Complications at 3b, 4 or 5 Clavien-Dindo rating (n)	27	2		35	2				OR: 1.32 (0.17 to 10.03)		.79
Gatenby 2015[35]	Mortality (n)	27	1		35	0						.25
Gatenby 2015[35]	Readmissions (n)	27	1		35	1				OR: 1.31 (0.08 to 21.91)		.85
Karran 2016[36]	LOS: All patients (days)	160	13 (median)	10 to 17 (IQR)	92	16 (median)	13 to 26 (IQR)	13.3 (5.2)	18.3 (9.8)	-.69 (-.95 to -.43)	-5.0 (-6.86 to -3.14)	**<.001**
Karran 2016[36]	LOS in critical care: All patients	160	1 (median)	0 to 1 (IQR)	92	1 (median)	1 to 2 (IQR)	0.7 (0.7)	1.3 (0.8)	-.89 (-1.16 to -.62)	-.67 (-.86 to -.47)	**<.001**

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
	(days)											
Karran 2016[36]	Readmission: All patients <30 days (n)	160	13		92	4				OR: 1.47 (0.45 to 4.82)		.53
Karran 2016[36]	LOS: Oesophageal surgery patients (days)	81	15 (median)	12 to 19.5 (IQR)	58	18 (median)	13.8 to 31.3 (IQR)	15.5 (5.7)	21.0 (13.3)	-.58 (-.92 to -.23)	-5.53 (-8.80 to -2.26)	**<.01**
Karran 2016[36]	LOS in critical care: Oesophageal surgery patients (days)	81	1 (median)	1 to 2 (IQR)	58	1 (median)	1 to 4 (IQR)	1.3 (0.8)	2.0 (2.3)	-.42 (-.76 to -.08)	-.67 (-1.20 to -.13)	**<.05**
Karran 2016[36]	Readmission: Oesophageal surgery patients <30 days (n)	81	7		58	4				OR: 1.28 (0.36 to 4.58)		.71
Karran 2016[36]	LOS: Gastric surgery patients (days)	79	11 (median)	8 to 15 (IQR)	34	14 (median)	12 to 18 (IQR)	11.3 (5.3)	14.7 (4.6)	-.65 (-1.06 to -.24)	-3.33 (-5.41 to -1.26)	**<.01**
Karran 2016[36]	LOS in critical care: Gastric surgery patients (days)	79	0 (median)	0 to 1 (IQR)	34	1 (median)	1 to 1 (IQR)	0.3 (0.8)	1.0 (0.0)	+	<.67 (-.92 to -.41)	**<.001**
Karran 2016[36]	Readmission: Gastric surgery patients <30 days (n)	79	6		34	0						.10
Karran 2016[36]	Patients suffering Clavien-Dindo morbidity grade C3 complications (n)	79	22		34	16				OR: 0.43 (0.19 to 1)		**<.05**
Karran	Mortality <30	79	5		34	2				OR: 1.08		.93

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
2016[36]	days (n)									(0.2 to 5.87)		

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs for continuous data, imputed where necessary. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for dichotomous data. P-values are from independent samples t-tests (for continuous data) or z-scores (for dichotomous data). LOS=Length of Stay; SD=Standard deviation; CI=Confidence interval; ICU=Intensive Care Unit; OR=Odds Ratio; +Not calculable due to zero standard deviation; n=sample size

Table 14. Data for all effectiveness outcomes for the two studies trialling an ERP intervention to improve recovery from pelvic surgery in the UK. Reported values are presented (mean and standard deviation (SD) unless indicated), as well as imputed means and SD where calculated.

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study, intervention	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Arumainayagam 2008[37]	Time to defecation (days)	56	6 (median)		56	6 (median)						
Arumainayagam 2008[37]	LOS (days)	56	13 (median)	11 to 17 (IQR)	56	17 (median)	15 to 23 (IQR)	13.7 (4.6)	18.3 (6.1)	-.85 (-1.24 to -.46)	-4.67 (-6.68 to -2.65)	**<.001**
Arumainayagam 2008[37]	Postop LOS (days)	56	12 (median)	10 to 15 (IQR)	56	15 (median)	13 to 21 (IQR)	12.3 (3.8)	16.3 (6.1)	-.79 (-1.17 to -.4)	-4.0 (-5.90 to -2.10)	**<.001**
Arumainayagam 2008[37]	Complications (n)	56	18		56	23				OR: 0.68 (0.31 to 1.47)		.33
Arumainayagam 2008[37]	Return to theatre (n)	56	4		56	3				OR: 1.36 (0.29 to 6.37)		.70
Arumainayagam 2008[37]	Deaths <28 days (n with days after surgery)	56	1 (20 days)		56	1 (7 days)				OR: 1 (0.06 to 16.39)		1.0
Arumainayagam 2008[37]	Readmissions within 28 days	56	3		56	5				OR: 0.58 (0.13 to 2.54)		.46
Mukhtar 2013[38]	Total theatre time (mins)	51	335.0	10.0	26	315.0	10.0			2.0 (1.43 to 2.57)	20.0 (15.2 to 24.8)	**<.001**
Mukhtar 2013[38]	ICU LOS (days)	51	1.0	0.1	26	2.4	0.9			-2.66 (-3.3 to -2.03)	-1.4 (-1.65 to -1.15)	**<.001**
Mukhtar 2013[38]	Time to removal of nasogastric tube (days)	51	2.0	0.3	26	5.1	1.2			-4.22 (-5.04 to -3.39)	-3.1 (-3.45 to -2.75)	**<.001**
Mukhtar 2013[38]	Time to removal of intravenous	51	3.6	0.3	26	4.9	0.5			-3.43 (-4.16 to -	-1.3 (-1.48 to -1.12)	**<.001**

		Intervention			Comparator			Intervention	Comparator			
Study, intervention	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	Imputed Mean (SD)	Imputed Mean (SD)	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
	fluids (days)									2.71)		
Mukhtar 2013[38]	LOS (days)	51	10.4 (median)	6 to 62 (range)	26	11.5 (median)	7 to 24 (range)					
Mukhtar 2013[38]	LOS with outlier removed (days)	51	11.5		26	12.9						
Mukhtar 2013[38]	Complications (n)	51	19		26	11				OR: 0.81 (0.31 to 2.12)		.67
Mukhtar 2013[38]	Time to passage of flatus (days)	51	4.6	0.2	26	6.2	0.4			-5.66 (-6.68 to -4.64)	-1.6 (-1.74 to -1.46)	**<.001**
Mukhtar 2013[38]	Time to passage of faeces (days)	51	6.1	0.3	26	7.4	0.5			-3.43 (-4.16 to -2.71)	-1.3 (-1.48 to -1.12)	**<.001**
Mukhtar 2013[38]	Time to full oral diet (days)	51	4.6	0.2	26	5.9	0.3			-5.46 (-6.45 to -4.47)	-1.3 (-1.41 to -1.19)	**<.001**

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs for continuous data, imputed where necessary. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for dichotomous data. P-values are from independent samples t-tests (for continuous data) or z-scores (for dichotomous data). LOS=Length of stay; SD=Standard deviation; CI=Confidence interval; ICU=Intensive Care Unit; OR=Odds Ratio; n=sample size

Table 15. Data for all effectiveness outcomes for the study trialling an intervention to improve recovery from vascular surgery in the UK. Mean and standard deviation are presented.

		Intervention			Comparator					
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Partridge 2017[39]	LOS (days)	85	3.32		91	5.53				
Partridge 2017[39]	New comorbid diagnoses made at assessment (%)	101	63.40		100	5		OR: 32.91 (12.28 to 88.24)		**<.001**
Partridge 2017[39]	Incidence of postoperative delirium (%)	85	11		91	24		OR: 0.39 (0.17 to 0.9)		**<.05**
Partridge 2017[39]	Fall (%)	85	2		91	8		OR: 0.23 (0.04 to 1.28)		.07
Partridge 2017[39]	Cardiac complications (%)	85	8		91	27		OR: 0.24 (0.09 to 0.58)		**<.01**
Partridge 2017[39]	Pulmonary complications (%)	85	9		91	14		OR: 0.61 (0.23 to 1.57)		.30
Partridge 2017[39]	Infective complications (%)	85	16		91	27		OR: 0.51 (0.25 to 1.08)		.08
Partridge 2017[39]	Bowel and bladder complications (%)	85	33		91	55		OR: 0.4 (0.22 to 0.74)		**<.01**
Partridge 2017[39]	Postoperative vascular surgery related issues (%)	85	7		91	11		OR: 0.61 (0.21 to 1.76)		.36
Partridge 2017[39]	Discharge timed get up and go (seconds)	85	18.9	1.8	91	20.1	11.6	-.14 (-.44 to .15)	-1.2 (-3.71 to 1.31)	.35
Partridge 2017[39]	Discharge gait speed ($m.s^{-1}$)	85	0.7	0.3	91	0.7	0.2	.0 (-.3 to .3)	0 (-.08 to .08)	1.0
Partridge 2017[39]	Postoperative blood transfusion (units infused)	85	0.3	0.7	91	1	3.7	-.26 (-.56 to .04)	-.7 (-1.51 to .11)	.09
Partridge 2017[39]	Discharge to higher care (%)	85	14		91	5		OR: 0.35 (0.11 to 1.11)		.07
Partridge 2017[39]	Readmission < 30 days (%)	85	18		91	11		OR: 1.95 (0.86 to 4.42)		.10
Partridge 2017[39]	Level 2/3 care used immediately after surgery (%)	85	31		91	43		OR: 0.6 (0.32 to 1.11)		.10

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs for continuous data. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for dichotomous data. P-values are from independent samples t-tests (for continuous data) or z-scores (for dichotomous data). LOS=Length of Stay; CI=Confidence interval; SIRS= Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome; OR=Odds Ratio; n=sample size

Table 16. Data for effectiveness outcomes from the study trialling a preoperative assessment intervention to improve recovery from various elective surgeries in the UK. Mean and standard deviation (SD) is presented unless indicated.

		Intervention			Comparator					
Study	Outcome (units)	n	Estimate	Variance	n	Estimate	Variance	*d* or OR (95% CI)	Mean difference (95% CI)	p
Ellis 2012[40]	Referrals – OT (%)	172	22.1		141	42.6				
Ellis 2012[40]	Referrals – Physiotherapy (%)	172	35.5		141	58.2				
Ellis 2012[40]	Referrals - Dietician (%)	172	3.5		141	8.5				
Ellis 2012[40]	Referrals - Social work/early supported discharge (%)	172	3.5		141	9.9				
Ellis 2012[40]	Referrals - Falls team (%)	172	0.0		141	4.3				
Ellis 2012[40]	Referrals - GP or district nurse (%)	172	1.7		141	5.0				
Ellis 2012[40]	Referrals - Carer support worker (%)	172	1.7		141	2.1				
Ellis 2012[40]	Referrals - Other agencies (%)	172	4.7		141	3.5				
Ellis 2012[40]	Total complications (%)	172	2.3		141	8.5		OR: 0.24 (0.08 to 0.76)		**<.01**
Ellis 2012[40]	LOS (days)	172	4.9	5.0	141	8.9	7.6	-.63 (-.86 to -.41)	-4.0 (-5.40 to -2.59)	**<.001**
Ellis 2012[40]	MMSE (raw score)	34	26.7	2.9	53	26	2.9	.24 (-.19 to .67)	0.7 (-.57 to 1.97)	.27

Standardised (Cohen's *d*) and non-standardised mean differences with 95% and confidence intervals were calculated from means and SDs for continuous data. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for dichotomous data. P-values are from independent samples t-tests (for continuous data) or z-scores (for dichotomous data). LOS=Length of Stay; OR=Odds Ratio; SD=Standard deviation; CI=Confidence interval; OT=Occupational Therapist; MMSE=Mini Mental State Exam; n=sample size

References

1. Anderson AD, McNaught CE, MacFie J, Tring I, Barker P, Mitchell CJ. Randomized clinical trial of multimodal optimization and standard perioperative surgical care. *Br J Surg* 2003;**90**:1497-504. https://doi.org/10.1002/bjs.4371

2. Gatt M, Anderson AD, Reddy BS, Hayward-Sampson P, Tring IC, MacFie J. Randomized clinical trial of multimodal optimization of surgical care in patients undergoing major colonic resection. *Br J Surg* 2005;**92**:1354-62. https://doi.org/10.1002/bjs.5187

3. Dhruva Rao PK, Howells S, Haray PN. Does an enhanced recovery programme add value to laparoscopic colorectal resections? *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2015;**30**:1473-7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00384-015-2320-9

4. Khan SA, Ullah S, Ahmed J, Wilson TR, McNaught C, Hartley J, *et al.* Influence of enhanced recovery after surgery pathways and laparoscopic surgery on health-related quality of life. *Colorectal Dis* 2013;**15**:900-7. https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.12191

5. Khoo CK, Vickery CJ, Forsyth N, Vinall NS, Eyre-Brook IA. A prospective randomized controlled trial of multimodal perioperative management protocol in patients undergoing elective colorectal resection for cancer. *Ann Surg* 2007;**245**:867-72. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.sla.0000259219.08209.36

6. King PM, Blazeby JM, Ewings P, Longman RJ, Kipling RM, Franks PJ, *et al.* The influence of an enhanced recovery programme on clinical outcomes, costs and quality of life after surgery for colorectal cancer. *Colorectal Dis* 2006;**8**:506-13. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1463-1318.2006.00963.x

7. Lidder P, Thomas S, Fleming S, Hosie K, Shaw S, Lewis S. A randomized placebo controlled trial of preoperative carbohydrate drinks and early postoperative nutritional supplement drinks in colorectal surgery. *Colorectal Dis* 2013;**15**:737-45. https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.12130

8. Dwyer AJ, Tarassoli P, Thomas W, Porter P. Enhanced recovery program in total hip arthroplasty. *Indian J Orthop* 2012;**46**:407-12. https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5413.98829

9. Gordon D, Malhas A, Goubran A, Subramanian P, Messer C, Houlihan-Burne D. Implementing the Rapid Recovery Program in primary hip and knee arthroplasty in a UK state run hospital. *Eur J Orthop Surg Tr* 2011;**21**:151-8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00590-010-0690-9

10. Harari D, Hopper A, Dhesi J, Babic-Illman G, Lockwood L, Martin F. Proactive care of older people undergoing surgery ('POPS'): designing, embedding, evaluating and funding a comprehensive geriatric assessment service for older elective surgical patients. *Age Ageing* 2007;**36**:190-6. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afl163

11. Hunt GR, Crealey G, Murthy BV, Hall GM, Constantine P, O'Brien S, *et al.* The consequences of early discharge after hip arthroplasty for patient outcomes and health care

costs: comparison of three centres with differing durations of stay. *Clin Rehabil* 2009;**23**:1067-77. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269215509339000

12. Khan SK, Malviya A, Muller SD, Carluke I, Partington PF, Emmerson KP, *et al.* Reduced short-term complications and mortality following Enhanced Recovery primary hip and knee arthroplasty: results from 6,000 consecutive procedures. *Acta Orthop* 2014;**85**:26-31. https://doi.org/10.3109/17453674.2013.874925

13. Maempel JF, Walmsley PJ. Enhanced recovery programmes can reduce length of stay after total knee replacement without sacrificing functional outcome at one year. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2015;**97**:563-7. https://doi.org/10.1308/rcsann.2015.0016

14. Maempel JF, Clement ND, Ballantyne JA, Dunstan E. Enhanced recovery programmes after total hip arthroplasty can result in reduced length of hospital stay without compromising functional outcome. *Bone Joint J* 2016;**98-B**:475-82. https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.98B4.36243

15. Malviya A, Martin K, Harper I, Muller SD, Emmerson KP, Partington PF, *et al.* Enhanced recovery program for hip and knee replacement reduces death rate. *Acta Orthop* 2011;**82**:577-81. https://doi.org/10.3109/17453674.2011.618911

16. Mertes SC, Raut S, Khanduja V. Integrated care pathways in lower-limb arthroplasty: are they effective in reducing length of hospital stay? *Int Orthop* 2013;**37**:1157-63. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-013-1829-1

17. Reilly KA, Beard DJ, Barker KL, Dodd CA, Price AJ, Murray DW. Efficacy of an accelerated recovery protocol for Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty--a randomised controlled trial. *Knee* 2005;**12**:351-7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knee.2005.01.002

18. Starks I, Wainwright TW, Lewis J, Lloyd J, Middleton RG. Older patients have the most to gain from orthopaedic enhanced recovery programmes. *Age Ageing* 2014;**43**:642-8. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afu014

19. Salmon P, Hunt GR, Murthy BV, O'Brien S, Beverland D, Lynch MC, *et al.* Patient evaluation of early discharge after hip arthroplasty: development of a measure and comparison of three centres with differing durations of stay. *Clin Rehabil* 2013;**27**:854-63. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269215513481686

20. McGregor AH, Rylands H, Owen A, Dore CJ, Hughes SP. Does preoperative hip rehabilitation advice improve recovery and patient satisfaction? *J Arthroplasty* 2004;**19**:464-8.

21. Williamson L, Wyatt MR, Yein K, Melton JT. Severe knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial of acupuncture, physiotherapy (supervised exercise) and standard management for patients awaiting knee replacement. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2007;**46**:1445-9. https://doi.org/10.1093/rheumatology/kem119

22. Pengas IP, Khan WS, Bennett CA, Rankin KS. Impact of Weekend Physiotherapy Service on the Cost Effectiveness of Elective Orthopaedic Hip and Knee Arthroplasty. *Open Orthop J* 2015;**9**:515-9. https://doi.org/10.2174/1874325001509010515

23. Barlow D, Masud S, Rhee SJ, Ganapathi M, Andrews G. The effect of the creation of a ring-fenced orthopaedic ward on length of stay for elective arthroplasty patients. *Surgeon* 2013;**11**:82-6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surge.2012.03.001

24. Furze G, Dumville JC, Miles JN, Irvine K, Thompson DR, Lewin RJ. "Prehabilitation" prior to CABG surgery improves physical functioning and depression. *Int J Cardiol* 2009;**132**:51-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2008.06.001

25. Goodman H, Parsons A, Davison J, Preedy M, Peters E, Shuldham C, *et al.* A randomised controlled trial to evaluate a nurse-led programme of support and lifestyle management for patients awaiting cardiac surgery 'Fit for surgery: Fit for life' study. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs* 2008;**7**:189-95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejcnurse.2007.11.001

26. Fleming IO, Garratt C, Guha R, Desai J, Chaubey S, Wang Y, *et al.* Aggregation of Marginal Gains in Cardiac Surgery: Feasibility of a Perioperative Care Bundle for Enhanced Recovery in Cardiac Surgical Patients. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth* 2016;**30**:665-70. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jvca.2016.01.017

27. Salhiyyah K, Elsobky S, Raja S, Attia R, Brazier J, Cooper GJ. A clinical and economic evaluation of fast-track recovery after cardiac surgery. *Heart Surg Forum* 2011;**14**:E330-4. https://doi.org/10.1532/HSF98.20111029

28. Abu Hilal M, Di Fabio F, Badran A, Alsaati H, Clarke H, Fecher I, *et al.* Implementation of enhanced recovery programme after pancreatoduodenectomy: a single-centre UK pilot study. *Pancreatology* 2013;**13**:58-62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pan.2012.11.312

29. Dasari BVM, Rahman R, Khan S, Bennett D, Hodson J, Isaac J, *et al.* Safety and feasibility of an enhanced recovery pathway after a liver resection: prospective cohort study. *HPB (Oxford)* 2015;**17**:700-6. https://doi.org/10.1111/hpb.12447

30. Jones C, Kelliher L, Dickinson M, Riga A, Worthington T, Scott MJ, *et al.* Randomized clinical trial on enhanced recovery versus standard care following open liver resection. *Br J Surg* 2013;**100**:1015-24. https://doi.org/10.1002/bjs.9165

31. Richardson J, Di Fabio F, Clarke H, Bajalan M, Davids J, Abu Hilal M. Implementation of enhanced recovery programme for laparoscopic distal pancreatectomy: feasibility, safety and cost analysis. *Pancreatology* 2015;**15**:185-90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pan.2015.01.002

32. Sutcliffe RP, Hamoui M, Isaac J, Marudanayagam R, Mirza DF, Muiesan P, *et al.* Implementation of an Enhanced Recovery Pathway After Pancreaticoduodenectomy in Patients with Low Drain Fluid Amylase. *World J Surg* 2015;**39**:2023-30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-015-3051-3

33. Dunne DFJ, Jack S, Jones RP, Jones L, Lythgoe DT, Malik HZ, *et al.* Randomized clinical trial of prehabilitation before planned liver resection. *Br J Surg* 2016;**103**:504-12. https://doi.org/10.1002/bjs.10096

34. Brunelli A, Thomas C, Dinesh P, Lumb A. Enhanced recovery pathway versus standard care in patients undergoing video-assisted thoracoscopic lobectomy. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2017;**154**:2084-90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2017.06.037

35. Gatenby PAC, Shaw C, Hine C, Scholtes S, Koutra M, Andrew H, *et al.* Retrospective cohort study of an enhanced recovery programme in oesophageal and gastric cancer surgery. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2015;**97**:502-7. https://doi.org/10.1308/003588415x14181254789880

36. Karran A, Wheat J, Chan D, Blake P, Barlow R, Lewis WG. Propensity Score Analysis of an Enhanced Recovery Programme in Upper Gastrointestinal Cancer Surgery. *World J Surg* 2016;**40**:1645-54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-016-3473-6

37. Arumainayagam N, McGrath J, Jefferson KP, Gillatt DA. Introduction of an enhanced recovery protocol for radical cystectomy. *BJU Int* 2008;**101**:698-701. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-410X.2007.07319.x

38. Mukhtar S, Ayres BE, Issa R, Swinn MJ, Perry MJ. Challenging boundaries: an enhanced recovery programme for radical cystectomy. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2013;**95**:200-6. https://doi.org/10.1308/003588413X13511609957579

39. Partridge JS, Harari D, Martin FC, Peacock JL, Bell R, Mohammed A, *et al.* Randomized clinical trial of comprehensive geriatric assessment and optimization in vascular surgery. *Br J Surg* 2017;**104**:679-87. https://doi.org/10.1002/bjs.10459

40. Ellis G, Spiers M, Coutts S, Fairburn P, McCracken L. Preoperative assessment in the elderly: evaluation of a new clinical service. *Scott Med J* 2012;**57**:212-6. https://doi.org/10.1258/smj.2012.012120