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INTRODUCTION
- People with advanced cancer have decreased Activities of Daily Living (ADL) ability
- We assessed efficacy of occupational therapy-based (OT-based) program, the ‘Cancer Home-Life Intervention’ in randomised controlled trial (RCT)
- No effect was found, but heterogeneity of treatment effect may disguise subgroup differences

AIM
To investigate gender and age (below/above 69 years) preponderance to respond to intervention

METHOD
- Exploratory subgroup analysis from RCT (N=191)

PARTICIPANTS
- Diagnosed with incurable cancer, had functional level 1-2 on WHOPerformanceScore, and lived at home or in sheltered living

OUTCOME
- ADL motor ability (Assessment of Motor and Process Skills) measured at baseline (T1) and at 12-weeks (T2)

ANALYSIS
- Multiple regression analysis; ADL motor ability at T2 as the dependent variable, treatment groups (intervention versus control) as the independent variable, and age and gender as modifiers

THE ‘CANCER HOME-LIFE INTERVENTION’
Main target = problems with participants occupations
Resolved by tailored combinations of 2-6 components chosen by participant and occupational therapist together

RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>logits (95% CI), p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤69 years vs. ≥69 years</td>
<td>0.30 (-0.05;0.64), 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women vs. men</td>
<td>0.23 (-0.11;0.57), 0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attention:
- Intervention apparently has better effect in participants ≤69 years, but results statistically non-significant

CONCLUSION
No subgroup effect, but some indications suggest greater effect for those aged below 69 years