

1

2

Global Approaches to Older Abuse Research in

3

Institutional Care Settings: A Systematic Review

4

5 Dr Maria Agaliotis^{1¶*}; Ms Tracey Morris^{2¶}, Professor Ilan Katz^{3¶}, and Professor David

6 Greenfield^{4 ¶} PhD.

7

8

9 ¹Australian Institute of Health Service Management (AIHSM), Tasmanian School of

10 Business and Economics, University of Tasmania (UTas), Rozelle Campus, Australia.

11 ²MPH (UNSW).

12 ³Social Policy Research Centre (SPCR), University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

13 ⁴School of Population Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of New South Wales, Sydney,

14 Australia.

15

16

17 ¶All authors have made substantial contributions to all three of sections (1), (2) and (3)

18 below:

19 (1) the conception and design of the study, or acquisition of data, or analysis and

20 interpretation of data: AGALIOTIS, MORRIS, KATZ, GREENFIELD

21 (2) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content: AGALIOTIS,

22 MORRIS, KATZ, GREENFIELD

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 (3) final approval of the version to be submitted: AGALLOTIS, MORRIS, KATZ,

24 GREENFIELD

25

26 *Corresponding author

27 Email: maria.agalotis@utas.edu.au

28

29 Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the manuscript and its Supporting
30 Information files.

31 Role of the Funding Source: The authors received no specific funding for this work.

32 Conflicts of Interest: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

33 Ethical standards: This project did not collect empirical data so ethical approval was not
34 required.

35

36 **Abstract**

37 **Objective:**

38 Over the last two decades, authors have argued the rate of abuse among older adults in
39 institutional settings has been underestimated due to challenges in defining and responding to
40 the issue. The purpose of this systematic review is to provide an in-depth analysis of
41 empirical studies examining methodologies measuring abuse of older people residing in a
42 long-term institutional care facility (nursing homes, independent living and assisted living
43 facilities), specifically staff-to-resident abuse.

44 **Methods**

45 Guided by PRISMA guidelines, 10 databases were searched from 2005 till July 2023. This
46 review inclusion criteria were any type of abuse, as defined by the World Health
47 Organization reported by staff and residents, family and relatives, and public anonymous
48 registries. This article also includes a methodological critical assessment of studies which
49 has not been conducted before. To direct the review, we use four guiding questions: a) what
50 are the study characteristics? b) what are the methods and measurement tools that have been
51 used? c) what has been the impact of methodology on the results? and d) what is the quality
52 of these studies?

53 **Results:**

54 In the last 18 years, 22 studies from eight countries undertook cross-sectional examinations of
55 staff-to-resident abuse. The review identified a heterogeneity of definitions of abuse and
56 variations with who reported abuse, measurement tools and recall periods. We found the
57 quality of studies varied significantly, with no consistency.

58 **Discussion:**

59 These variations in study methodologies impacted the ability to synthesise the findings
60 making it difficult to estimate a global prevalence rate of aged care abuse. From the analysis,
61 we develop an Aged Care Abuse Research Checklist (ACARC) as a first step towards

62 achieving a global standardized, evidence-based methodology for this field. Doing so will
63 normalize processes within organizations and the community, allowing early interventions to
64 change practices, reduce the risk of recurrence and improve resident quality of care and
65 workplace cultures.

66 **Systematic Review Registration Number:** PROSPERO registry number:

67 CRD42018055484, <https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO>.

68 **Keywords:** abuse, methodology, nursing homes, quantitative research methods.

69 **Introduction**

70 Older people have higher risks of isolation, fragility, impaired cognitive function, and lack of
71 social support structures; individually, and collectively, these issues make them vulnerable to
72 maltreatment or abuse, most often from persons in trusting relationships [1]. Maltreatment
73 and abuse can contribute to long term physical and psychological harms including stress,
74 injury, depression, and increased mortality [2].

75

76 Recent Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) data estimates
77 between 6 – 20% of people aged 80 and over currently reside in institutional settings, and by
78 2050 this is likely to double [3]. This change is in part driven by the fact that the global
79 population of people aged 60 and over, will increase from 962 million in 2017, to 2.1 billion
80 by 2050 [4]. Institutional settings can range from independent living facilities, assisted living
81 communities, nursing homes and continuing care retirement facilities. Abuse can be
82 committed by staff-to-resident, resident-to-resident, or visitor-to-resident [5].

83

84 A 2019 systematic literature review found two in three residential unit staff self-reported
85 committing abuse in the last year [5]. We know rates of abuse are reported to be higher
86 among the vulnerable dependent older adults living in institutional settings, compared to
87 older people in the general community [5], and yet many instances go unreported. Although
88 evidence of extensive abuse of older adults is well established, challenges in defining,
89 identifying, and responding to it restrict our ability to address the issue. In 2002, some clarity
90 was brought to the problem by the World Health Organization (WHO), defining older adult
91 abuse as ‘elder abuse’, and described it as an intentional or inappropriate act, single or
92 repeated, causing distress or harm to an older adult [6]. Types of abuse include physical,
93 psychological, or emotional, financial (or financial exploitation), sexual and neglect,

94 intentional or unintentional [6]. Over the last ten years, there have been consistent calls to
95 understand how to standardize, measure rates of abuse among older adults [7-10].

96

97 We know that over the last two decades, due to varying definitions and social norms across
98 the world, the rate of abuse among older adults in institutional settings has been
99 underestimated [10-13]. In short, our understanding of the prevalence of abuse of older
100 adults is significantly limited and recent descriptions of instruments used to examine staff-to-
101 resident abuse in residential care settings need a more thorough standardized investigation,
102 since reporting abuse is as an essential part of public health, and reports of abuse is the
103 responsibility of all members of the community [9, 10, 12]. Understanding the quality of
104 abuse measurement tools among older adults [10, 12] within all aged care institutional
105 settings, will provide a clearer picture of the how to better standardize the methodological
106 approaches to measuring older age abuse in institutional settings.

107

108 This review in addition conducts a methodological quality assessment on empirical studies
109 among all institutional settings, examining all modes of reporting older age abuse (staff,
110 resident, relatives, or community [via registries including whether allegations or sustained
111 acts of abuse]). Overall, the study aimed to investigate and develop a common standard
112 research criteria to advance the methodological rigor in and practical viability approaches
113 when measuring older abuse within institutional settings. Four guiding questions direct the
114 review: (1) what are the study characteristics? (2) what are the methods and measurement
115 tools that have been used and are they valid and reliable? (3) what has been the impact of
116 methodology on the results? and (4) what is the level of quality of these studies?

117 **Methods**

118 *Search strategy*

119 A systematic quantitative review protocol was developed according to the PRISMA [14] (S1
120 Fig) and registered (SYSTEMATIC REVIEW REGISTRATION NUMBER: PROSPERO
121 registry number: CRD42018055484, <https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO>)[15]. Ten
122 academic databases (S1 File) were searched. The keyword search was informed by
123 Lindbloom et al. (2007) [13] and a Cochrane review by Baker et al.(2016) [16] (S2 File). In
124 addition to this search, full paper copies of potentially relevant articles were retrieved, and
125 their reference lists screened.

126 *Eligibility criteria*

127 The inclusion criteria included: observational studies reporting any incidence or prevalence
128 data on any type of abuse as defined by the WHO (2022) (physical, psychological, financial,
129 sexual abuse and neglect); as observed or committed abuse on older participants residing in
130 long term institutional care facilities including assisted, independent or extended living
131 facilities or care units, and residential or a nursing home; staff-to-resident abuse from ‘health
132 care professional’ or ‘staff member’ to ‘patient’ or ‘resident’. Research articles were limited
133 to full-text English language and published from 2005 till May 2020. This timing coincides
134 with the last systematic review on abuse among older residents residing in nursing homes
135 conducted by Lindbloom et al (2007). Additional searches were conducted using the same
136 academic databases to retrieve studies published between May 2020 to July 2023. We also
137 excluded studies based on study design such as single case reports; case series; and
138 discussion or opinion pieces.

139 *Data Extraction and Data analysis*

140 Titles and abstracts obtained from the search were screened by two reviewers (MA and TM).
141 Duplicate articles were excluded. Data were extracted by one reviewer (TM) and
142 independently audited by a second (MA). The data extraction was guided by an analytical
143 framework using the elements of epidemiological methodology used in prevalence studies
144 [17]. The framework characteristics and elements form the header columns for presented
145 tables (Table 1) and rows form the information extracted from each article. Disagreement or
146 ambiguities were resolved by consensus. Descriptive tables were developed based on the
147 study recruitment methodology, that is who reported the abuse (staff, residents, relatives, or
148 community) (S3 File). The subheading columns were structured based on the examining,
149 study characteristics, methodology characteristics and results (S3 File).

150

151 *Methodological Quality Assessment*

152 A methodological quality assessment of included articles were independently assessed by
153 three reviewers (TM, MA, and IK) using Boyle et al.(1988) [18] 8-item checklist, designed to
154 evaluate the elements of prevalence studies (S4 File).

155

156 **Results**

157 *Systematic review*

158 A total of 1,298 citations were retrieved from the search. Four additional articles were located
159 through hand searching. Duplicates and non-English language papers were then removed
160 resulting in 826 records. Initial screening, against inclusion criteria, of title and abstract,
161 reduced the records to 108. Detailed screening, through full-text review, reduced the records
162 to 44 articles identified as meeting the study criteria. Four papers, by Griffore et al. (2009)

163 [19], Page et al. (2009) [20], Post (2010) [21], Schiamburg et al. (2012) [22] and Zhang et al.
164 (2011) [23], all reported data from the same study population. Griffore et al. (2009) [19] was
165 subsequently retained over the other three, based on a stronger study design including a more
166 defined recall period and a focus on multiple types of abuse. Papers published by Ben Natan
167 et al.(2010) [24, 25] and Moore (4) [26-29] used the same population. Ben Natan et al.[25]
168 study examining psycho-social factors affecting elders' maltreatment in long-term care
169 facilities and Moore's paper examining observed abuse from two time periods, 2011 to 2013
170 and from 2015 to 2019 with prevalence data were chosen [30, 31]. While other studies did
171 not provide prevalence data of abuse [32, 33] or examined perception of elder abuse and
172 neglect among nursing staff working in a hospital [34]. The final study cohort comprised 22
173 studies (Fig. 1: Identification and Selection of Studies).

174 ***Study Characteristics***

175 Country settings varied, with eight from the United States of America [USA] [19, 35-41], two
176 from Israel [24, 42], two from Australia [43, 44], nine from individual European countries
177 [45-52] and two from the United Kingdom [30, 31].

178

179 Similarly, the studies were methodologically diverse, with 16 cross-sectional, 13 studies
180 collected abuse data from staff, with the majority using surveys [35, 36, 44, 46, 47, 52] or
181 questionnaires [24, 45, 49, 51]. Three studies utilised a mixed methods approach to distribute
182 a staff questionnaire and interview [30, 31, 41], however for the purpose of this review we
183 only included questionnaire data. A total of three studies were reviewed which collected data
184 from residents. Residents were interviewed in two studies [47, 50], while one study by Cohen
185 et al.(2010) [42], interviewed and collected data using participant's health profile to
186 determine signs of abuse from risk indicators of maltreatment or abusive acts.

187

188 The remaining cross-sectional study randomly selected 'family members' from the general
189 community to participate in a telephone interview [19] and one from a community registry
190 [40]. The five retrospective cross-sectional studies used one or more existing abuse reporting
191 systems or registries [37-39, 48]. The following study characteristics are arranged based on
192 persons reported abuse, from highest contact with resident (staff) to least contact with
193 resident (registries) to examine recruitment methodology and study participant details (Table
194 1).

195 ***Recruitment and Participant Characteristics – Staff***

196 The 13 studies that recruited staff [24, 30, 31, 35, 36, 41, 44-47, 49, 51, 52] did so by selecting
197 institutes or homes ranging from 2 [41] to 1,600 [45]. The majority of studies (7) utilised a
198 randomised facilities sample of ‘nursing homes’ [45, 46, 51] including ‘extended care units’ [52] or
199 ‘nursing facilities ranging from assisted living and independent living apartments’ [41], while two
200 ‘long term institutionalized facilities’ [24], ‘senior homes’ [47]. Three studies utilised convenience
201 sampling from ‘for profit’ [30] or/and ‘non-profit care homes’ [49] or based on the criteria a ‘newly
202 open care facility’ [31]. All studies selected facilities within a defined geographical region. The
203 remaining three studies recruited staff using a professional registry of Certified Nursing Assistants
204 [CNAs], nurse aids within a state in the USA [35, 36], or from a subscribers list from a quarterly
205 electronic resource addressing resident safety [44].

206

207 Staff were defined as ‘direct care workers’ or ‘employees’ [45, 47], ‘care workers’ [49] or
208 ‘care staff’ [30, 31]. Others defined staff as ‘facilities employees’ [41]. Some studies used a
209 generalised staff in terms such as ‘staff workers’ [24], ‘staff members’ [51]. The six studies
210 distinguished nursing professions as specific either ‘enrolled’, ‘registered nurses’ and/or
211 ‘nurse aids’ or ‘certified nursing assistants’ [CNAs] [35, 36, 41, 43, 46, 52]. Of the 13 studies
212 recruiting staff, 11 reported on one or more staff characteristics from gender to years of
213 employment (see Table 1) [24, 35, 36, 41, 44-47, 49, 51, 52]. Of those who recruited staff
214 cohorts ranged from 53 [44] to 7,000 [35, 36].

215

216 Of the 13 studies, 12 studies reported a response rate, ranging from 15% [41] to 92% [24]
217 (Table 1). Staff participant characteristics were reported in eleven studies; ten reported the
218 majority being female (>82%) [24, 35, 36, 41, 44-47, 49, 51, 52]; with an age range between
219 16 to 74 in seven studies, [51] and 13.7 mean years experienced as reported in five studies
220 [24, 44, 49, 51, 52]. Current nursing home experience ranging from 1.1 [35] to 8 years [51],

221 while one study reported the overall professional experience as a mode, with approximately
222 40% having more than 8 years' experience [47]. Of the thirteen studies that utilized reported
223 abuse by staff, four collect data on one or more resident characteristics [41, 45, 47, 51](Table
224 1).

225 ***Recruitment and Participant Characteristics – Residents***

226 Three studies examined older adult abuse as reported by residents [42, 47, 50]. One study
227 selected 10 'nursing homes' with 640 eligible 'nursing home residents' invited 200 to
228 participate, with 82% doing so [50]. A second study selected 24 'senior homes', screened
229 1,807 'clients', with 27% meeting the study criteria [47]. No response rates were recorded.
230 The third study collected data from 71 admitted 'inpatients' from 'elderly homes' or 'nursing
231 homes' [42]. Studies examining residents were defined as a 'client' [47], 'resident' [19, 35,
232 45, 46, 50, 51] or a 'patient' [24, 37, 42](Table 1).

233
234 All three studies recruiting residents reported on residents' characteristics. The majority of
235 the participants were female (>65%) [42, 47, 50] with a mean age of 82 (± 7.5) (range: 60 –
236 99) [42, 47, 50]. Activities of Daily Living (ADL) was used in several studies to report
237 resident dependency levels. ADL were described as a frequency (from "from never to
238 occasionally or always, needs help or assistance with all ADL's), with the highest being
239 'occasional to always' (81%) [50], as a category, 'required assistance with all ADLs' (45%)
240 [42] or as a status, 'being self-sufficient' (54%) [47]. Years of residency were only reported in
241 one study as 'length of stay', with two-thirds reporting less than four years [47]. No staff
242 characteristics were reported in the studies recruiting residents (Table 1).

243 ***Recruitment and Participant Characteristics – Relatives***

244 Relatives were recruited in only one study. There were 450 participants from the general
245 community who had ‘a family member’ ‘receiving long-term care services’ to take part in a
246 telephone survey [19]. No response rate was recorded. The only study characteristics
247 collected were description of residents, as the ‘family member’ being female (73%). No staff
248 characteristics were reported (Table 1).

249 ***Recruitment and Participant Characteristics – Registry***

250 Six studies utilized existing registries to report institutional abuse. Four studies from the USA, with
251 two recorded close to 100 ‘sexual abuse’ reports reported in ‘certified nursing facilities’ over a short
252 period of six-months [39, 40], while the third studies examined 616 complaints related to ‘neglect’
253 from ‘assisted living facilities’ over an eight-year period [38]. Lastly the final study examined ‘430
254 residents living in long-term care facilities’ admitted to one of the five metropolitan hospitals (as an
255 inpatient) over a five-year period [37].

256

257 The two remaining studies from Australia [43] and Portugal [48], examined forensic medical
258 reports for incidences of ‘abuse’ [48] or ‘female sexual abuse’ [43] from ‘nursing homes’ or
259 ‘institutional settings’ over a 10 [48] to 15 [43] year period resulting in small prevalent
260 cohorts, ranging from 28 [43] to 59 [48], respectively (Table 1). Residents were defined as
261 ‘living or residing in nursing homes’ or as an ‘alleged victim’ [43, 48].

262

263 Of the six studies, five reported the percentage of female residents ranging from 58% [37] -
264 100% [39], with the exception of one study which focused on male residents only [40]. In
265 these five studies, mean age was reported in three studies, with an average 79.7 years [37, 39,
266 48], while two studies reported on median age, ranging from 71 – 83 [39, 40, 43]. There was
267 variation in defining resident’s dependency. Using the Activities of Daily Living (ADLs),

268 dependency was reported as a status [‘being mildly to totally dependent’ (62%)] [39], a
269 category [‘mild/moderated’ or ‘severe’ (‘loss of autonomy’ [highest, severe 56%])] [48], a
270 gradient [‘ability to function independently’ 0 – 10 scale (aggregate mean 4.8 [Barthel
271 Index])] [37] or as a status [‘dependency or assistance with ADLs’ (18%)] [43]. Years of
272 residency was only reported in one study, at the time of registered abuse, with a median of 17
273 months [48] (Table 1).

274

275 ***Methodology Instruments Used to Measure Older Aged Abuse***

276 Overall, we identified 16 instruments used to measure older aged abuse in long term institutes
277 over the last 18 years. In Table 1, we constructed columns examining the methodological
278 approaches for each of the studies included in the review, based on who reported the abuse
279 (highest contact with resident, staff to lowest registries) with the following methodological
280 features such as 1) method of administering data (such as mode, distribution and collection)
281 2) number of items and name of the identified instruments [including source], 3) observed
282 and/or experienced abuse with type of abuse reported 4) recall period and 5) validity of tool.
283 In S5 File, we have provided a more in-depth analysis of the commonly defined types of
284 abuse (as defined by WHO), with additional information such as name of tool, source of tool,
285 how type of abuse is defined and definition of type of abuse to examine homogeneity in each
286 tool when measuring type of abuse.

287

288 ***Instruments Used to Measure Older Age Abuse - As Reported by Staff, 289 and /or Residents.***

290 Of the 16 instruments, 11 were used to measure abuse as observed and/or experienced by the
291 staff member, resident or relative. The review found the three most commonly used tools

292 measured staff abuse; Malmedal et al's 42 acts of inadequate care instrument (2009) [45, 50,
293 51]; Castle's (2012) 28 item questionnaire measuring how often staff observed and/or
294 perpetrated abuse [35, 36, 46] and Drennan et al.(2012) [49, 52, 53] national survey on
295 interactions and conflicts within nursing home settings. There were variations among these
296 instruments ranging from modes of delivery, either presented as a questionnaire or survey,
297 with differences in definition and types of abuse and discrepancies in recall periods.

298

299 Malmedal's et al.(2009) [51] original 42-item questionnaire was used to measure staff
300 'observed' or 'committed' 'physical, psychological (emotional), financial and neglect' acts
301 (unintentional and intentional acts) of inadequate care' within a four-week recall period,
302 using a four-point Likert-type frequency scale ranging from 'never' to 'more than once a
303 week' was used in two other studies. This questionnaire has been tested for face validity only,
304 indicating the tool was easy to follow and comprehensive, evidence pertaining to the other
305 items of validity were not reported.

306

307 In 2012, Habjanič and Lahe [50] further modified Malmedal (2009) [51] question which
308 asked 'residents' face-to-face if they had 'ever experienced' 'mental', 'physical' and
309 'financial abuse' using a 'six months' recall period to record the 'number of incidences',
310 rather than using the Malmedal et al.(2009) [51] Likert scale (Table 1). In 2017, Blumenfeld
311 Arens et al.[45] used Malmedal et al.(2009) [51] to ask staff if they only 'observed' 'elder
312 abuse' (not as the original definition, 'inadequate acts' of 'physical, psychological
313 (emotional) and neglect, but not financial abuse, using with the same recall period and Likert-
314 type frequency scale. None of the studies measured correlation coefficient.

315

316 Castle and Beach's (2013) [36] 46-item questionnaire measured the 'number' of times staff
317 'observed' 'physical', 'psychological (verbal)', 'financial (material exploitation)' or 'sexual

318 abuse' in 'last three months of their prior place of employment' and was used again in a study
319 by Castle the following year [35]. The questionnaire has been tested for face and content
320 validity (using Fleisch–Kinkaid Scale), indicating this tool is measuring the degree which
321 abuse is measuring abuse accurately Recently, Botngård et al.(2020) [46] changed Castle's
322 questionnaire to examine staff's incidences of not only 'observed' but also 'perpetrated'
323 abuse using the same recall, measuring additional types of abuse, 'overall' and 'neglect',
324 within their 'current place of employment' in the 'last 12 months', not their prior place of
325 employment, as the original instrument intended use. All studies utilized the original
326 frequency using a three-point Likert-type scale as 'never', 'once' or 'repeatedly' (Table 1).
327 None of the studies reported on correlation coefficient.

328

329 Gil & Capelas (2022) [49], and Neuberg (2017) [52] utilised the long-established
330 questionnaire by Drennan et al.(2012) [53], a 25-item national survey of staff-resident
331 interactions and conflicts within residential care settings. Between the two papers, there were
332 variations with types of abuse and whether it measured as witnessed [52] and/or committed
333 [49] abuse. In Neuberg et al. [52] study, the survey was pretested in a validation pilot study
334 and achieved a reliability coefficient was > 0.7 , deeming the instrument to be reliable.

335

336 One study utilised as part of their questionnaire, the long-established Iowa Dependent Adult
337 Abuse Nursing Home Questionnaire [54] to measure 'number of times' 'perpetrating' or'
338 witnessing' 'acts of violence' (including physical, psychological, financial [exploitation],
339 sexual acts and neglect) 'committed' by staff 'in the past 12 months'. This questionnaire was
340 tested for reliability (0.89) [24]. The authors of this instrument have conducted readability
341 and content validity analysis, although this was conducted in 2005 [55].

342

343 The remaining studies constructed questionnaires, surveys or telephone interviews using
344 peer-reviewed studies and/or industry reports [19, 30, 31, 41, 42, 44, 47, 49] to develop their
345 own surveys with 7 – 40 items [44, 47], to report abuse by staff, residents or relatives as
346 experienced, suspected or observed, with no reporting on any validation studies being carried
347 out. Overall, there is still some heterogeneity among these instruments, they are still in their
348 early constructs, more studies and methodology testing are required conducted to validate
349 these instruments. See Table 1 for further details.

350

351 ***Instruments using Data Registries to measure Older Age Abuse***

352 The remaining six studies utilized government registries or databases. Four studies utilized
353 existing government registries such as the Registry Arizona Secretary of State & Arizona
354 Department of Health Service offices [38] or the Adult Protective Services (APS) (National
355 Adult Protective Services Association [NAPSA], 2021) (3) in conjunction with a survey (Sex
356 Abuse Survey [SASU]) [39] and/or with hospital records with the use of Clinical Signs of
357 Neglect Scale (CSNS) [37, 39, 40] to report ‘isolated or ongoing’ investigation of ‘citations
358 and allegations’ [38] or a ‘suspected, reported, unsatisfactory, partial or substantiated
359 resolution case of abuse’ [39, 43, 48] or used the to identify ‘clinical signs of elder
360 mistreatment or elder neglect’ [37]. Two studies utilized clinical forensic medicine reports
361 [43, 48] of ‘current or past medical observations and/or victim complaints of suspicion of
362 physical or psychological abuse’ [48] or ‘alleged incidence of sexual assault among women
363 only’ to report incidences of abuse [43]. These studies varied with recall periods ranging
364 from six months [39, 40] to 15 years [43]. Some of these studies due to governance process of
365 reporting incidence cases into a registry required validated professional staff to perform
366 examinations [48], a consortium of experts to develop clinical validated scales [37, 39, 40]
367 and independent research reviewers [43] ensuring embedded testing for interrater reliability,

368 validity and reliability of findings, however registers are commonly known for their practical
369 limitations such as variability in data collected impacting quality (completeness or accuracy),
370 difficulties with follow-up and data dredging (Table 1).

371

372 ***Impact of Methodology on the Results***

373 ***All abuse***

374 Out of the 22 studies, ten studies measured the overall incidence of abuse (measuring one or
375 more types of abuse as defined by WHO) [24, 30, 31, 41, 42, 46-49, 51](Table 1), with the
376 highest overall prevalence reported over a four week period reported in one study, 91%
377 ‘observed’ abuse by *staff*, while ‘committed’ abuse by staff was at 87% [51]. Two studies
378 reported abuse by staff over a 12-month period resulted in lower rates of ‘observed’ abuse
379 ranging from 55% [49] to 76% [46] and for ‘perpetrating’, from 54% [24]to 60% [46].

380

381 Two studies reported by ‘*residents*’ overall abuse over a 12-month period, retained lower
382 rates, than above. ‘Experienced’ abuse ranged from 11% [47]to 31% [42] , while ‘observed’
383 was at a lower rate of 5% in one study [47]. No studies examined overall abuse reported by
384 relatives or community via a registry. Five studies (23%) reported all five types of abuse as
385 defined by WHO [19, 24, 42, 46, 49] (See Table 1). The following sections will examine
386 prevalence based on types of abuse as defined by WHO, physical, psychological, financial,
387 sexual and neglect.

388

389 ***Physical abuse***

390 The most commonly measured form of abuse was physical abuse, also defined as ‘physical
391 violence’ [24], ‘mistreatment [19], ‘maltreatment’ [42] or ‘acts of physical character’ [51],

392 measured in 15 studies [19, 24, 30, 35, 36, 41, 42, 45-52]. An accumulation of 81 items were
393 identified to describe acts of physical abuse, with each study using three [45] to 11 [42] items
394 to describe physical abuse. The most commonly used verbs to describe physical abuse was
395 ‘hitting’ (8) [19, 35, 42, 46, 47, 50] or ‘kicked’ (7) [19, 35, 46, 47, 50], with variations in
396 definition, recall periods and persons reported. One study relied on staff to define physical
397 abuse [30] or did not disclose items measured [31] (S5 File).

398

399 The highest rate of physical abuse reported was ‘witnessed’ by *staff* (44%), in the act of
400 ‘restraining/hold back a resident’ ‘over a recall period of four weeks’ [51], and the highest
401 ‘committed’ abuse was 33% from the same act of ‘restraining/hold back a resident’ as
402 reported in the same study. When the same questionnaire was used in Blumenfeld Arens et al.
403 [45] inn 2017, the study questionnaire, measured witness physical abuse over a 4-week
404 period, resulting in a lower rate of 1.4%.

405

406 Studies examining physical abuse over a 12-month period, Gil and Capelas (2022) [49] and
407 Neuberg et al. (2017) [52] using the same questionnaire [53], resulted in different levels of
408 physical abuse by *staff*. Neuberg et al. (2017) [52] reported over 12 months, 42% of staff
409 observed ‘force feeding the resident’ in the last 12 months, whereas Gils and Capelas (2022)
410 [49] recorded 14% observed staff committing ‘at least 1 of the 6 behaviours of physical
411 abuse’. The remaining studies utilised various measurement tools, with the same recall period
412 of 12-months resulting in observed rates ranging from 6% [30] to 30% [47], while committed
413 abuse were even lower ranging from 1.7% [30] to 12.3% [24].

414

415 Three studies reported physical abuse reported by *residents* either in the last six [50] to 12
416 months [42] resulted in lower rates of ‘observed’ abuse, from 1% [47] to 2% [47] and 8% for

417 ‘experienced’ abuse [42]. Cohen’s study [42] found only three residents attained a score of
418 three or more on the signs of physical scale. Compared to this, *relatives* reporting abuse in
419 telephone interviews in the last 12 months had higher rates of abuse at 74% [19], while
420 physical signs or evidence of physical abuse from forensic medical reports (FMR) from
421 registries, were lower at 55 cases over a 10-year period [48], however these tend to be
422 extreme cases of abuse (S5 File).

423 ***Psychological abuse***

424 The second most common measured form of older age abuse in long term institutes was
425 psychological abuse. Fourteen studies [24, 30, 35, 36, 41, 42, 45-47, 49-52] addressed
426 psychological abuse. Three studies defined this type of abuse as ‘psychological abuse’ [30,
427 42, 46, 47, 49] while the remaining six defined as ‘emotional’ [19, 41, 45, 50], ‘mental abuse’
428 [24, 51] or as a combination of ‘psychological and verbal abuse’ [35] or ‘emotional or
429 psychological and verbal mistreatment’ [19].

430

431 There were in total 47 items, with each study using three [45] to 14 [47] items to classify
432 psychological abuse. The most common terms used to describe psychological abuse were of
433 ‘intent’(5) [47] or ‘threat’(4) [35, 47, 50, 51]. A total of four studies did not disclose items or
434 descriptions of types or examples of abuse asked [24, 41, 52] (S5 File).

435

436 Psychological abuse was reported by *staff* (11) [24, 30, 35, 36, 41, 45-47, 49, 51, 52],
437 *residents* (2) [42, 50] and *relatives* (1) [19]. The highest rates of ‘observed’ and ‘committed’
438 act of psychological abuse was ‘entering a room without knocking’ of abuse by *staff*, 64% of
439 staff committed the act, while 84% observed other staff in the last four weeks [51]. Three
440 studies examine psychological abuse ‘committed’ by staff over the last 12 months found
441 higher incidents ranging from 23% [24] to 46% [47], with variation in instruments utilized to

442 measure this form of abuse. ‘Observed’ abuse by *staff* was reported in five studies, with
443 incidents ranged from 30% [47] to 62% [19], with variation in instruments used making it
444 difficult to provide an average rate. Two studies utilised Dennon et al. [53] instrument
445 however there was a 20% difference between the act of shouting at resident in anger [49]
446 [33% [49] from 16 care home settings versus 55% from nursing home and extend care units
447 [52]].

448

449 *Residents* reported ‘experienced’ psychological abuse ranged from 10% over a 12-month
450 period [47] to 56% [50] over a six-month period, however reported ‘observed’ abuse was
451 lower at 4% [47]. Uniquely, Cohen et al. (2010) [42] reported distribution of disclosed abuse
452 and found “very low complaints for psychological abuse” (13%). Telephone interviews
453 among family members (*relatives*) reported 84% ‘observed’ ‘verbal mistreatment’ by nursing
454 staff ‘in the previous year’ [19]. No studies measuring psychological abuse used registries.
455 All studies examined specific psychological acts, making it difficult to aggregate the incident
456 rate due to variations as shown above (S5 File).

457 ***Financial abuse***

458 Eleven studies defined financial abuse either as ‘material exploitation’ [19, 35, 36, 46] and/or
459 ‘financial exploitation’ [24, 42], ‘financial abuse’ [30, 49, 50], ‘acts of financial character’
460 [19, 46, 51]. An accumulation of 24 items was identified to described acts of financial abuse,
461 with each study using one [51] to seven [42] items to describe financial abuse. Most common
462 term used to describe financial abuse were ‘signing documents’ (6) [35, 42, 46, 50] (S5 File).

463

464 Most of the studies examining the rates of financial abuse were reported by *staff* (8) [24, 30,
465 35, 36, 41, 46, 49, 51], followed by *residents* (2) [42, 50] or *relatives* (1) [19]. The highest
466 level of financial abuse reported in this review were observations of staff from *relatives* of

467 older adults residing in nursing homes, 71.9% [19]. This was followed by reported
468 ‘experienced’ financial abuse by *residents* in one study, at 32.8% [50] over the last 6 months.
469 Lower rates of financial abuse were reported by staff, for ‘observed’ incident ranged from
470 2.1% [46] to 3.3% [49] in care and nursing homes.
471
472 *Staff* reporting ‘committing’ financial abuse were at a lower rate 0% [51] to <1% [24, 46]
473 over the last four weeks to 12 months, while two study examined staff ‘observed’ financial
474 abuse found 10%, of staff took ‘assets’ from nursing home residents or ‘destroying
475 belongings’ of resident residing in assisted living institutes, 26% [36]. Interestingly Castle’s
476 questionnaire used in two studies, in two similar setting and recall periods, found the
477 incidents from ‘taking residents assets’ were similar, 10% [35] versus 11% [36]. No studies
478 measuring financial abuse used registries (S5 File).

479

480 ***Sexual abuse***

481 Eleven studies reported the prevalence of sexual abuse, described either as abuse [19, 24, 30,
482 36, 39-44, 46, 47, 49] with variation in definition of this form of abuse ranging from as an act
483 of ‘assault’ [43], ‘misconduct’ [19], ‘violence’ [24], ‘unlawful or unwelcome sexual
484 behaviour’[44] or ‘sexual nature without consent’ [49], to an outcome of signs of ‘forensic
485 evidence’ [40] or ‘victimization (women)’ [39].

486

487 Number of items describing sexual abuse ranged from one [49] to 11 items [39]. Among the
488 eleven studies, in total were 34 items that identified abuse a including, as an act of exposure
489 to (4) [35, 39, 40] (hands off) to oral-genital contact (3) [35, 39, 40] (hands on). Evidence of
490 signs of sexual abuse included a torn underwear to infected [42].

491

492 Most of the studies relied on reports by *staff* (4) [24, 35, 46, 47], or *registries* (3) [39, 40, 44],
493 followed by direct reporting from residents (2) [42, 47] and one by *relatives* [19] (S5 File).
494 Reports from *relatives* had the highest reported level of sexual abuse at 40% [19]. *Registries*
495 reporting an incidence of sexual abuse performed by staff ranged from 15.6% to 25% [39, 40,
496 43] however these cases were over a ten-to-15-year period. The lowest report incidences of
497 this type of abuse were reported by *staff* as ‘observed’ resulted in $\leq 7\%$ or ‘committed’ $<1\%$
498 [24, 30, 35, 36, 41, 46, 47, 49], while two studies reporting no sexual abuse reported by
499 *residents* [42, 47]. There were two studies showing some consistency with findings, utilising
500 the same questionnaire in different institutionalised settings, found staff observed 69 nursing
501 home staff and 61 assisted living staff ‘exposed private body parts to embarrass resident’ in
502 the last three months [35, 36] (S5 File).

503 ***Neglect***

504 Similar to psychological abuse studies, neglect is the equally the second highest form of
505 abuse investigated in this review among older adults residing in long term institutions [19, 24,
506 30, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45-49, 51, 52].

507

508 The definition of neglect varied with 3 [38] to 11 items [37] describing these acts from
509 ‘physical and mental neglect’ [24], to ‘clinical sign of neglect’ [37, 42, 48], or collective
510 categorised as ‘personal, environmental, medical’ [38] to specific items described care
511 neglect such as ‘not changing the position of bedridden person’ or ‘ignoring resident when
512 they called’ [47, 49, 52]. Only two studies utilised the same instrument to measure neglect
513 [35, 36]. Four studies did not provide or specify items that were measured for this type of
514 abuse [24, 41, 52].

515

516 Neglect ‘observed’ by *relatives* retain the highest rate in failure to provide basic needs to
517 residents (86.9%) [19]. Four studies reported neglect ‘committed’ by *staff* over the last 12
518 months, with results varied from 1% [47] to 46.9% [46], compare to nine studies reporting
519 ‘observed’ acts of neglect ranging from 9% [47] to 57.8% [46]. These variations are due to
520 different instruments and definitions used to measure neglect. Surprisingly, four studies used
521 the same instruments, however disseminated findings differently, with one study reporting if
522 ‘observed’ or ‘committed’ one of the ten items list for neglect, while the other reported 10
523 items distinctly with respected incident rates [45, 49, 51, 52].

524

525 The highest prevalence of neglect was 24%, attained from the face-to-face interviews
526 conducted by hospital staff [42] among inpatient *residents*, while the another study when
527 interviewing residents on ‘observed’ or ‘experienced’ neglect conducted in facilities were
528 ‘unmentioned’ [47]. *Registries* reported 20% of severe cases of neglect, however again, this
529 was over a 10 or more-year period [37, 48], while other study reported a total of 1,196 total
530 neglect allegations, with 535 substantiated, over an eight year period, making it difficult
531 synthesis findings [38]. Other abuse items not classified by WHO are also included in S5 File
532 table.

533

534 ***Methodological Quality Assessments***

535 Studies were assessed and ranked by methodological score and categorized according to their
536 study design and sampling (Table 2); using an eight-item methodological scoring
537 standardized checklist [18]. Two independent reviewers scored a total of 88 items and agreed
538 on 82 (93%) (κ 0.90 (95% CI 0.88 to 0.99), $p < 0.001$) meaning there was a high agreement.
539 The only minor discrepancy was from the interpretation of validated measurement tools. The
540 representation of samples was at times not reported (85%), with no studies examining non-

541 respondents and five studies (36%) reporting response rates [24, 35, 46, 51]. Only one study
542 accounted for sampling design in their analysis [45], while all studies did not report confident
543 intervals for prevalence rates (item 8). A total of four studies (29%) achieved a total score
544 above 5 [45, 46, 50, 51], with scores ranging from 1/8 to 6/8.

545 **Discussion**

546 The systematic review initially identified 1,302 peer-reviewed journal articles published in
547 the last 18 years. Detailed analysis identified only 22 empirical studies conducted in eight
548 different countries that met the review criteria. Most articles focus on all types of abuse rather
549 than just physical and psychological abuse. The majority of studies examine abuse from the
550 staff perspective, with few reporting from residents, relatives and community members.
551 Researchers have utilised study designs to include not only staff reporting abuse but other
552 sources such as residents incorporating clinician signs of abuse, relatives and the general
553 public. Similarly, to other reviews, we report that relatives, followed by staff tend to report
554 the highest level of observed abuse, while resident reports the lowest abuse [12].
555 Measurement tools used via registries also produce low prevalence because they tend to
556 report extreme cases of physical signs and reported abuse, however this tends to be limited to
557 physical or sexual abuse and/or neglect.

558

559 The main aim of this review was to illustrate and critique methodologies used within the
560 field. We identified a heterogeneity of definitions of abuse, variations of who reported abuse,
561 a wide range of measurement tools and recall periods. There was little comparability between
562 studies and variable study quality. The inconsistencies and poor quality make it difficult to
563 synthesis findings, and not possible to establish the prevalence of abuse rates.

564

565 Among the 22 studies in the review, there was no consistency in presenting the study's
566 participants or cohort characteristics, making it difficult to conduct comparability or
567 understanding individual study's generalisability. The majority of cohort studies described
568 their participants characteristics, either staff, residents or community members, using one

569 characteristic. This point reveals there is no agreement, within or across countries, about
570 what and how characteristics should be reported.

571

572 There was also no consistency across the 22 studies in methods and measurement tools used
573 for investigating staff abuse among residents. Only six [36, 45, 46, 49, 50, 52] of the 22
574 studies had used three previously developed methodologies [35, 51] to measure older adult
575 abuse, however, modifications were made to these original questionnaires, impacting the
576 ability to compare findings. There were variations with recruitment methods resulting in
577 different sample sizes and a lack of consistency in who was reporting the abuse, concluding
578 with differences in findings. Only two studies utilised an independent researcher to
579 personally distribute the questionnaire to staff [24] or interviewed residents face-to-face as an
580 inpatient admitted to hospital for reasons unrelated to an incident of abuse [42] avoiding
581 explicit bias in data analysis. Furthermore, only one study reported a prevalence of ‘self-
582 reported’, ‘observed’, ‘committed’ or ‘experienced’ forms of older abuse by both staff and
583 residents [47]. Study designs that focus on staff or residents reporting abuse to other staff
584 members or facility managers, deter disclosure in their responses or create stigma and blame
585 among staff who have witness or committed abuse, resulting in underestimated rates of abuse
586 [46, 51]. Anonymity of those who distribute the survey, conduct interviews or examinations
587 will reduce bias and improve reliability of the study’s findings [24, 35, 42].

588

589 It is evident that despite an increased interest in older adult abuse, as previous authors have
590 cited, there has been minimal progress in standardising abuse measurements nationally nor
591 globally [11]. This point highlights the unmet need to generate a robust standardized
592 prevalence measurement tool of all types of older abuse, for use at national and global levels
593 [6]. Instead of developing a modified questionnaire or survey, future research should focus on
594 external validating current questionnaires.

595

596 Finally, the overall methodological assessment of the cohort of studies was poor, with only
597 four of the 22 studies, meeting the standard expected by Boyce's [18] prevalence study
598 criteria. The individual studies themselves are accreditable. Heterogeneity in methodology is
599 not valid or creditable to draw conclusions in the understanding prevalence of older adult
600 abuse on a national nor global level. Boyce's tool, the most generic one available, was not
601 designed for this field and may therefore have limited the findings.

602

603 From this review, the most appropriate methodological choice for measuring older adult
604 abuse in institutional settings would be Malmedal's et al.(2009) [51] original 42-item
605 questionnaire, however this is based on limited evidence, a high-quality assessment score and
606 repeatability of the measurement tool in three studies [45, 50, 51], exhibiting a close to
607 consistency in results. Thus, the analysis has revealed that to improve the knowledge base,
608 there is a need for testing consistency in methods and measurement tools used for
609 investigating staff abuse among residents. This includes greater participation from all
610 stakeholders in research [46], and a standardised, comprehensive set of tools and data
611 elements to be utilised. The WHO definitions provide a basis upon which these resources can
612 be established [49]. This approach will enable accurate measurement of abuse and promote
613 construct validity and reliability measurement tools on abuse of older adults. The proposed
614 resources will assist in implementing effective workplace management programs to tailor
615 associated risk factors of abuse within institutionalised care. These resources could be
616 developed by a global consortium of experts and patient representatives, similar to
617 internationally established methodologies in other health fields, including clinical and
618 psychological topics [56]. Additionally, there is a need to establish a methodological quality
619 assessment tool specific for institutionalised care to determine the level of quality of
620 evidence. This work could take direction from that by Giannakopoulos et al. (2012) [57] and

621 Shamliyan et al.(2010) [58] who developed instruments measuring the quality of studies
622 examining the prevalence of disorders and diagnostic protocols or rates and risk factors for
623 diseases. Gerontology researchers can further develop the evidence base by undertaking
624 translational research projects. These studies will address individual organisational problems,
625 educate, and improve staff's understanding and identification of abuse behaviours [59, 60],
626 and provide the broader industry policy direction [8]. All outcomes which will contribute to
627 improvements in residents' quality of life, safety and quality of care, and staff wellbeing –
628 together which contribute to the quadruple aim in healthcare [61].

629
630 As a key step towards improving the evidence base and establishing standardised research
631 tools identified above, we have developed the Aged Care Abuse Research Checklist
632 (ACARC) (Table 3). This tool has been derived from the 22 empirical studies key strengths
633 [19, 24, 30, 31, 35-52] and is designed to improve the methodological quality and research
634 rigor for future studies. The ACARC comprises 11 points covering study design (2),
635 methodology (6), results (2) and publication (1). The widespread use of ACARC can promote
636 researchers' engagement in collecting prevalence data on aged care abuse on national and
637 international scales.

638

639 ***Limitations***

640 A limitation of this review was that it did not include studies examining residential special
641 units. These environments were excluded because of their different clinical focus and unique
642 challenge in involving residents in research. Nevertheless, the decision may have potentially
643 excluded methodological tools measuring higher abuse rates other than indicated in this
644 review. There is a need to conduct a specialized review and analysis for these
645 institutionalized settings, as these groups have different needs and demands or present
646 findings of these subgroups within articles [42, 45, 46].

647 **Conclusion**

648 The review examined research methodologies used when investigating abuse within the aged
649 care field. The review identified a heterogeneity of definitions of abuse, variation of who
650 reported abuse, lack of agreement on measurement tools and recall periods, and variable
651 study quality. To develop evidence-based methodology there is a need for standardised,
652 comprehensive resources for the field. Ideally, a global consortium could be established to
653 determine how to consistently define, accurately measure, report, analyse, and respond to
654 abuse. The Aged Care Abuse Research Checklist (ACARC) was developed from the review
655 as a first step towards achieving this outcome. Doing so will normalise processes within
656 organisations and the community, allowing early interventions to change practices and reduce
657 the risk of recurrence. These arrangements will improve resident quality of care and
658 workplace cultures.

659 **Acknowledgments**

660 All those involved have been the authors

661 **REFERENCES**

- 662 1. Gale CR, Westbury L, Cooper C. Social isolation and loneliness as risk factors for the
663 progression of frailty: the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *Age Ageing*. 2018;47(3):392-7.
664 doi: 10.1093/ageing/afx188.
- 665 2. Simone L, Wettstein A, Senn O, Rosemann T, Hasler S. Types of abuse and risk factors
666 associated with elder abuse. *Swiss Med Wkly*. 2016;146:w14273. doi:
667 <https://dx.doi.org/10.4414/smw.2016.14273>.
- 668 3. Dyer SM, Valeri M, Arora N, Ross T, Winsall M, Tilden D, Crotty M. Review of
669 International Systems for Long-Term Care of Older People: Report prepared for the Royal
670 Commission into Aged Care Quality and Safety: research paper 2. [Internet] Flinders University;
671 2019. Available from:
672 [https://agedcare.royalcommission.gov.au/publications/Documents/research-paper-2-review-](https://agedcare.royalcommission.gov.au/publications/Documents/research-paper-2-review-international-systems-long-term-care.pdf)
673 [international-systems-long-term-care.pdf](https://agedcare.royalcommission.gov.au/publications/Documents/research-paper-2-review-international-systems-long-term-care.pdf).
- 674 4. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. World
675 Population Ageing (ST/ESA/SER.A/390). United Nations; 2015. Available from:
676 [https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WPA2015_Report.](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WPA2015_Report.pdf)
677 [pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WPA2015_Report.pdf)
- 678 5. Yon Y, Ramiro-Gonzalez M, Mikton CR, Huber M, Sethi D. The prevalence of elder
679 abuse in institutional settings: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Public Health*
680 2019;29(1):58-67. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/cky093.
- 681 6. World Health Organization. Abuse of older people. Geneva: World Health Organization;
682 2022. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/abuse-of-older-people>.

- 683 7. Baker JC, LeBlanc LA. Acceptability of interventions for aggressive behavior in long-
684 term care settings: comparing ratings and hierarchical selection. *Behav. Ther.* 2011;42(1):30-41.
685 doi: 10.1016/j.beth.2010.04.005.
- 686 8. Pillemer K, Burnes D, Riffin C, Lachs MS. Elder Abuse: Global Situation, Risk Factors,
687 and Prevention Strategies. *Gerontologist.* 2016;56 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S194-S205. doi:
688 10.1093/geront/gnw004.
- 689 9. Yon Y, Ramiro-Gonzalez M, Mikton CR, Huber M, Sethi D. The prevalence of elder
690 abuse in institutional settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Public Health.*
691 2019;29(1):58-67. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/cky093.
- 692 10. Malmedal W, Kilvik A, Steinsheim G, Botngard A. A literature review of survey
693 instruments used to measure staff-to-resident elder abuse in residential care settings. *Nurs Open.*
694 2020;7(6):1650-60. doi: 10.1002/nop2.573.
- 695 11. De Donder L, De Witte N, Brosens D, Dierckx E, Verté D. Learning to Detect and
696 Prevent Elder Abuse: The Need for a Valid Risk Assessment Instrument. *Procedia Soc. Behav.*
697 *Sci.* 2015;191:1483-8. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.583.
- 698 12. Hirt J, Adlbrecht L, Heinrich S, Zeller A. Staff-to-resident abuse in nursing homes: a
699 scoping review. *BMC Geriatr.* 2022;22(1):563. doi: [https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12877-022-](https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12877-022-03243-9)
700 03243-9.
- 701 13. Lindbloom EJ, Brandt J, Hough LD, Meadows SE. Elder mistreatment in the nursing
702 home: a systematic review. *JAMDA.* 2007;8(9):610-6. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2007.09.001.
- 703 14. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The
704 PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*
705 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

- 706 15. Agaliotis M, Morris T, Katz I, Greenfield D. Global Approaches to Older Abuse
707 Research in Institutional Care Settings: A Systematic Review: PROSPERO International
708 prospective register of systematic reviews. CRD42018055484, 18 November 2017
709 <https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO>.
- 710 16. Baker PR, Francis DP, Hairi NN, Othman S, Choo WY. Interventions for preventing
711 abuse in the elderly. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 2016;(8):CD010321. doi:
712 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD010321.pub2>.
- 713 17. Li T, Vedula S, Hadar N, Parkin C, Lau J, Dickersin K. Innovations in Data Collection,
714 Management, and Archiving for Systematic Reviews. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 2015;162:287-94. doi:
715 10.7326/M14-1603.
- 716 18. Boyle MH. Guidelines for evaluating prevalence studies. *Evid Based Ment Health.*
717 1998;1(2):37. doi:10.1136/ebmh.1.2.37
- 718 19. Griffiore RJ, Barboza GE, Mastin T, Oehmke J, Schiamberg LB, Post LA. Family
719 members' reports of abuse in Michigan nursing homes. *J. Elder Abuse Negl.* 2009;21(2):105-14.
720 doi: 10.1080/08946560902779910.
- 721 20. Page C, Conner T, Prokhorov A, Fang Y, Post L. The effect of care setting on elder
722 abuse: results from a Michigan survey. *J. Elder Abuse Negl.* 2009;21(3):239-52. doi:
723 10.1080/08946560902997553.
- 724 21. Post L, Page C, Conner T, Prokhorov A, Yu F, Biroscak BJ. Elder Abuse in Long-Term
725 Care: Types, Patterns, and Risk Factors. *Res Aging.* 2010;32(3):323-48. doi:
726 10.1177/0164027509357705.
- 727 22. Schiamberg LB, Oehmke J, Zhang Z, Barboza GE, Griffiore RJ, Von Heydrich L, et al.
728 Physical abuse of older adults in nursing homes: a random sample survey of adults with an

729 elderly family member in a nursing home. *J. Elder Abuse Negl.* 2012;24(1):65-83. doi:
730 10.1080/08946566.2011.608056.

731 23. Zhang Z, Schiamberg LB, Oehmke J, Barboza GE, Griffore RJ, Post LA, et al. Neglect of
732 older adults in Michigan nursing homes. *J. Elder Abuse Negl.* 2011;23(1):58-74.

733 24. Ben Natan M, Lowenstein A, Eisikovits Z. Psycho-social factors affecting elders'
734 maltreatment in long-term care facilities. *Int. Nurs. Rev.* 2010;57(1):113-20. doi:
735 10.1111/j.1466-7657.2009.00771.x. PubMed PMID: 2010-02627-020.

736 25. Ben Natan M, Ariela L. Study of factors that affect abuse of older people in nursing
737 homes. *Nurs. Manag. (Harrow)*. 2010;17(8):20-4. doi: 10.7748/nm2010.12.17.8.20.c8143.

738 26. Moore S. Abuse of residents in nursing homes: Results of a staff questionnaire. *Nurs*
739 *Times*. 2017;113(2):29-33.

740 27. Moore S. You can lead a horse to water but you can't make it drink: How effective is staff
741 training in the prevention of abuse of adults? *J. Adult Prot.* 2017;19(5):297-308. doi:
742 10.1108/JAP-03-2017-0008.

743 28. Moore S. Oops! Its happened again! Evidence of the continuing abuse of older people in
744 care homes. *J. Adult Prot.* 2018;20(1):33-46. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAP-06-2017-0026>.

745 29. Moore S. The road goes ever on: evidence of the continuing abuse of older people in care
746 homes. *Working with Older People*. 2019;23(3):152-66. [https://doi.org/10.1108/WWOP-06-](https://doi.org/10.1108/WWOP-06-2019-0014)
747 [2019-0014](https://doi.org/10.1108/WWOP-06-2019-0014).

748 30. Moore S. Safeguarding vulnerable older people: a job for life? *J. Adult Prot.*
749 2016;18(4):214-28. <https://doi.org/10.1108/WWOP-06-2019-0014>..

750 31. Moore S. The sound of silence: Evidence of the continuing under reporting of abuse in
751 care homes. *J. Adult Prot.* 2020;22(1):35-48. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JAP-08-2019-0027>.

- 752 32. Lafferty A, Drennan J, Treacy P, Lyons I, O'Loughlin A, Fealy G. Researching elder
753 abuse in Irish residential care settings for older people: Results from a pilot study. *Ir. J. Med.*
754 *Sci.*. 2011;180:S323. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11845-011-0742-0>.
- 755 33. Wang JJ. Psychological abuse behavior exhibited by caregivers in the care of the elderly
756 and correlated factors in long-term care facilities in Taiwan. *J Nurs Res.* 2005;13(4):271-80.
- 757 34. Neuberg M, Pudmej Esegovic V, Krizaj M, Cikac T, Mestrovic T. Abuse and neglect of
758 older people in health facilities from the perspective of nursing professionals: A cross-sectional
759 study from Croatia. *Int. J. Older People Nurs.* 2022;17(6):e12484. doi:
760 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/opn.12484>.
- 761 35. Castle N. Nurse aides' reports of resident abuse in nursing homes. *J Appl Gerontol*
762 2012;31(3):402-22. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0733464810389174>.
- 763 36. Castle N, Beach S. Elder abuse in assisted living. *J Appl Gerontol.* 2013;32(2):248-67.
764 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464811418094>
- 765 37. Friedman L, Avila S, Friedman D, Meltzer W. Association between Type of Residence
766 and Clinical Signs of Neglect in Older Adults. *Gerontol.* 2019;65(1):30-9. doi:
767 10.1159/000492029
- 768 38. Phillips LR, Ziminski C. The public health nursing role in elder neglect in assisted living
769 facilities. *Public Health Nurs.* 2012;29(6):499-509. doi: [https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-](https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1446.2012.01029.x)
770 1446.2012.01029.x.
- 771 39. Teaster PB, Ramsey-Klawnsnik H, Abner EL, Kim S. The Sexual Victimization of Older
772 Women Living in Nursing Homes. *J. Elder Abuse Negl.* 2015;27(4-5):392-409. doi:
773 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08946566.2015.1082453>.

- 774 40. Teaster PB, Ramsey-Klawnsnik H, Mendiondo MS, Abner E, Cecil K, Tooms M. From
775 behind the shadows: a profile of the sexual abuse of older men residing in nursing homes. *J.*
776 *Elder Abuse Negl.* 2007;19(1-2):29-45, table of contents. doi:
777 https://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J084v19n01_03.
- 778 41. McCool JJ, Jogerst GJ, Daly JM, Xu Y. Multidisciplinary reports of nursing home
779 mistreatment. *JAMDA.* 2009;10(3):174-80. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2008.09.005.
- 780 42. Cohen M, Halevy-Levin S, Gagin R, Priltuzky D, Friedman G. Elder abuse in long-term
781 care residences and the risk indicators. *Ageing Soc.* 2010;30:1027-40. doi:
782 10.1017/s0144686x10000188.
- 783 43. Smith D, Cunningham N, Willoughby M, Young C, Odell M, Ibrahim J, et al. The
784 epidemiology of sexual assault of older female nursing home residents, in Victoria Australia,
785 between 2000 and 2015. *Leg Med (Tokyo).* 2019;36:89-95. doi:
786 10.1016/j.legalmed.2018.11.006.
- 787 44. Smith DE, Wright MT, Ibrahim JE. Aged care nurses' perception of unwanted sexual
788 behaviour in Australian residential aged care services. *Australas. J. Ageing.* 2022;41(1):153-9.
789 doi: 10.1111/ajag.13014.
- 790 45. Blumenfeld Arens O, Fierz K, Zuniga F. Elder abuse in nursing homes: Do special care
791 units make a difference? A secondary data analysis of the Swiss Nursing Homes Human
792 Resources Project. *Gerontol.* 2017;63(2):169-79. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000450787>.
- 793 46. Botngård A, Eide AH, Mosqueda L, Malmedal W. Elder abuse in Norwegian nursing
794 homes: a cross-sectional exploratory study. *BMC Health Serv. Res.* 2020;20(1):9. doi:
795 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4861-z>

- 796 47. Buzgová R, Ivanová K. Violation of ethical principles in institutional care for older
797 people. *Nurs. Ethics* 2011;18(1):64-78. doi: 10.1177/0969733010385529.
- 798 48. Frazão SL, Correia AM, Norton P, Magalhaes T. Physical abuse against elderly persons
799 in institutional settings. *J Forensic Leg Med.* 2015;36:54-60. doi:
800 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2015.09.002>.
- 801 49. Gil AP, Capelas ML. Elder abuse and neglect in nursing homes as a reciprocal process:
802 the view from the perspective of care workers. *J. Adult Prot.* 2022;24(1):22-42. doi:
803 10.1108/JAP-06-2021-0021.
- 804 50. Habjanič A, Lahe D. Are frail older people less exposed to abuse in nursing homes as
805 compared to community-based settings? Statistical analysis of Slovenian data. *Arch Gerontol*
806 *Geriatr.* 2012;54(3):e261-70. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2011.07.006>.
- 807 51. Malmedal W, Ingebrigtsen O, Saveman B. Inadequate care in Norwegian nursing homes
808 -- as reported by nursing staff. *Scand. J. Caring Sci.* 2009;23(2):231-42. doi: [10.1111/j.1471-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6712.2008.00611.x)
809 [6712.2008.00611.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6712.2008.00611.x)
- 810 52. Neuberg M, Zeleznik D, Mestrovic T, Ribic R, Kozina G. Is the burnout syndrome
811 associated with elder mistreatment in nursing homes: Results of a cross-sectional study among
812 nurses. *Arhiv za Higijenu Rada i Toksikologiju.* 2017;68(3):190-7. doi:10.1515/aiht-2017-68-
813 2982.
- 814 53. Drennan J, Lafferty, A., Treacy, M.P., Fealy, G., Phelan, A., Lyons, I. Hall, P. Older
815 People in Residential Care Settings: Results of a National Survey of Staff-Resident Interactions
816 and Conflicts. NCPOP, University College Dublin; 2012. Available from:
817 <https://www.lenus.ie/handle/10147/301725>.

- 818 54. Daly JM, Jogerst GJ. Association of knowledge of adult protective services legislation
819 with rates of reporting of abuse in Iowa nursing homes. *JAMDA*. 2005;6(2):113-20. doi:
820 10.1016/j.jamda.2005.01.005.
- 821 55. Daly JM, Jogerst GJ. Readability and Content of Elder Abuse Instruments. *J. Elder*
822 *Abuse Negl*. 2005;17(4):31-52. doi: 10.1300/J084v17n04_03.
- 823 56. Bjelic-Radisic V, Cardoso F, Cameron D, Brain E, Kuljanic K, da Costa RA, et al. An
824 international update of the EORTC questionnaire for assessing quality of life in breast cancer
825 patients: EORTC QLQ-BR45. *Ann. Oncol*. 2020;31(2):283-8. doi: 0.1016/j.annonc.2019.10.027.
- 826 57. Giannakopoulos NN, Rammelsberg P, Eberhard L, Schmitter M. A new instrument for
827 assessing the quality of studies on prevalence. *Clin Oral Investig*. 2012;16(3):781-8. doi:
828 10.1007/s00784-011-0557-4.
- 829 58. Shamliyan T, Kane RL, Dickinson S. A systematic review of tools used to assess the
830 quality of observational studies that examine incidence or prevalence and risk factors for
831 diseases. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2010;63(10):1061-70. doi:
832 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.04.014>.
- 833 59. Myhre J, Saga S, Malmedal W, Ostaszkiwicz J, Nakrem S. Elder abuse and neglect: an
834 overlooked patient safety issue. A focus group study of nursing home leaders' perceptions of
835 elder abuse and neglect. *BMC Health Serv. Res*. 2020;20(1):199. doi: 10.1186/s12913-020-
836 5047-4.
- 837 60. Radermacher H, Toh YL, Western D, Coles J, Goeman D, Lowthian J. Staff
838 conceptualisations of elder abuse in residential aged care: A rapid review. *Australas J Ageing*.
839 2018;37(4):254-67. doi: 10.1111/ajag.12565.

- 840 61. World Health Organization. Continuity and coordination of care: a practice brief to
841 support implementation of the WHO Framework on integrated people-centred health services.
842 License: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018. [cited
843 2021 Sept 27]. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/274628>.
- 844 62. Kelley TA. International Consortium for Health Outcomes Measurement (ICHOM).
845 Trials. 2015;16(3):O4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1745-6215-16-S3-O4>.
- 846 63. Beach SR, Carpenter CR, Rosen T, Sharps P, Gelles R. Screening and detection of elder
847 abuse: Research opportunities and lessons learned from emergency geriatric care, intimate
848 partner violence, and child abuse. J. Elder Abuse Negl. 2016;28(4-5):185-216. doi:
849 10.1080/08946566.2016.1229241.
- 850

S1 Fig: PRISMA Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	3
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	4 - 5
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	6 - 7
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	6
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	6
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	6, S1 File
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	S1 File
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	6
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	6-7, S3 File
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	10 - 29, S3, S5 Files
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	7, 43 - 46
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	N/A
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	N/A

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	N/A
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	N/A
RESULTS			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	Fig 1 p 9
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	10-43 Table 1, S5 File Tables
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	43-46, Table 2
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	N/A
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	N/A
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	N/A
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	N/A
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	47-51
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	52
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	53
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	N/A

Table 1: Summary of study characteristics via staff, residents, relative and community reporting abuse.

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
Author	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment	Definition	Yrs. Resident	Dependency	Method of collecting data,	Experienced (E)	Recall	Frequency of	Validity of Tool
Year			Definition NHs	Age \bar{x} (\pm sd)	Professional	N	Distributed	/Observed (O)	Month	Abuse	
Country			N (%)	[Range]	Experience	(%)	No: of items Source				
			Study Population N (%)	(%, F)	\bar{x} (\pm sd)		Questionnaire				
			Response Rate (RR) %		[Range]						
<i>Staff</i>											
1. Ben Natan M et al. 2010 IL [24]	Overall P Psych F (exploitation) S N	CS	Rand LTF <i>LTF</i> 300 (8%) S:600 (NR%) RR: 85% <i>Facility Directors: 24</i> RR: 91.6%	R: <i>Elderly Patients</i> NR [NR] (F:NR) S: <i>Staff members (incl. nurses, nursing aids, administration & facility directors)</i> NR [20-65] 40 – 49 (F:81.6%)	R: NR NR [NR] <i>Overall (Yrs.)</i> S: 13.8 (NR) [NR] <i>Present NH</i> ≤ 5 61.4%	R: NR	Q, Researcher SQ: Items: 5 parts Part 2: Reporting incidents of violence Daly & Jogerst (2005) Iowa Dependent Adult Abuse Nursing Home Questionnaire	S: D	12	S: Number • 1 -5 • 6-10 • 11 -16 • 17 or more	NR

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
	Author Year Country	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment Definition NHs N (%) Study Population N (%) Response Rate (RR) %	Definition Age \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range] (%, F)	Yrs. Resident Professional Experience \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range]	Dependency N (%)	Method of collecting data, Distributed No: of items Source Questionnaire	Experienced (E) /Observed (O)	Recall Month	Frequency of Abuse
2. Blumenfeld Arens OB et al., 2017 SW [45]	P Psych (Emotional) N	CS	Rand NH <i>NHs (SCU, Non-SCU or other)</i> 1,600 S: 6,000 (76.7%) RR: NR%	R: <i>Residents</i> 84.6 (\pm 3.0) [NR] (F:9.8%) S: <i>Direct care workers</i> 43.1 (\pm 12.3) [NR] (F:NR)	R: NR S: NR	R: NR	Q, NR SQ Items: 42 Malmodal et al. (2009)	S: O	4 Wks.	S: How often Never to more than once a week (4-point Likert scale)	Cronbach's alpha 0.78 Face to face content Content validity Internal validity External validity
3. Botngård A et al. 2020 NO [46]	Overall P Psych F (Material) S N	CS	Rand NH <i>NHs (CRE)</i> 939 [7.8%] S: 6337 (58.3%) RR: 60.1%	R: <i>Residents</i> NR [NR] (F:NR) S: <i>Nursing staff</i> NR [16 - 73] >31-75, 71.1%	R: NR S: NR	R: NR	Survey, Coordinator distributed SC from SQ: Items 35 Castle (2012) modified Verbal: Clarke & Pierson (1999) Psych: Lachs & Pillemer (2004) Caregiver: Federal Register (1991) Medication: Chambers (1999)	S: D & O	12	S: How often Never – Repeatedly (3-point Likert- type scale)	Generalisability Validity tested Internal validity

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
Author	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment	Definition	Yrs. Resident	Dependency	Method of collecting data,	Experienced (E)	Recall	Frequency of	Validity of Tool
Year			Definition NHs	Age \bar{x} (\pm sd)	Professional	N	Distributed	/Observed (O)	Month	Abuse	
Country			N (%)	[Range]	Experience	(%)	No: of items Source				
			Study Population N (%)	(%, F)	\bar{x} (\pm sd)		Questionnaire				
			Response Rate (RR) %		[Range]						
				(F: 91.5%)			Material exploitation: Rabiner et al. (2006)				
							Sexual: The National Center on Elder Abuse (1998)				

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment Definition NHs N (%) Study Population N (%) Response Rate (RR) %	Definition Age \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range] (%, F)	Yrs. Resident Professional Experience \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range]	Dependency N (%)	Method of collecting data, Distributed No: of items Source Questionnaire	Experienced (E) /Observed (O)	Recall Month	Frequency of Abuse	Validity of Tool
4. Buzgová, R., & Ivanová, K. 2011 CR [47]	Overall P Psych S N (Care)	CS (interviews and questionnaires)	Rand NH Senior Homes 24 (50%) NR: RR% R: 488/3597 (27% selected) RR: NR% S: 477 / 1446 (NR%) RR: 64%	R: clients NR (\pm NR) [60 - >75] (F: 74.8%) >75 years 350 (71.7%) S: DCE NR (\pm NR) [18 to >35] (F: 96.9%) >35 years 333 (73.4%)	R: Length of stay NR [<4 - >10] R: < 4 62.1% S: Present NH NR [<4 - >8] >8 years 173 38.1%	R: Self-sufficiency (Barthel ADL Index) 262 53.7%	R: I, NR SC from SQ: 32 questions (26 listed forms of elder abuse) Buzgová & Ivanová et al.(2009) WHO (2002) S: Q, Anonymous, NR SC from SQ, 40 Buzgová & Ivanová et al.(2009) WHO (2002)	R: D & O S: D & O	12 12	R: How often (number) S: Never Once Repeatedly (3-point Likert-type scale)	Validity tested
5. Castle N. 2012 USA [35]	P Psych (& verbal)	CS	Rand Prof. Registry NHs NR	R: Residents NR [NR]	R: NR	R: NR	Q: Mail out, NR SC from SQ: Items 46 (28 measured abuse)	S: O	3	S: Number	Face validity Content validity

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
	Author Year Country	Types of Abuse Study Design	Recruitment Definition NHs N (%) Study Population N (%) Response Rate (RR) %	Definition Age \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range] (%, F)	Yrs. Resident Professional Experience \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range]	Dependency N (%)	Method of collecting data, Distributed No. of items Source Questionnaire	Experienced (E) /Observed (O)	Recall Month	Frequency of Abuse	Validity of Tool
		F (material exploitation) S Other: Caregiver abuse Medication abuse	\bar{x} 125.1 (\pm 72.2) beds S: 7,000 (49%) RR: 64%	(F:NR) S: Nurse aides or Certified Nursing Assistants (CNAs) 32.5 (\pm 8.1) [NR] (F: 91%)	 S: Present NH S: 1.1 (\pm 3.1)		Verbal: Clarke & Pierson (1999) Psych: Lachs & Pillemer (2004) Caregiver: Federal Register (1991) Medication: Chambers (1999) Material exploitation: Rabiner et al. (2006) Sexual: The National Center on Elder Abuse (1998)			Never (0), Once (1) or more (number)	
6. Castle N & Beach S. 2013 USA [36]	P Psych (verbal) F (Material exploitation), S O: Caregiver abuse, O: Medication abuse	CS	Rand Prof. Registry ALs 1470 (nr%) RR: NR S: 895 (NR%) RR: 63%	R: Residents NR (\pm NR) [NR] (F:NR) S: Nurse aides 31.4 (\pm 8.1) [NR] (F: 94%)	R: NR NR [NR] S: NR NR [NR]	R: NR	Q: Mail out, NR SC from SQ, 46 (28 measured abuse) Verbal: Clarke & Pierson (1999) Psych: Lachs & Pillemer (2004) Caregiver: Federal Register (1991) Medication: Chambers (1999) Material exploitation: Rabiner et al. (2006) Sexual: The National Center on Elder Abuse (1998)	S: O	3	NR	Face validity Content validity

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment Definition NHs N (%) Study Population N (%) Response Rate (RR) %	Definition Age \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range] (%, F)	Yrs. Resident Professional Experience \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range]	Dependency N (%)	Method of collecting data, Distributed No: of items Source Questionnaire	Experienced (E) /Observed (O)	Recall Month	Frequency of Abuse	Validity of Tool
7. Gil AP & Capelas ML 2022 PT [49]	Overall P Psych F S N Other: Global	CS (interviews)	One council in the metropolitan area Care homes 16 (50%) RR: NR% S: 186 (NR %) RR: 88.4%	R: Residents NR (\pm NR) [NR] (F: NR%) S: Care workers 20 (51.1%) 47 (\pm NR) [21 - 68] (F: 94.0%)	R: NR NR [NR] S: 10 years (NR) [NR] Permanent contract	R: NR	NR Q: NR (self-completed) SC from SC, 31 Rabold and Goergen (2013) and Drennan et al. (2012), NR for types of abuse	S: D & O (excluded including others including S)	12	Ever	NR
8. Malmedal W et al 2009 NO [51]	Overall P Psych (Emotional) F N	CS	Rand NH <i>Nursing Homes</i> 51 (31%) S: 780 (NR) RR: 78.9%	R: Resident NR [NR] (F: 70%) S: Staff members 40 (\pm 13) [16-74]	R: NR NR [NR] S: Overall (Yrs.) 14 (NR)	R: Confused 59%	Q, Staff SC from SQ: Items: 42 20 items on acts of inadequate care Based on several clinical research studies Saveman BI et al. (1999) Goergen (2001)	S: D & O	4 Wks.	S: How often Never to more than once a week (4-point Likert-type scale)	Cronbach's alpha; physical 0.57; Validity tested

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
	Author	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment	Definition	Yrs. Resident	Dependency	Method of collecting data,	Experienced (E)	Recall	Frequency of
Year			Definition NHs	Age \bar{x} (\pm sd)	Professional	N	Distributed	/Observed (O)	Month	Abuse	
Country			N (%)	[Range]	Experience	(%)	No: of items Source				
			Study Population N (%)	(%, F)	\bar{x} (\pm sd)		Questionnaire				
			Response Rate (RR) %		[Range]						
				(F: 97%)	[0-45]		Pillemer & Bachman-Prchn (1991)				
				<i>Present NH</i>							
				8 (NR)							
9. McCool JJ et al. 2009 USA [41]	Overall P Psych (Emotional) F N	CS (interviews and survey)	Nursing Facilities (2) Nursing Facilities 2 (15%) RR: NR% S: 335 NR% RR: 15%	R: Resident NR (\pm NR) [NR] (F: NR%) S: Staff members NR (\pm NR) [18 - 71] (F: 86.5%) Nursing & administrative staff 29 (59.2%) Other staff 20 (40.8%)	R: NR NR [NR] S: NR NR (NR) [NR]	R: NR	Q, Staff, Postal SC from SQ, 28 5 person experiences with suspected adult abuse and reporting Clark-Daniels CL et al, 1990 Oswald RA, 2004	S: O	Ever	Ever in current facility	NR

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
	Author	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment	Definition	Yrs. Resident	Dependency	Method of collecting data,	Experienced (E)	Recall	Frequency of
Year			Definition NHs	Age \bar{x} (\pm sd)	Professional	N	Distributed	/Observed (O)	Month	Abuse	
Country			N (%)	[Range]	Experience	(%)	No: of items Source				
			Study Population N (%)	(%, F)	\bar{x} (\pm sd)		Questionnaire				
			Response Rate (RR) %		[Range]						
10. Moore S. 2016 UK [30]	P, Psych, F, S, N Other	CS (interviews and survey)	5 new care homes for older people Local authorities with adult social services Private sector care and NHs 152 (22%) RR: NR% S: 134 189 (NR%) RR: 70.9% (average)	R: Residents NR (\pm NR) [NR] (F: NR%) S: Care staff NR (\pm NR) [NR] (F: NR%)	R: NR NR [NR] S: NR NR [NR]	R: NR	Q: Mail out, Managers contacted Researchers SC, NR Department of Health, 2000	S: D	12	Never Ever	NR
11. Moore S. 2020 UK [31]	Overall	CS (interviews and survey)	11 newly open NHs 11 (NR%) RR: NR% S: NR 429 (NR%)	R: NR NR (\pm NR) [NR] (F: NR%) S: Care Staff NR (\pm NR)	R: NR NR [NR] S: NR NR	R: NR	Q: Mail out, Managers contacted Researchers SC, NR Department of Health, 2000	S: O	12	Happened once, or repeatedly During day or night 12 months ago 1-3 years ago	NR

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
Author Year Country	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment Definition NHs N (%) Study Population N (%) Response Rate (RR) %	Definition Age \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range] (%, F)	Yrs. Resident Professional Experience \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range]	Dependency N (%)	Method of collecting data, Distributed No: of items Source Questionnaire	Experienced (E) /Observed (O)	Recall Month	Frequency of Abuse	Validity of Tool
			RR: 82.9%	[NR] (F: NR%)	[NR]					More than 3 years ago	
12. Neuberg M et al. 2017 HRV [52]	P, Psych, F, S,	CS	2 state and 2 private NHs & 2 Ext care units NHs & Ext care units NR (NR%) RR: NR% S: Nursing Professionals 200 (85.5%) RR: 85.5%	R: Elderly Individuals NR (\pm NR) [NR] (F: NR%) S: Nursing Professionals Qualifications Bachelor: 39 (22.8 %), Masters: 3 (1.8 %) Secondary: 129 (75.4 %) 41.0 (\pm NR) [30.0-51.0] (F: 86.5%)	R: NR NR [NR] S: 20.0 (NR) [8.0-30.0]	R: NR	Q: NR, NR SQ, 25 Drennan J, Lafferty A, Treacy MP, Fealy G, Phelan A, Lyons I, Hall P. Older People in Residential Care Settings: Results from a National Survey of Staff-Resident Interactions and Conflicts. NCPOP: University College Dublin, 2012	S: O	12	Never Once 2 to 10 times More than 10 times	Internal validity

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
Author Year Country	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment Definition NHs N (%) Study Population N (%) Response Rate (RR) %	Definition Age \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range] (%, F)	Yrs. Resident Professional Experience \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range]	Dependency N (%)	Method of collecting data, Distributed No: of items Source Questionnaire	Experienced (E) /Observed (O)	Recall Month	Frequency of Abuse	Validity of Tool
13. Smith DE et al. 2022 AUS [44]	S	R CS	Sample of residential aged care services nurses enrolled to complete an e-learning course Residential aged care services NR (NR%) RR: NR% S: EN & RN's (aged care nurses) 167 (77.2%) RR: 34.9%	R: Residents NR (\pm NR) [NR] (F: NR%) S: EN & RN's (aged care nurses) Senior Management 20 (51.1%) NR (\pm NR) [35 - 64] (F: 91.1%)	R: NR NR [NR] S: NR (NR) [NR] 10 years' experience 26 (57.8%)	R: NR	S: Online, nurses registered to course SC, 7 SC survey instrument	S: D & O	12	Ever	NR
<i>Residents</i>											
1. Buzgová, R., & Ivanová, K. 2011 CR [47]	Overall P Psych S N (Care)	CS (interviews and questionnaires)	Rand NH <i>Senior Homes</i> 24 NHs (50%)	R: clients NR [60 - >75] (F: 74.8 %)	R: Length of stay NR [<4 - >10] R: < 4	R: Self-sufficiency (Barthel ADL Index) 262	R: I, NR SC from SQ: 32 questions 26 listed forms of elder abuse	R: D & O	12	R: How often (number)	Validity tested

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY			
	Author	Year	Country	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment	Definition	Yrs. Resident	Dependency	Method of collecting data,	Experienced (E)	Recall	Frequency of	Validity of Tool
						Definition NHs	Age \bar{x} (\pm sd)	Professional	N	Distributed	/Observed (O)	Month	Abuse	
						N (%)	[Range]	Experience	(%)	No: of items				
						Study Population N (%)	(%, F)	\bar{x} (\pm sd)		Source				
						Response Rate (RR) %		[Range]		Questionnaire				
						R: 488/3597 (27% selected) RR: NR	>75 350 (71.7%)	(62.1%)	(53.7%)	S: Q, Anonymous Items: 40 Buzgová & Ivanová et al.(2009) WHO (2002)	S: D & O		S: Never Once Repeatedly (3-point Likert- type scale)	
						S: 477 / 1446 (NR%) RR: 64%	S: DCE NR [18 to >35] (F: 96.9%) >35 333 (73.4%)	S: Present NH NR [<4 - >8]	>8 173 (38.1%)					

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
Author Year Country	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment Definition NHs N (%) Study Population N (%) Response Rate (RR) %	Definition Age \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range] (%, F)	Yrs. Resident Professional Experience \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range]	Dependency N (%)	Method of collecting data, Distributed No: of items Source Questionnaire	Experienced (E) /Observed (O)	Recall Month	Frequency of Abuse	Validity of Tool
2. Cohen M et al. 2010 IL [42]	P [signs of abuse] Psych S N [signs of abuse & neglect of basic needs] Other: Signs of abuse: exploitation] & Disrespectful attitudes	CS (interviews and observation of health profiles and a list of maltreatment or abusive acts)	Hospitalised R <i>Elderly homes, sheltered homes & NHs or 'nursing (long-stay) departments' of hospitals sheltered-home facilities</i> NR R: 71 (64.8%) RR: NR	R: <i>Hospitalised inpatients</i> 81.6 (\pm 7.5) [70 - 99] (F: 64.8%) S: <i>Staff</i> NR [NR] (F: NR)	R: NR NR [NR] S: NR NR [NR]	R: ADLs: Totally dependent 15 (61.9%)	I: (F-to-F), Social workers SC from SQ: Items: 24 Listed maltreatment/abusive acts Kotwitz & Bowling (2003) Wan, Tseng and Chen (2007) O: (Physical), Nurses Signs of Abuse Inventory and the Expanded Indicators of Abuse Questionnaire (Cohen, 2006, 2007)	R: D	12	R: Maltreatment and abusive acts 'Never' to 'almost all the time'. Score: 0 to 72 R: Signs of Abuse Inventory '0', 'not at all', to '4', 'extreme' (4-point Likert-type scale)	Internality reliability Criterion validity
3. Habjanić A & Lahe D 2012 SI [50]	P Psych (mental) F	CS	Rand NH <i>Nursing Homes</i> 7/10 NHs [Pool 28]	R: <i>Nursing home residents</i> NR	R: NR	R: ADLs Occasional - Always 104	I: (F-to-F), Researchers Nursing staff informed residents of study	R: D	6	R: <i>Reported</i> (Number)	Reliability tested Validity tested

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY			
	Author	Year	Country	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment	Definition	Yrs. Resident	Dependency	Method of collecting data,	Experienced (E)	Recall	Frequency of	Validity of Tool
						Definition NHs	Age \bar{x} (\pm sd)	Professional	N	Distributed	/Observed (O)	Month	Abuse	
						N (%)	[Range]	Experience	(%)	No: of items Source				
						Study Population N (%)	(%, F)	\bar{x} (\pm sd)		Questionnaire				
						Response Rate (RR) %		[Range]						
						R: 1,541 (41.0%) Randomly selected 200 RR: 81.5%	\geq 65 (F:82.8%) 75-84 years 47.7%		(81.3%)	SC from SQ: Items: NR Develop from examples primarily from: The National Center on Elder Abuse (1998) Isola et al. (2008) Garre-Olmo et al. (2009) Malmedal et al. (2009)				
<i>Relatives</i>														
1. Griffone RJ et al. 2009 USA [19]	P Psych F S N Other:	CS		Rand RDD Community RT Nursing Homes or Long-Term Care Services NR RT: 1002 (45.1%)		R: Age 65 or older resided in a facility that they defined as a nursing home NR \geq 65]	R: NR	R: NR	I: RDD, [Telephone Interview] SQ: Items: NR Michigan Survey of Households with Family Members Receiving Long-Term Care Services (MLTCS)	RT: O	12	RT: Number	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None • 1 or 2 • 3 to 5 • 6 to 10 • More than 10

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY			
	Author	Year	Country	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment	Definition	Yrs. Resident	Dependency	Method of collecting data,	Experienced (E)	Recall	Frequency of	Validity of Tool
						Definition NHs	Age \bar{x} (\pm sd)	Professional	N	Distributed	/Observed (O)	Month	Abuse	
						N (%)	[Range]	Experience	(%)	No: of items Source				
						Study Population N (%)	(%, F)	\bar{x} (\pm sd)		Questionnaire				
						Response Rate (RR) %		[Range]						
			Caretaker abuse			(RR: NR)	(F:NR)	S: NR						
							S: Staff & Caregiver	RT: NA						
							NR							
							[NR]							
							(F:NR)							
							RT: Adults reported a relative in NH							
							NR							
							[NR]							
							(F:NR)							

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
Author Year Country	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment Definition NHs N (%) Study Population N (%) Response Rate (RR) %	Definition Age \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range] (%, F)	Yrs. Resident Professional Experience \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range]	Dependency N (%)	Method of collecting data, Distributed No: of items Source Questionnaire	Experienced (E) /Observed (O)	Recall Month	Frequency of Abuse	Validity of Tool
<i>Registry</i>											
1. Frazão SL et al. 2015 PT [48]	P (& Signs P) Neglect: Medical and medication	R CS	Registry <i>Institutional setting or NH</i> 10 NHs R: 1 479 (reports) (3.9%) RR: NA	R: <i>Alleged victim of physical abuse living in a NH</i> 79.7 (NR) [66-107] (F: 79.7%) S: <i>Institutional caregiver</i> NR [NR] (F:NR)	R: Median 17 months [3 days - 147 months] S: NR	R: ADLs: Severe 33 (55.9%)	Registry, NA Reporting Systems: Items: NR Forensic medical reports (FMR)	Investigations (O/D)	120 (10 Yrs.)	R: Suspicion/alleged victim of elder abuse Number	NR
2. Friedman L et al. 2017 USA [37]	N (clinical signs of neglect)	R CS	<i>Long-term care facilities</i> 105 LTFs NFP: 22 FP: 83 R: 430	R: <i>Inpatients</i> NFP: 79.3 (\pm 9.5) (F: 56.9%) FP: 77.7 (\pm 9.3)	R: NR	R: ADL score NFP: 4.9 (\pm 5.5) FP: 4.7	Registry, (Inpatient hospital), 11 Clinical signs of neglect [CSNS] Items: 0 – 60 items	Investigations (O/D)	60 (5 Yrs.)	'Any' One or more clinical signs	Content validity Consensual validity

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY			
	Author	Year	Country	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment	Definition	Yrs. Resident	Dependency	Method of collecting data,	Experienced (E)	Recall	Frequency of	Validity of Tool
						Definition NHs	Age \bar{x} (\pm sd)	Professional	N	Distributed	/Observed (O)	Month	Abuse	
						N (%)	[Range]	Experience	(%)	No: of items Source				
						Study Population N (%)	(%, F)	\bar{x} (\pm sd)		Questionnaire				
						Response Rate (RR) %		[Range]						
						NFP:61 FP: 369 RR: NA	(F: 63.9%) S: Caregivers NR [NR] (F:NR)	S: NR	(\pm 5.4)					
3. Phillips LR & Ziminski C 2012 USA [38]	N	R CS Exploratory			Registry: Complaints ALS 165 (10% Arizona) R: NR NR RR: NA%	R: Resident NR (\pm NR) [NR] (F: NR) S: Staff NR (\pm NR) [NR] (F:NR)	R: NR NR [NR] S: NR NR [NR]	R: NR	Registry, NA SC, NR Registry Arizona Secretary of State Arizona Department of Health Service offices	Allegations of neglect O	96 (8 Yrs.)	Citation	Intrater reliability	
4. Smith DE et al. 2019 AUS [43]	S	R CS			Registry: <i>FMEx</i> from <i>CFM</i> NR	R: <i>Alleged Victim</i> NR [\geq 65] (F:100%	R: NR	Physical health needs (Y): 11 (39.3%)	Reporting Systems, NA SC, NR Clinical case CFM, VIFM, Registry	Alleged Incident (O/D)	180 (15 Yrs.)	Number (alleged incidents)	NR	

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY			
	Author	Year	Country	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment	Definition	Yrs. Resident	Dependency	Method of collecting data,	Experienced (E)	Recall	Frequency of	Validity of Tool
						Definition NHs	Age \bar{x} (\pm sd)	Professional	N	Distributed	/Observed (O)	Month	Abuse	
						N (%)	[Range]	Experience	(%)	No: of items Source				
						Study Population N (%)	(%, F)	\bar{x} (\pm sd)		Questionnaire				
						Response Rate (RR) %		[Range]						
						R: 28 RR: NA	Median: 83 80-84: (28.6%) S: Alleged Perpetrator * Direct Care Staff (n = 7) and Medical Practitioners (n = 1) NR	S: NR	Dementia: 17 (73.9%)					

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY
	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment Definition NHs N (%) Study Population N (%) Response Rate (RR) %	Definition Age \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range] (%, F)	Yrs. Resident Professional Experience \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range]	Dependency N (%)	Method of collecting data, Distributed No: of items Source Questionnaire	Experienced (E) /Observed (O)	Recall Month	Frequency of Abuse	Validity of Tool
5. Teaster PB et al. 2007 USA [40] (Men Only)	S	CS	Registry NHs NR R: 37 Investigation RR: NA Substantiated: 6/26 Perpetrator as staff 16/24 75%	R: <i>Older men residing in NHs</i> 71(NR) [50-93] (F: 29.7%) S: <i>Facility staff</i> NR [NR] (F:NR)	NR	NR	Case reports, Registry, NA Reporting Systems: Items: NR Adult Protective Services (APS) and other regulatory entities from five states & used SASU	Investigations (O/D)	6	Isolated or ongoing (Y/N) [include substantiate allegations of abuse]	Reliability testing Validity testing
6. Teaster PB et al. 2015 USA [39] (Women Only)	S	R CS	Registry NHs NR R: 64 (40% by staff) RR: NA Substantiated: 20/64	R: <i>Women living in NHs</i> 81 (NR) [66 -101] (F: 100%) S: <i>Facility staff</i> NR	R: NR S: NR	R: ADLs Required Assistance 45.3%	Case reports, Registry, NA Reporting Systems Items: NR Adult Protective Services (APS) and other regulatory entities from five states & used SASU	Investigations (O/D)	6	Isolated or ongoing (Y/N) [include substantiate allegations of abuse]	Reliability testing Validity testing

STUDY DETAILS	DESIGN		SAMPLE				METHODOLOGY				QUALITY			
	Author	Year	Country	Types of Abuse	Study Design	Recruitment	Definition	Yrs. Resident	Dependency	Method of collecting data,	Experienced (E)	Recall	Frequency of	Validity of Tool
						Definition NHs N (%) Study Population N (%) Response Rate (RR) %	Age \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range] (%, F)	Professional Experience \bar{x} (\pm sd) [Range]	N (%)	Distributed No: of items Source Questionnaire	/Observed (O)	Month	Abuse	
							[NR] (F:NR)							

ADL = Activities of Daily Living; CRE = Central Register of Establishments and Enterprises; CFM = Clinical Forensic Medicine; CNF = Certified Nursing Facilities; CRE = Central Register of Establishments and Enterprises; CS = Cross Sectional; CSNS = Clinical signs of neglect; DCE = Direct care Employee; DCW = Direct Care Workers; EN = Enrolled Nurse; F = Female; FME = Forensic Medical Examination; FMR = Forensic Medical Reports; FP = For Profit; HRV = Croatia; LTF = Long-term Facility; LTFP = Long-term Care Facilities; N = Nurse; Non-SU = Non-Specialised Care Units; A = Not Applicable; NFP = Non-for-Profit; NR = Not Reported; RR = Response Rate; Rand = Random; R = Resident; R CS = Retrospective Cross Sectional; RDD = Random-digit dialling; RN = Registered Nurse; RR = Response Rate; RT = Relative; S = Staff; SCU = Specialised Care Units; Yrs. = Years; Wks. = Weeks; UK = United Kingdom.

Table 2: Methodological Quality of Studies

	Author, Year, Country	Mode of Recruitment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
NURSING HOMES											
1.	Botngård A et al,2020, NO [46]	NHs	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
2.	Habjanič A & Lahe D, 2012, SI [50]	NHs	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	6
3.	Blumenfeld Arens O, 2017, SW [45]	NHs	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	5
4.	Malmedal W et al, 2009, NO [51]	NHs	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	5
5.	Buzgová, R & Ivanová, K, 2011, CR [47]	NHs	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
6.	Castle N, 2012, USA [35]	NHs	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
7.	Ben Natan M et al, 2010, IL [24]	NHs	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
8.	Griffore RJ et al, 2009, USA [19]	CATI	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
9.	Neuberg M et al, 2017, HRV [52]	NHs & ECUs	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
10.	Smith DE et al, 2022, AUS [44]	Registered subscribers to resource on resident safety	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
11.	Gil AP & Capelas ML, 2022, PT [49]	NHs	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
ASSISTANT LIVING											
1.	Castle N & Beach S, 2013, USA [36]	Professional Registration Nurse Aides	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
2.	McCool JJ et al, 2009, USA [41]	ALF & ECUs	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

CARE HOMES											
1.	Moore S, 2016, UK [30]	CHs	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
2.	Moore S, 2020, UK [31]	CHs	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
REGISTRIES											
1.	Teaster PB et al, 2007, USA [40]	RG	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
2.	Teaster PB et al, 2015, USA [39]	RG	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
3.	Phillips LR & Ziminski C, 2012, USA [38]	RG from ALFs	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3
4.	Smith DE et al, 2019, AUS [43]	RG(s)	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
5.	Frazão SL et al, 2015, PT [48]	RG	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
HOSPITALS											
1.	Cohen M et al, 2010, IL [42]	Hosp	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
2.	Friedman L et al, 2017, USA [37]	Hosp	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4

ALFs=Assistant Living Facilities; CATI = computer-assisted telephone interviewing; ECUs=Extended Care Units; Hosp = Hospitals; NHs = Nursing Homes; RG = Registries

Table 3: Aged Care Abuse Research Checklist (ACARC)

Element	Key questions
Study design	1) Does the study recruit a representative cross-sectional cohort of participants using a random selection of nursing homes [35, 42] or via a professional registration list? [35]
	2) Does the study include sub representative groups within institutionalised care settings, from impaired to non-cognitive functioning residents among cognitive functioning residents? [45]
Methodology	3) Does the study conduct data collection discretely with the use of an independent researcher? [24, 42]
	4) Does the study utilise a standardised validated unmodified definition and measurement tools on abuse of older adults? [56, 62]
	5) Does the study collect 'self-reported', observed, committed or experience forms of abuse from all stakeholders, including staff, residents, relatives and community members? [46]
	6) Does the study incorporate the collection of signs and symptoms of abuse by using independent professional forensic physicians, other medical staff or an independent researcher in a timely manner? [39, 40, 42, 43, 48]
	7) Does the study collect data within an agreed recall period between - ideally between three to twelve months? [63]
	8) Does the study collect the incidence of abuse: a) to measure immediate signs and reports of suspected within a timely manner; and,

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.09.23293921>; this version posted August 10, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

	b) in-depth to verify incidents of abuse and to investigate the complexities attached to these abuse acts [39, 40, 43, 48] to minimise recall bias?
Results	9) Does the study report on age and sex-specific estimates with confidence intervals to allow study comparisons? [18]
	10) Does the study present data on all study participants stakeholders' characteristics, as risk factors studies have shown these variables are determinates of abuse? [16]
Publication	11) Does the study publish methods and results with transparency - by providing the full questionnaire and additional study results using publisher appendices to improve the study's validity and reliability?

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.09.23293921>; this version posted August 10, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.09.23293921>; this version posted August 10, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




Fig. 1. Identification and Selection of Studies – PRISMA flow diagram [14]