

Supplementary data

Appendix 1:

Data abstraction and quality assessment

The titles and abstracts of all identified citations were screened by one member of the review team (PAC). Using criteria adapted from materials on evaluating patient-based outcome measures [20] and prognostic studies [21] one reviewer (PAC) designed a proforma to extract information and data on recruitment strategy and sample selection, outcomes, follow-up, data collection methods, prognostic variables, analytic techniques, cross-validation, acceptability and feasibility. To ensure standardisation the form was pilot tested on two papers that failed to meet our inclusion criteria on grounds of age of patients.

One reviewer (PAC) assessed the methodological quality of the included studies using a modified list of recommended criteria for evaluating internal, statistical and external validity [22, 23]. As with the data extraction form, the criteria list was pilot tested in two studies excluded from the review. The final list consisted of 19 items (Table 1). Each item was scored using a binary scale (1/0) adapted from systematic reviews of prognostic factors [24, 25, 26]. For each selected study, items that met each criterion were awarded a positive value. A zero value was awarded if the item was absent or insufficiently described. The total score (1–19) was used to rank the studies in terms of methodological quality and evidence level. Studies that had a total score of ≥ 14 ($\geq 70\%$) were considered good and classified as level A evidence; scores of 10–13 were considered moderate, level B evidence; scores of ≤ 9 ($< 50\%$) were considered poor, level C evidence.

Appendix 2 Criteria for assessing reliability and validity of studies of prognoses in patients with life-threatening non-malignant disease

	Criterion	Score
To evaluate internal validity		
Description of inclusion and/or exclusion criteria	A	1/0
Subjects recruited at a common point during course of disease	B	1/0
Consecutive sample	C	1/0
Follow-up long enough (to yield adequate outcome events)	D	1/0
Drop-outs/loss to follow-up <20%	E	1/0
Follow-up known for all or high proportion of (completer) patients	F	1/0
Data collected prospectively (blinded to outcome)	G	1/0
Data collected for purposes of reported study	H	1/0
Selection of prognostic variables evidence based	I	1/0
All important prognostic variables included	J	1/0
		1/0
To evaluate statistical validity		
Sample size adequate (positive if ratio of patients to variables $\geq 10:1$)	K	1/0
Appropriate univariate/bivariate analysis	L	1/0
Appropriate multivariate analysis	M	1/0
Adjustment for confounding factors	N	1/0
Appropriate regression analysis technique	O	1/0
Numerical summary of prognostic strength of variable(s)/model	P	1/0
		1/0
To evaluate external validity		
Description of clinical/socio-demographic characteristics	Q	1/0
Description of medical and other interventions during observation	R	1/0
Cross-validation in a (second) independent group	S	1/0

1= positive (design or conduct adequate); 0= negative (design or conduct inadequate or item insufficiently described)

Appendix 3

Methodological quality

Data extraction was conducted using the specifically designed proforma and the eleven included studies were then evaluated for internal, statistical and external validity using the 19 methodological criteria listed in Table 1. The results of this exercise are shown in Table 2. The studies are ranked in descending order by their methodological score (mean score = 10.5, range 7–18). Higher scores indicate higher grades of evidence. Five studies were graded level A, scoring high marks for internal and statistical validity. Of these, three studies externally validated their results in a second independent group. All but one study was prospective with blind assessment of the predictor variables. Overall, the main methodological weaknesses were: failure to recruit subjects at a common point during the course of their disease (5 studies), recruitment of a non-consecutive sample or insufficient description of recruitment strategy (8 studies), failure to include or report inclusion of confounders in multivariate model (7 studies), failure to report information about medical or para-medical interventions subsequent to or during observation period (9 studies) and failure to cross-validate results in an independent test set of patients (7 studies).

Appendix 4

Methodological assessment of included studies

1 st author and ref	Year	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	Score	Level
Knaus [27]	1995	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	18	A
Fox [28]	1999	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	13	B
Lee [29]	2003	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	15	A
Glare [30]	2003	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	12	B
Walter [31]	2001	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	16	A
Hanrahan [32]	1995	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	C
Luchins [33]	1997	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	12	B
Hanrahan [34]	1999	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	9	C
Marquis [35]	2002	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	13	B
Nishimura [36]	2002	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	14	A
Oga [37]	2003	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	17	A

Appendix 5 Full Reference List

(bold = in printed version, plain text = website only)

1. Higginson IJ. Palliative and terminal care. In: Stevens A, Raftery J eds. Health care needs assessment: second series: the epidemiologically based needs assessment reviews. Abingdon: Radcliffe Medical Press, 1997.
2. Murray CJL, Lopez AD. Alternative projections of mortality and disability by causes 1990–2020: Global burden of disease. *Lancet* 1997; 349: 1498–1504.
3. Addington-Hall J. Reaching out: specialist palliative care for older adults with non-malignant diseases. London: NCHSPCS, 1998.
4. WHO Expert Committee. Cancer pain relief and palliative care. Geneva: WHO, 1990.
5. Skilbeck J, Mott L, Page H, Smith D, Ahmedzai SH, Clark D. Palliative care in chronic obstructive airways disease: a needs assessment. *Palliat Med* 1998; 12: 245–54.
6. Gore JM, Brophy CJ, Greenstone MA. How well do we care for patients with end-stage chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)? A comparison of palliative care and quality of life in COPD and lung cancer. *Thorax* 2000; 55: 1000–6.
7. Edmonds P, Karlson S, Khan S, Addington-Hall J. A comparison of the palliative care needs of patients dying from chronic respiratory diseases and lung cancer. *Palliative Med* 2001; 15: 287–95.

8. Field D, Addington-Hall J. Extending specialist palliative care to all? *Soc Sci Med* 1999; 48: 1271–80.
9. Hospice and palliative care facts and figures. London: Hospice Information, 2002.
10. Gott CM, Ahmedzai SH, Wood C. How many inpatients at an acute hospital have palliative care needs? Comparing the perspective of medical and nursing staff. *Palliative Med* 2001; 15: 451–60.
11. Farquhar M, Grande G, Todd C, Barclay S. Defining patients as palliative: Hospital doctors' versus general practitioners' perceptions. *Palliative Med* 2002; 16: 247–50.
12. Christakis NA, Lamont EB. Extent and determinants of error in doctors' prognoses in terminally ill patients: prospective cohort study. *BMJ* 2000; 320: 469–72.
13. Murtagh FEM, Preston M, Higginson I. Patterns of dying: palliative care for non-malignant disease. *Clin Med* 2004; 4: 39–44.
14. Morita T, Tsunoda J, Inoue S, Chihara S. The palliative prognostic index: a scoring system for survival of terminally ill cancer patients. *Support Care Cancer* 1999; 7: 128–33.
15. Piravano M, Maltoni M, Nanni O *et al.* A new palliative prognostic score: a first step for the staging of terminally ill cancer patients. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1999; 17: 231–9.

16. Centres for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Hospice Manual. Chapter 2 Coverage of services. Publication 21. (http://www.cms.hhs.gov/manuals/21_hospice/hs0-fw.asp)

17. Department for Work and Pensions. Disability Living Allowance Overview. (<http://www.dwp.gov.uk/medical/dla/asp>)

18. Alderson P, Green S, Higgins J eds. Cochrane Reviewers' Handbook. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2004. (<http://212.49.218.203/newgenMB/WebHelpSpecific/handbook.pdf>)

19. Khan KS, Riet G, Glanville J, Sowden AJ, Kleijnen J eds. Undertaking systematic reviews of research on effectiveness. CRD's guidance for those carrying out or commissioning reviews. CRD report number 4. 2nd edition, 2001. (<http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/report4.htm>)

20. Fitzpatrick R, Dovey C, Buxton MJ, Jones DR. Evaluating patient-based outcome measures for use in clinical trials. Health Technol Assessment 1998; 2 (14).

21. Altman DG. Systematic reviews of evaluations of prognostic variables. BMJ 2001; 323: 224–8.

22. Sackett DL, Haynes RB, Tugwell P. Clinical Epidemiology. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and company, 1991.

23. Laupacis A, Sekar N, Stiell IG. Clinical prediction rules. A review and suggested modifications of methodological standards. JAMA 1997; 277: 488–94.

24. Kwakkel G, Wagenaar RC, Kollen BJ, Lankhorst GJ. Predicting disability in stroke – a critical review of the literature. *Age Ageing* 1996; 25: 479–89.
25. Borghouts JAJ, Koes BW, Bouter CM. The clinical course and prognostic factors of non-specific neck pain: a systematic review. *Pain* 1998; 77: 1–13.
26. Scholten-Peeters GGM, Verhagen AP, Bekkering GE *et al.* Prognostic factors of whiplash-associated disorders: a systematic review of prospective cohort studies. *Pain* 2003; 104: 303–22.
27. Knaus WA, Harrerll FE, Lynn J *et al.* The SUPPORT prognostic model. Objective estimates of survival for seriously ill hospitalised adults. *Ann Intern Med* 1995; 122: 191–203.
28. Fox E, Landrum-McNoft K, Ahong Z, Dawson NV, Wu AW, Lynn J. Evaluation of prognostic criteria for determining hospice eligibility in patients with advanced lung, heart, or liver disease. *JAMA* 1999; 282: 1638–45.
29. Lee DS, Austin PC, Rouleau JL, Liu PP, Naimark D, Tu JV. Predicting mortality among patients hospitalized for heart failure. Derivation and validation of a clinical model. *JAMA* 2003; 290: 2581–7.
30. Glare P, Eychmueller S, Virik K. The use of the palliative prognostic score in patients with diagnoses other than cancer. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2003; 26: 883-5.

- 31.** Walter LC, Brand RJ, Counsell SR *et al.* Development and validation of a prognostic index for 1-year mortality in older adults after hospitalization. *JAMA* 2001; 285: 2987–94.
- 32.** Hanrahan P, Luchins DJ. Feasible criteria for enrolling end-stage dementia patients in home hospice care. *Hosp J* 1995; 10: 47–53.
- 33.** Luchins DJ, Hanrahan P, Murphy K. Criteria for enrolling dementia patients in hospice. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1997; 45: 1054–9.
- 34.** Hanrahan P, Raymond M, McGowan E, Luchins D. Criteria for enrolling dementia patients in hospice: a replication. *Am J Hospice Palliative Care* 1999; 16: 395–400.
- 35.** Marquis K, Debigaré R, Lacasse Y *et al.* Midthigh cross-sectional area is a better predictor of mortality than body mass index in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2002; 166: 809–13.
- 36.** Nishimura K, Izumi T, Tsukino M, Oga T. Dyspnea is a better predictor of 5-year survival than airways obstruction in patients with COPD. *Chest* 2002; 121: 1434–40.
- 37.** Oga T, Nishimura K, Tsukino M, Sato S, Hajro T. Analysis of the factors related to mortality in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Role of exercise capacity and health status. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2003; 167: 544–9.
- 38.** Stuart B, Alexander C, Arenalla C *et al.* Medical guidelines for determining prognosis in selected non-cancer diseases, 2nd edition. Arlington, Va: National Hospice Organization, 1996.

39. Volicer L. Hospice care for dementia patients. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1997; 45: 1147–9.
40. Glare P, Christakis N. Predicting survival in patients with advanced disease. In: Doyle D, Hanks G, Cherny N, Calman K eds. *Oxford Textbook of Palliative Medicine* 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004: 29–42.
41. Mador MJ. Muscle mass, not body weight, predicts outcome in patients with chronic obstructive disease. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2002; 160: 787–9.
42. Anthonisen NR, Wright EC, Hodgkin JE. Prognosis in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1986; 133: 14–20.
43. Seamark D, Ryan M, Smallwood N, Gilbert J. Deaths from heart failure in general practice: implications for palliative care. *Palliative Med* 2002; 16: 495–8.
44. Redelmeier DA, Lustig AJ. Prognostic indices in clinical practice. *JAMA* 2001; 285: 3024–5.
45. Easterbrook PJ, Berlin J, Gopalan R, Matthews DR. Publication bias in clinical research. *Lancet* 1991; 337: 867–72.
46. Claessens MT, Lynn J, Zhing Z *et al*. Dying with lung cancer or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: Insights from SUPPORT. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2000; 48: s146–s53.

47. Levenson JW, McCarthy EP, Lynn J, Davis RB, Phillips RS. The last six months of life for patients with congestive heart failure. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2000; 48: s101–s9.
48. Ahmedzai SH, Walsh TD. Palliative medicine and modern cancer care. *Semin Oncol* 2000; 27: 1–6.
49. Christakis NA. *Death foretold. Prophecy and prognosis in medical care.* Chicago, Ill: The University of Chicago Press, 2001.
50. Wyatt JC, Altman DG. Commentary: prognostic models: clinically useful or quickly forgotten? *BMJ* 1995; 311: 1539–41.
51. Speck P, Addington-Hall J. Spiritual needs in health care. *BMJ* 2004; 329: 123–4.