Consultation

Chapter 20 Physician Extenders

Emergency and acute medical care in over 16s: service delivery and organisation

NICE guideline <number>

July 2017

Draft for consultation

Developed by the National Guideline Centre, hosted by the Royal College of Physicians

1

Disclaimer
Healthcare professionals are expected to take NICE clinical guidelines fully into account when exercising their clinical judgement. However, the guidance does not override the responsibility of healthcare professionals to make decisions appropriate to the circumstances of each patient, in consultation with the patient and, where appropriate, their guardian or carer.

Copyright

© National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2017. All rights reserved.

Chapter 20 Physician extenders

Contents

1

20 Physician Extenders

20.1 Introduction

The term 'Physician Extenders' is used to incorporate a wide range of professions working in roles that would have traditionally been seen as the role of a doctor. The roles include Advanced Nurse Practitioners, Physician Associates and Advanced Clinical Practitioners who may be Physiotherapists and Paramedics with extended training.

Given the increasing pressures within the NHS from an aging population and a lack of front-line health care professionals, it was felt that these roles needed to be further evaluated in order to determine if they – either individually or in combination – could help to alleviate some of this pressure and support the medical workforce.

Some of the roles under the umbrella term 'Physician Extender', such as Advanced Nurse Practitioners, are well established in the UK health service and often provide specialist services, for example, the role of the Diabetes Specialist Nurse or Heart Failure Specialist Nurse; much fewer numbers are working in a generalist setting in secondary care. Other roles, such as Physician Associates, are new to the UK, currently with small numbers which makes it challenging to produce robust evidence to assess the role.

20.2 Review question: Do physician extenders (for example, physician assistants and emergency nurse practitioners) improve outcomes in secondary care?

For full details see review protocol in Appendix A.

Table 1: PICO characteristics of review question

Population	Adults and young people (16 years and over) at risk of an AME, or with a suspected or confirmed AME

Intervention	Intervention to be stratified by physician extender and specialist nurse
	• Physician extenders in addition to usual care. Roles include:
	  ○ Emergency Nurse Practitioners
	  ○ Advanced Nurse Practitioners
	  ○ Advanced Care Practitioners
	  ○ Physician Assistants/Physician Associates
	  ○ Critical Care Practitioners
	  ○ Critical Care Outreach Nurses
	  ○ Independent prescribing pharmacists
	• Specialist nurse in addition to usual care. Roles include:
	  ○ Diabetes Inpatient Specialist Nurses
	  ○ Heart Failure Specialist Nurses

Comparison	No Physician extenders or specialist nurse Usual care (for example, junior doctors, nurses)
Outcomes	• Mortality (CRITICAL) • Avoidable adverse events (CRITICAL) • Quality of life (CRITICAL) • Patient and/or carer satisfaction (CRITICAL)

	• Length of stay (CRITICAL) • Readmission up to 30 days (IMPORTANT) • Missed or delayed treatments (IMPORTANT) • Staff satisfaction (IMPORTANT)
Study design	Systematic reviews (SRs) of RCTs, RCTs, observational studies only to be included if no relevant SRs or RCTs are identified.

20.3 Clinical evidence

We included 4 studies in the physician extender strata[51,81,163,178], and 2 studies in the specialist nurse strata.[12,55] These are summarised respectively in Table 2 and Table 3 below. Evidence from these studies is summarised in the GRADE clinical evidence summary below (Table 4 and Table 5). See also the study selection flow chart in Appendix B, study evidence tables in Appendix D, forest plots in Appendix C, GRADE tables in Appendix F and excluded studies list in Appendix G.

Table 2: Summary of studies included in the review for the strata physician extender

Study	Intervention and comparison	Population	Outcomes	Comments
Cowan 2006[51] Quasi-RCT USA	Intervention (n=581) Presence of a Nurse Practitioner whose primary role were the following: case management, facilitation of communication and collaboration with physicians and nurses, leading and actively implementing timely processes after the daily multidisciplinary rounds, surveillance of cost-effective measures, twice-daily assessments of cultures for sensitivity with the goal of changing the antibiotic regimen to the narrowest spectrum, review of all medications for drug/drug interactions and side effects, changing intravenous medications to oral, and enforcement of disease-specific care pathways. Continuous care for patients for 8 hours per day. Concurrent medication or care: Increase in multi-disciplinary rounds from weekly to daily (with the NP taking part in the rounds); appointment of a (hospitalist) medical director who was in charge of overseeing NP and physicians. There was 1 medical director for the first 9 months of the study and (assumed) 2 for the final duration. Comparison (n=626) Usual care: Multi-disciplinary rounds once a week. No NP. No further details.	(n=1207) patients admitted to the general medical floor of a tertiary academic medical hospital Inclusion: unclear Exclusion: sickle cell anaemia	Length of stay; in-hospital mortality.	Intervention was a combination of 3 elements: Nurse Practitioner on team; increase in ward rounds; presence of a medical director. Quasi-randomised by intake day. Physicians and RN were randomised into teams and rotated between the 2 groups. Declined to participant on intervention ward intake received NP care.

Study	Intervention and comparison	Population	Outcomes	Comments
Forster 2005[81] RCT Canada	Intervention (n=307) Presence of clinical nurse specialist (nurse team co-ordinator). Role of the nurse was as a team co-coordinator and whose in-hospital role was to facilitate hospital care by retrieving preadmission information, arranging in-hospital consolations and intervention, and organising post discharge follow-up. Comparison (n=313) Usual care	(n=620) consecutive patients admitted from the ED or another service to the general medical service of at 2 sites of tertiary care teaching hospital. Inclusion: All admissions Exclusion: None	Length of stay; in-hospital mortality	Also includes post-discharge outcomes, but intervention also included post-discharge follow-up so these are not included.
Moher 1992[163] RCT Conducted in Canada	Intervention (n=136) Presence of clinical nurse specialist (nurse team co-ordinator). Role is to participate in ward rounds, collaborate with health care professionals, facilitate administrative tasks such as discharge planning, coordinate tests and procedures, and to collect and collate patient information. Comparison (n=131) Usual care without the nurse team co-ordinator	(n=267) patients admitted to general Clinical Teaching Units at a university teaching hospital/ Inclusion: All admissions Exclusion: death expected within 48 hours, those admitted directly to ICU.	Length of stay; in-hospital mortality; readmissions (unknown follow-up); patient and/or carer satisfaction.	
Pioro 2001[178] RCT USA	Intervention (n=193) Nurse practitioner based care. Nurse practitioner's role admission assessment, assembly of patient data, co-ordination of care with patient's attending doctors and implementation of diagnostic and therapeutic plans. NPs were on weekdays 0730 to 2000 and on weekends for morning rounds. NPs were supervised by a medical director who made daily rounds. Comparison (n=188) Usual care by traditional house staff (6 teams consisting of 1 senior or junior medical resident and 2 interns supervised by a teaching attending doctor.	(n=381) patients admitted through out-patient facilities or the emergency room at university hospital. Inclusion: age 18-69. Exclusion: admitted to intensive care or other specialty units and those transferred from the intensive care. For first 5 months patients outside of core admitting times were excluded (not weekdays 0730 to 1700). Rest of duration (~ 1 year) all weekday admissions were included.	Length of stay; in-hospital adverse events; in-hospital mortality; 30 day mortality; quality of life (SF-36 – general health); patient and/or carer satisfaction.	Large asymmetric cross-over of patients: 90/193 crossed over from intervention to control Reasons for cross-over: bed availability (29%), doctor request (22%), NP request (22%), and other (28%). Teams rotated on a monthly basis.

1 **Table 3: Summary of studies included in the review for the strata specialist nurse**

Study	Intervention and comparison	Population	Outcomes	Comments
Arts 2012[12] RCT Netherlands	Registered Nurse specialists with extensive experience in diabetes care (Advanced practice nurses). Participants received care from advanced nurse practitioners (Doctoral or Master's prepared registered nurses) who worked according to a protocol (no further details on protocol). Control group: usual care (5 physicians).	People with diabetes mellitus types 1 and 2 treated by an Internist in an academic hospital in Maastricht, the Netherlands.	Mortality; adverse events (diabetes-related complications); quality of life.	
Davies 2001[55] RCT UK	Intervention (n=148) Presence of 1 of 4 diabetes specialist nurse. DSN care included individual structures patient education appropriate to need, and practical management advice including verbal and written case-note feedback to ward-based medical staff. DSN input began on the day of referral and randomisation, and continued until discharge. Comparison (n=152) Usual care without any input from the DSN.	(n=300) sequential, unselected referrals of in-patients to the DSN service (with either type 1 or type 2 diabetes) to a university hospital. Exclusion: patients unable to complete self-reported questionnaire were selectively excluded from that outcome. Reasons for exclusion include: visually impaired, non-English, confused, or had reduced consciousness.	Length of stay; frequency of admission (12 months); patient and/or carer satisfaction; disease specific quality of life; mortality.	If declined to participate patients received DSN input.

Table 4: Clinical evidence summary: Physician extender versus no physician extender or usual care

Outcomes	No of Participants (studies) Follow up	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated absolute effects	
				Risk with Control	Risk difference with Physician extender versus no physician extender/usual care (95% CI)
Adverse events	709 (2 studies) In-hospital to 34 days follow-up	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[a,b] due to risk of bias, imprecision	RR 0.90 (0.64 to 1.28)	Moderate	
				157 per 1000	16 fewer per 1000 (from 57 fewer to 44 more)
Length of stay	1474 (2 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW[a] due to risk of bias	-	The mean length of stay in the control groups was 6.47 days	The mean length of stay in the intervention groups was 1.14 lower (1.83 to 0.45 lower)
Mortality	2475 (4 studies) in hospital to up to 4 months follow-up	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[a,b] due to risk of bias, imprecision	RR 1.15 (0.88 to 1.51)	Moderate	
				71 per 1000	11 more per 1000 (from 9 fewer to 36 more)
Satisfaction	290 (1 study) 34 days	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW[a] due to risk of bias	-	The mean satisfaction in the control group was 7.6	The mean satisfaction in the intervention groups was 0.6 higher (0.07 to 1.13 higher)
Readmission	1774 (2 studies) 2 weeks to 4 months	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW[a] due to risk of bias	RR 1.02 (0.87 to 1.2)	Moderate	
				225 per 1000	4 more per 1000 (from 30 fewer to 45 more)

(a) Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.
(b) Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed 1 MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MIDs.

Narrative findings

Median (IQR) length of stay: Intervention: 6 (3-11) days; Control: 5 (3-10) days, (Forster 2005).

Length of stay during index admission (no SDs reported): Intervention: 5.0 days; Control: 5.3 days, (Pioro 2001).

Mean change in SF-36 at 6 weeks post discharge (no SDs reported): Intervention: 4.7; Control: 2.9, (Pioro 2001).

Table 5: Clinical evidence summary: Specialist nurse versus no specialist nurse or usual care

Outcomes	No of Participants (studies) Follow up	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated absolute effects	
				Risk with Control	Risk difference with Specialist nurse versus no physician extender/usual care (95% CI)
Adverse events	294 (1 studies) 2 year follow-up	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[a,b] due to risk of bias, imprecision	RR 0.57 (0.27 to 1.21)	Moderate	
				117 per 1000	50 fewer per 1000 (from 85 fewer to 25 more)
Mortality	592 (2 studies) Mortality at 1 year or 2 year follow-up	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW[a,b,c] due to risk of bias, imprecision, inconsistency	RR 0.93 (0.42 to 2.07)	Moderate	
				40 per 1000	3 fewer per 1000 (from 23 fewer to 43 more)
Satisfied patients	133 (1 study) 1 week	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW[a] due to risk of bias	RR 1.54 (1.24 to 1.91)	Moderate	
				591 per 1000	319 more per 1000 (from 142 more to 538 more)
Readmission	300 (1 studies) at 12 months	⊕⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW[a,b] due to risk of bias, imprecision	RR 1.00 (0.68 to 1.48)	Moderate	
				250 per 1000	0 more per 1000 (from 80 fewer to 120 more)

(a) Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.
(b) Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed 1 MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MIDs.
(c) Downgraded by 1 increment because the point estimate varies widely across studies, unexplained by subgroup analysis.

Narrative findings

Median (IQR) length of stay – Intervention: 8 days; Control: 11 days, p<0.01 (Davies 2001).

Audit of Diabetes Dependent Quality of Life (ADDQoL) final score at 1 week after discharge (no details of scale used): Intervention: 0.88; Control: 0.40 (Davies 2001).

Mean EQ-5D quality of life (SD): Intervention: 0.86 (0.22) at baseline and 0.80 at 2 years; Control: 0.82 (0.22) at baseline and 0.82 at 2 years (Arts 2012.)

20.4 Economic evidence

Published literature

No economic evaluations were identified for the first stratum (physician extenders). One economic evaluation was identified with the relevant comparison for the second stratum (specialist nurses) and has been included in this review[12]. This is summarised in the economic evidence profile below (**Error! eference source not found.**) and the economic evidence tables in Appendix E. One study was excluded on the grounds of applicability and another study was selectively excluded – see Appendix H.

The economic article selection protocol and flow chart for the whole guideline can found in Appendix 41A and Appendix 41B.

Table 6: Economic evidence profile: Specialist nurse versus usual care

Study	Applicability	Limitations	Other comments	Incremental cost	Incremental effects	Cost effectiveness	Uncertainty
Arts 2012[12] ([Netherlands]	Partially applicable (a)	Potentially serious limitations (b)	• Within RCT analysis • Population: People with diabetes mellitus type 1 and 2 who are treated by an internist in an academic hospital in Maastricht, the Netherlands. • Comparators: diabetes nurse specialists (DNS) versus physicians • Follow-up: 2 years	2 versus 1: £309	2 versus 1: -0.02 QALYs	DNS dominated	Differences in costs and QALYs were not significant. No sensitivity analysis is reported.

Abbreviations: DNS: diabetes nurse specialist ICER: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; N/A: not applicable; QALY: quality-adjusted life years; RCT: randomised controlled trial.
(a) Some uncertainty regarding the applicability of resource use and costs from the Netherlands (2007) to current NHS context. No discounting reported.

Baseline and relative treatment effects are based on a single RCT, so by definition, does not reflect all evidence in the area. Costs of medications, investigations and other staff groups' time are not included. No sensitivity analysis is reported.

20.5 Evidence statements

Clinical

Physician Extenders

- Four studies comprising 2475 people evaluated the role of physician extenders for improving outcomes in secondary care in adults and young people at risk of an AME, or with a suspected or confirmed AME. The evidence suggested that physician extenders may provide a benefit in reduced length of stay (2 studies, low quality), with a slight reduction in adverse events (2 studies, very low quality). However, the evidence for physician extenders suggested no difference on readmission (2 studies, low quality) or patient and/or carer satisfaction (1 study, low quality) compared to usual care and there was a possible increase in mortality (4 studies, very low quality).

Specialist nurses

- Two studies comprising 592 people evaluated the role of specialist nurses for improving outcomes in secondary care in adults and young people at risk of an AME, or with a suspected or confirmed AME. The evidence suggested that specialist nurses may provide a benefit in reduced adverse events (1 study, very low quality) and improved patient and/or carer satisfaction (1 study, low quality). However, the evidence for specialist nurses suggested no difference to mortality (2 studies, very low quality) or readmission (1 study, very low quality) compared to usual care.

Economic

- One cost utility analysis showed that specialist nurse care was dominated by usual care being more costly (mean £309 per patient) and less effective (0.02 QALYs lost per patient).

20.6 Recommendations and link to evidence

Recommendations	-
Research recommendations	**RR11. What is the clinical and cost effectiveness of providing 'physician extenders' such as advanced nurse practitioners, 'physician associates' and advance clinical practitioners in secondary care?**
Relative values of different outcomes	Mortality, quality of life, length of stay, avoidable adverse events and patient and/or carer satisfaction were considered by the guideline committee to be critical outcomes. Readmission, discharges, missed or delayed treatments, and staff satisfaction were considered important outcomes. The review specifically examined evidence for the effectiveness of: • Physician extenders: ○ Emergency Nurse Practitioners ○ Advanced Nurse Practitioners ○ Advanced Care Practitioners ○ Physician Assistants or Physician Associates ○ Critical Care Practitioners ○ Critical Care Outreach Nurses ○ Independent prescribing pharmacists. • Specialist nurse: ○ Diabetes in patient specialist nurses ○ Heart failure specialist nurses.
Trade-off between clinical benefits and harms	A total of 6 studies were identified for this review. Four of these studies were in the physician extender strata and 2 studies were assessed in the specialist nurses strata. The 2 including specialist nurses studies were both diabetes specialist nurses as there was a lack of evidence on other specialist nurses such as COPD nurses and oncology nurses. Studies with surgical practitioners were excluded from this review as our remit was limited to medical emergencies. The evidence suggested that physician extenders may provide a benefit in reduced length of stay and patient and/or carer satisfaction. However, the evidence suggested no difference on readmission rates (from 2 weeks to 4 months) or patient and/or carer satisfaction compared to usual care. A possible trend towards fewer adverse events was counterbalanced by a possible increase in mortality. Quality of life was identified only as narrative findings, whilst no evidence was identified for missed or delayed treatments, and staff satisfaction. Evidence from diabetes inpatient specialist nurses may provide a benefit in reduced adverse events and improved patient and/or care satisfaction. The evidence suggested no difference to mortality or readmission at 12 months. Quality of life was identified only as narrative findings, whilst no evidence was identified for length of stay, readmission within 30 days missed or delayed treatments, and staff satisfaction. Although there are several types of physician extender, randomised control trials have only evaluated diabetes specialist nurses, nurse care co-ordinators and nurse practitioners focused on pathway management and improving compliance with best practice. The committee noted the difficulty in making a recommendation without having a broad spectrum of evidence available, as the applicability to the UK system is unclear. The committee noted in particular that there were no RCTs of physician

Recommendations	-
Research recommendations	**RR11. What is the clinical and cost effectiveness of providing 'physician extenders' such as advanced nurse practitioners, 'physician associates' and advance clinical practitioners in secondary care?**
	associates or assistants, which is a new profession within the UK and the area in which a recommendation would have a significant impact. Therefore, the committee considered a research recommendation would be appropriate.
Trade-off between net effects and costs	One economic evaluation of diabetes nurse specialists was included. It showed an increase in cost and a decrement in quality of life, which almost reached statistical significance. Another study[180] showed that a diabetes specialist nurse service added to standard care was associated with a substantial cost saving of £436 per admission compared to standard care alone. This was excluded because of the date of the costs, 2003, and because it did not evaluate health outcomes but it is suggestive that in the right form and setting, these specialists could be cost saving. No evidence was identified for any of the other categories of physician extenders in secondary care. There is some evidence that physician extenders as part of a multi-disciplinary team can be cost saving and clinically effective in primary care[212]. The committee considered that the rationale behind physician extenders is to provide equivalent (or better) care at lower staff cost. Given the limited evidence across the whole spectrum of physician extenders, the committee felt that there was a need for more research of high quality into this area to inform policy decisions on whether physician extenders should be adopted on a large scale.
Quality of evidence	Clinical evidence: The physician extender strata included 4 studies: 3 RCTs and 1 quasi-randomised study. All evidence was graded at very low or low quality and evidence was of very high risk of bias, whilst adverse events and mortality were additionally downgraded for imprecision. Two of the trials randomised patients to physician-based care with or without physician extenders; the others randomised patients to either physician-based care or physician extenders. The specialist nurse strata included 2 RCTs. All evidence was graded at very low as all evidence was of very high risk of bias and had high imprecision, whilst mortality was further downgraded for inconsistency. Both trials randomised patients to either physician-based care or specialist nurse care. Economic evidence: The study was assessed to be partially applicable since resource use and costs were from a Netherlands perspective. It was assessed as having potentially serious limitations in that baseline and relative treatment effects are based on a single RCT and costs of medications, investigations and other staff time were not included. Due to the lack of high quality evidence applicable to the UK, the committee decided to make a recommendation for further research.
Other considerations	The committee discussed the contradictory evidence between the economic and clinical evidence, and its applicability to the UK setting. They noted that there may be logistical reasons why a physician extender would be more cost-saving than indicated by the economic evidence identified within this review; for example, they may cover staff shortages, so fewer locums are required, or permit consultant staff to be deployed more effectively on ward rounds or in clinics. The committee did not interpret the clinical evidence as showing that physician extenders had worse clinical

Recommendations	-
Research recommendations	**RR11. What is the clinical and cost effectiveness of providing 'physician extenders' such as advanced nurse practitioners, 'physician associates' and advance clinical practitioners in secondary care?**
	outcomes. The committee noted that the workforce planning has left England with insufficient numbers of doctors both in primary and secondary care. Even if an expansion in the number of medical student posts occurred there will be a lag time of more than 5 years to realise the benefit. The training of physician extenders is likely to be shorter (particularly in the case of nurse specialists who focus on a specific disease process rather than act as generalists) and could be used to plug these gaps. The committee noted, with the increasing elderly population, there will be an ever increasing need of staff to manage the demand so increasing the numbers of physician extenders and also increasing medical student places is mutually compatible. The committee had extensive experience of working with all types of physician extenders and anecdotally had found them to be a very positive role within the NHS, however, the evidence as it stood was not sufficient to provide a positive recommendation, despite this. The committee noted that, as a relatively new and diverse group of healthcare professionals in the UK, the role of the physician associate or assistants would be expected to be evaluated in line with the Health Education England Strategic Framework 15-year strategy, supporting the need for a research recommendation. The committee noted that, in the USA, nurse practitioners and physician associates are both post-graduate level, but the training requirements are different. In the UK currently, the Royal College of Nursing position is that any nurse who has been educationally prepared, whether at BSc or MSc level, against the Royal College of Nursing competences, is entitled to be referred to as an Advanced Nurse Practitioner. The training requirement to become a registered physician associate is a post-graduate diploma. Physician extenders with a technical background (non-nursing) cannot, at present, acquire prescribing rights. The committee discussed the need for an evaluation of these professions using randomised controlled trial methodologies to generate more secure evidence, using either parallel cluster or stepped wedge designs. Researchers would need to clarify whether the practitioners were deployed as adjuncts to, or substitutes for, doctors. A trial assessing the contribution of physician associates based in secondary care is ongoing and is due to publish in 2018[5].

1
2

References

1 How do non-physician providers function in HMOs? HMO Practice. 1994; 8(4):151-156

2 More educated nurses prove cost-effective for the sickest patients. Clinical Resource Management. 2001; 2(10):148-145

3 The clinical effectiveness of nurse practitioners' management of adults in an adult emergency department: a systematic review. JBI Library of Systematic Reviews. 2006; 4(10 Suppl):1-11

4 Emergency nurse practitioners. Emergency Nurse. 2015; 23(1):19

5 Investigating the contribution of physician associates (PAs) to secondary care in England: a mixed methods study. Health Services and Delivery Research, 2015. Available from: https://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/projects/141926/#/

6 Ahern M, Imperial J, Lam S. Impact of a designated hepatology nurse on the clinical course and quality of life of patients treated with rebetron therapy for chronic hepatitis C. Gastroenterology Nursing. 2004; 27(4):149-155

7 Ahmed A. Quality and outcomes of heart failure care in older adults: Role of multidisciplinary disease-management programs. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society. 2002; 50(9):1590-1593

8 Allen JK, Dennison-Himmelfarb CR, Szanton SL, Bone L, Hill MN, Levine DM et al. Community Outreach and Cardiovascular Health (COACH) Trial: a randomized, controlled trial of nurse practitioner/community health worker cardiovascular disease risk reduction in urban community health centers. Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes. 2011; 4(6):595-602

9 Allen JK, Himmelfarb CRD, Szanton SL, Bone L, Hill MN, Levine DM. COACH trial: a randomized controlled trial of nurse practitioner/community health worker cardiovascular disease risk reduction in urban community health centers: rationale and design. Contemporary Clinical Trials. 2011; 32(3):403-411

10 Allen K, McAleavy JM, Wright S. An evaluation of the role of the Assistant Practitioner in critical care. Nursing in Critical Care. 2013; 18(1):14-22

11 Allen K, Hazelett S, Jarjoura D, Hua K, Wright K, Weinhardt J et al. A randomized trial testing the superiority of a postdischarge care management model for stroke survivors. Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases. 2009; 18(6):443-452

12 Arts EEA, Landewe-Cleuren SANT, Schaper NC, Vrijhoef HJM. The cost-effectiveness of substituting physicians with diabetes nurse specialists: a randomized controlled trial with 2-year follow-up. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2012; 68(6):1224-1234

13 Bakewell-Sachs S. The clinical nurse specialist as a member of the research team. Journal of Perinatal and Neonatal Nursing. 1991; 5(3):70-77

14 Ball STE, Walton K, Hawes S. Do emergency department physiotherapy practitioner's, emergency nurse practitioners and doctors investigate, treat and refer patients with closed musculoskeletal injuries differently? Emergency Medicine Journal. 2007; 24(3):185-188

15 Banerjee S, Beatty S, Tyagi A, Kirkby GR. The role of ophthalmic triage and the nurse practitioner in an eye-dedicated casualty department. Eye. 1998; 12(5):880-882

16 Barton D, Mashlan W. An advanced nurse practitioner-led service - consequences of service redesign for managers and organizational infrastructure. Journal of Nursing Management. 2011; 19(7):943-949

17 Bevis LC, Berg-Copas GM, Thomas BW, Vasquez DG, Wetta-Hall R, Brake D et al. Outcomes of tube thoracostomies performed by advanced practice providers vs trauma surgeons. American Journal of Critical Care. 2008; 17(4):357-363

18 Black A. Non-medical prescribing by nurse practitioners in accident & emergency and sexual health: a comparative study. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2013; 69(3):535-545

19 Black A, Dawood M. A comparison in independent nurse prescribing and patient group directions by nurse practitioners in the emergency department: a cross sectional review. International Emergency Nursing. 2014; 22(1):10-17

20 Blue L, Lang E, McMurray JJ, Davie AP, McDonagh TA, Murdoch DR et al. Randomised controlled trial of specialist nurse intervention in heart failure. BMJ. 2001; 323(7315):715-718

21 Brandon AF, Schuessler JB, Ellison KJ, Lazenby RB. The effects of an advanced practice nurse led telephone intervention on outcomes of patients with heart failure. Applied Nursing Research. 2009; 22(4):e1-e7

22 Broers CJM, Sinclair N, van der Ploeg TJ, Jaarsma T, Van Veldhuisen DJ, Umans VAWM. The post-infarction nurse practitioner project: a prospective study comparing nurse intervention with conventional care in a non-high-risk myocardial infarction population. Netherlands Heart Journal. 2009; 17(2):61-67

23 Bryant-Lukosius D, Carter N, Reid K, Donald F, Martin-Misener R, Kilpatrick K et al. The clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of clinical nurse specialist-led hospital to home transitional care: a systematic review. Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice. 2015; 21(5):763-781

24 Burgess LH, Cohen MR, Denham CR. A new leadership role for pharmacists: a prescription for change. Journal of Patient Safety. 2010; 6(1):31-37

25 Butler M, Collins R, Drennan J, Halligan P, O'Mathuna DP, Schultz TJ et al. Hospital nurse staffing models and patient and staff-related outcomes. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2011; Issue 7:CD007019. DOI:10.1002/14651858.CD007019.pub2

26 Calder C, Reilly M, Osman LM, Douglas A, Douglas JG. Development of centralised asthma nurse specialist follow up service for patients who attend out of hours for asthma. Thorax. 2002; 57(Suppl 3):iii71

27 Callaghan L. Advanced nursing practice: an idea whose time has come. Journal of Clinical Nursing. 2008; 17(2):205-213

28 Carberry M, Connelly S, Murphy J. A prospective audit of a nurse independent prescribing within critical care. Nursing in Critical Care. 2013; 18(3):135-141

29 Carey N, Courtenay M, James J, Hills M, Roland J. An evaluation of a Diabetes Specialist Nurse prescriber on the system of delivering medicines to patients with diabetes. Journal of Clinical Nursing. 2008; 17(12):1635-1644

30 Carlson SR. The effect of a nurse practitioner intervention on women referred for screening mammography. San Diego: University of San Diego; 2004

31 Carroll DL, Rankin SH, Cooper BA. The effects of a collaborative peer advisor/advanced practice nurse intervention: cardiac rehabilitation participation and rehospitalization in older adults after a cardiac event. Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing. 2007; 22(4):313-319

32 Carter AJE, Chochinov AH. A systematic review of the impact of nurse practitioners on cost, quality of care, satisfaction and wait times in the emergency department. CJEM. 2007; 9(4):286-295

33 Caserta FM, Depew M, Moran J. Acute care nurse practitioners: the role in neuroscience critical care. Journal of the Neurological Sciences. 2007; 261(1-2):167-171

34 Cheng I, Lee J, Mittmann N, Tyberg J, Ramagnano S, Kiss A et al. Implementing wait-time reductions under Ontario government benchmarks (Pay-for-Results): a cluster randomized trial of the effect of a physician-nurse supplementary triage assistance team (MDRNSTAT) on emergency department patient wait times. BMC Emergency Medicine. 2013; 13:17

35 Christmas AB, Reynolds J, Hodges S, Franklin GA, Miller FB, Richardson JD et al. Physician extenders impact trauma systems. Journal of Trauma. 2005; 58(5):917-920

36 Clark C, Smith L, Cloutier L, Glynn L, Clark O, Taylor R et al. LB01.01: Allied health professional-led interventions for improving control of blood pressure in patients with hypertension: a Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Hypertension. 2015; 33(Suppl 1):e44

37 Cockayne S, Pattenden J, Worthy G, Richardson G, Lewin R. Nurse facilitated self-management support for people with heart failure and their family carers (SEMAPHFOR): a randomised controlled trial. International Journal of Nursing Studies. 2014; 51(9):1207-1213

38 Cole KE, Johnson LM. Impact--improving patient access time: arterialcannulation. Intensive and Critical Care Nursing. 2014; 30(3):167-174

39 Colligan M, Collins C, Foley B, Jones P, Miles J, Zeng I. Emergency nurse practitioners: do they provide an effective service in managing minor injuries, compared to emergency medicine registrars? New Zealand Medical Journal. 2011; 124(1344):74-80

40 Comiskey C, Coyne I, Lalor J, Begley C. A national cross-sectional study measuring predictors for improved service user outcomes across clinical nurse or midwife specialist, advanced nurse practitioner and control sites. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2014; 70(5):1128-1137

41 Connolly MJ, Boyd M, Broad JB, Kerse N, Lumley T, Whitehead N et al. The Aged Residential Care Healthcare Utilization Study (ARCHUS): a multidisciplinary, cluster randomized controlled trial designed to reduce acute avoidable hospitalizations from long-term care facilities. Journal of the American Medical Directors Association. 2015; 16(1):49-55

42 Considine J, Kropman M, Stergiou HE. Effect of clinician designation on emergency department fast track performance. Emergency Medicine Journal. 2010; 27(11):838-842

43 Considine J, Lucas E, Payne R, Kropman M, Stergiou HE, Chiu H. Analysis of three advanced practice roles in emergency nursing. Australasian Emergency Nursing Journal. 2012; 15(4):219-228

44 Considine J, Martin R, Smit D, Winter C, Jenkins J. Emergency nurse practitioner care and emergency department patient flow: case-control study. EMA - Emergency Medicine Australasia. 2006; 18(4):385-390

45 Cook O, McIntyre M, Recoche K. Exploration of the role of specialist nurses in the care of women with gynaecological cancer: a systematic review. Journal of Clinical Nursing. 2015; 24(5-6):683-695

46 Cooper MA, Lindsay GM, Kinn S, Swann IJ. Evaluating Emergency Nurse Practitioner services: a randomized controlled trial. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2002; 40(6):721-730

47 Cooper S, O'Carroll J, Jenkin A, Badger B. Emergency care practitioners (ECP): practice and performance in the UK West country--a case study. International Emergency Nursing. 2008; 16(3):180-184

48 Cope K, Fowler L, Pogson Z. Developing a specialist-nurse-led 'COPD in-reach service'. British Journal of Nursing. 2015; 24(8):441-445

49 Corner J. The role of nurse-led care in cancer management. Lancet Oncology. 2003; 4(10):631-636

50 Counsell SR, Callahan CM, Clark DO, Tu W, Buttar AB, Stump TE et al. Geriatric care management for low-income seniors: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association. 2007; 298(22):2623-2633

51 Cowan MJ, Shapiro M, Hays RD, Afifi A, Vazirani S, Ward CR et al. The effect of a multidisciplinary hospitalist/physician and advanced practice nurse collaboration on hospital costs. Journal of Nursing Administration. 2006; 36(2):79-85

52 Dacey MJ, Mirza ER, Wilcox V, Doherty M, Mello J, Boyer A et al. The effect of a rapid response team on major clinical outcome measures in a community hospital. Critical Care Medicine. 2007; 35(9):2076-2082

53 David D, Britting L, Dalton J. Cardiac acute care nurse practitioner and 30-day readmission. Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing. 2015; 30(3):248-255

54 Davidson PM, Cockburn J, Newton PJ, Webster JK, Betihavas V, Howes L et al. Can a heart failure-specific cardiac rehabilitation program decrease hospitalizations and improve outcomes in high-risk patients? European Journal of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation. 2010; 17(4):393-402

55 Davies M, Dixon S, Currie CJ, Davis RE, Peters JR. Evaluation of a hospital diabetes specialist nursing service: a randomized controlled trial. Diabetic Medicine. 2001; 18(4):301-307

56 Dawes HA, Docherty T, Traynor I, Gilmore DH, Jardine AG, Knill-Jones R. Specialist nurse supported discharge in gynaecology: a randomised comparison and economic evaluation. European Journal of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Biology. 2007; 130(2):262-270

57 De Broe S, Christopher F, Waugh N. The role of specialist nurses in multiple sclerosis: a rapid and systematic review. Health Technology Assessment. 2001; 5(17):1-47

58 Dean E. Promoting best practice in urgent care. Emergency Nurse. 2012; 20(1):6-8

59 Dean SC, Kerry SM, Khong TK, Kerry SR, Oakeshott P. Evaluation of a specialist nurse-led hypertension clinic with consultant backup in two inner city general practices: randomized controlled trial. Family Practice. 2014; 31(2):172-179

60 Derksen RJ, Bakker FC, de Lange-de Klerk ESM, Spaans IM, Heilbron EA, Veenings B et al. Specialized emergency nurses treating ankle and foot injuries: a randomized controlled trial. American Journal of Emergency Medicine. 2007; 25(2):144-151

61 Dewar C, Corretge M. Interrater reliability of the Wells score as part of the assessment of DVT in the emergency department: agreement between consultant and nurse practitioner. Emergency Medicine Journal. 2008; 25(7):407-410

62 Dewar C, Selby C, Jamieson K, Rogers S. Emergency department nurse-based outpatient diagnosis of DVT using an evidence-based protocol. Emergency Medicine Journal. 2008; 25(7):411-416

63 Dinh M, Walker A, Parameswaran A, Enright N. Evaluating the quality of care delivered by an emergency department fast track unit with both nurse practitioners and doctors. Australasian Emergency Nursing Journal. 2012; 15(4):188-194

64 Dinh MM, Enright N, Walker A, Parameswaran A, Chu M. Determinants of patient satisfaction in an Australian emergency department fast-track setting. Emergency Medicine Journal. 2013; 30(10):824-827

65 Doan Q, Sabhaney V, Kissoon N, Sheps S, Singer J. A systematic review: the role and impact of the physician assistant in the emergency department. EMA - Emergency Medicine Australasia. 2011; 23(1):7-15

66 Domingo GRR, Reyes FC, Thompson FV, Johnson PM, Shortridge-Baggett LM. Effectiveness of structured discharge process in reducing hospital readmission of adult patients with community acquired pneumonia: a systematic review. JBI Library of Systematic Reviews. 2012; 10(18):1086-1121

67 Donaghy D. The asthma specialist and patient education. Professional Nurse. 1995; 11(3):160-162

68 Donald F, Martin-Misener R, Carter N, Donald EE, Kaasalainen S, Wickson-Griffiths A et al. A systematic review of the effectiveness of advanced practice nurses in long-term care. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2013; 69(10):2148-2161

69 Donald F, Kilpatrick K, Reid K, Carter N, Bryant-Lukosius D, Martin-Misener R et al. Hospital to community transitional care by nurse practitioners: a systematic review of cost-effectiveness. International Journal of Nursing Studies. 2015; 52(1):436-451

70 Donald F, Kilpatrick K, Reid K, Carter N, Martin-Misener R, Bryant-Lukosius D et al. A systematic review of the cost-effectiveness of nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists: what is the quality of the evidence? Nursing Research and Practice. 2014; 2014:896587

71 Driscoll A, Toia D, Gibcus J, Srivastava PM, Hare DL. Heart Failure Nurse Practitioner clinic: an innovative approach for optimisation of beta-blockers. Heart, Lung and Circulation. 2008; 17:S13

72 Dyar S, Lesperance M, Shannon R, Sloan J, Colon-Otero G. A nurse practitioner directed intervention improves the quality of life of patients with metastatic cancer: results of a randomized pilot study. Journal of Palliative Medicine. 2012; 15(8):890-895

73 Ellis G. The impact of a stroke nurse specialist on risk factor modification in a TIA clinic. Current Controlled Trials. 2003;

74 Ellis G, Rodger J, McAlpine C, Langhorne P. The impact of a stroke nurse specialist on risk factor modification in a TIA clinic: a randomised controlled trial. Age and Ageing. 2004; 33(Suppl 1):10

75 Ellis G, Rodger J, McAlpine C, Langhorne P. The impact of a stroke nurse specialist input on risk factor modification:a randomised controlled trial. Clinical Rehabilitation. 2005; 23:99-105

76 Ellis G, Rodger J, McAlpine C, Langhorne P. The impact of stroke nurse specialist input on risk factor modification: a randomised controlled trial. Age and Ageing. 2005; 34(4):389-392

77 Ezra DG, Mellington F, Cugnoni H, Westcott M. Reliability of ophthalmic accident and emergency referrals: a new role for the emergency nurse practitioner? Emergency Medicine Journal. 2005; 22(10):696-699

78 Fanta K, Cook B, Falcone RAJ, Rickets C, Schweer L, Brown RL et al. Pediatric trauma nurse practitioners provide excellent care with superior patient satisfaction for injured children. Journal of Pediatric Surgery. 2006; 41(1):277-281

79 Farmer J, Currie M, Hyman J, West C, Arnott N. Evaluation of physician assistants in National Health Service Scotland. Scottish Medical Journal. 2011; 56(3):130-134

80 Forbes A, While A, Dyson L, Grocott T, Griffiths P. Impact of clinical nurse specialists in multiple sclerosis--synthesis of the evidence. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2003; 42(5):442-462

81 Forster AJ, Clark HD, Menard A, Dupuis N, Chernish R, Chandok N et al. Effect of a nurse team coordinator on outcomes for hospitalized medicine patients. American Journal of Medicine. 2005; 118(10):1148-1153

82 Fotheringham D, Dickie S, Cooper M. The evolution of the role of the Emergency Nurse Practitioner in Scotland: a longitudinal study. Journal of Clinical Nursing. 2011; 20(19-20):2958-2967

83 Fry M. Literature review of the impact of nurse practitioners in critical care services. Nursing in Critical Care. 2011; 16(2):58-66

84 Furze G, Cox H, Morton V, Chuang LH, Lewin RJP, Nelson P et al. Randomized controlled trial of a lay-facilitated angina management programme. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2012; 68(10):2267-2279

85 Gershengorn HB, Wunsch H, Wahab R, Leaf DE, Brodie D, Li G et al. Impact of nonphysician staffing on outcomes in a medical ICU. Chest. 2011; 139(6):1347-1353

86 Gillard JN, Szoke A, Hoff WS, Wainwright GA, Stehly CD, Toedter LJ. Utilization of PAs and NPs at a level I trauma center: effects on outcomes. JAAPA : Official Journal of the American Academy of Physician Assistants. 2011; 24(7):34-3

87 Goessens BMB, Visseren FLJ, Sol BGM, de Man-van Ginkel J, van der Graaf Y, SMART Study Group. A randomized, controlled trial for risk factor reduction in patients with symptomatic vascular disease: the multidisciplinary Vascular Prevention by Nurses Study (VENUS). European Journal of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation. 2006; 13(6):996-1003

88 Goldie CL, Prodan-Bhalla N, Mackay M. Nurse practitioners in postoperative cardiac surgery: are they effective? Canadian Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing. 2012; 22(4):8-15

89 Goldman LE, Sarkar U, Kessell E, Guzman D, Schneidermann M, Pierluissi E et al. Support from hospital to home for elders: a randomized trial. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2014; 161(7):472-481

90 Goodwin M. Do epilepsy specialist nurses use a similar history-taking process as consultant neurologists in the differential diagnosis of patients presenting with a first seizure? Seizure. 2011; 20(10):795-800

91 Gracias VH, Sicoutris CP, Stawicki SP, Meredith DM, Horan AD, Gupta R et al. Critical care nurse practitioners improve compliance with clinical practice guidelines in "semiclosed" surgical intensive care unit. Journal of Nursing Care Quality. 2008; 23(4):338-344

92 Gradwell C, Thomas KS, English JSC, Williams HC. A randomized controlled trial of nurse follow-up clinics: do they help patients and do they free up consultants' time? British Journal of Dermatology. 2002; 147(3):513-517

93 Greving JP, Kaasjager HAH, Vernooij JWP, Hovens MMC, Wierdsma J, Grandjean HMH et al. Cost-effectiveness of a nurse-led internet-based vascular risk factor management programme: economic evaluation alongside a randomised controlled clinical trial. BMJ Open. 2015; 5(5):e007128

94 Griffiths P, Harris R, Richardson G, Hallett N, Heard S, Wilson-Barnett J. Substitution of a nursing-led inpatient unit for acute services: randomized controlled trial of outcomes and cost of nursing-led intermediate care. Age and Ageing. 2001; 30(6):483-488

95 Haan JM, Dutton RP, Willis M, Leone S, Kramer ME, Scalea TM. Discharge rounds in the 80-hour workweek: importance of the trauma nurse practitioner. Journal of Trauma. 2007; 63(2):339-343

96 Hamden K, Jeanmonod D, Gualtieri D, Jeanmonod R. Comparison of resident and mid-level provider productivity in a high-acuity emergency department setting. Emergency Medicine Journal. 2014; 31(3):216-219

97 Harbman P. The development and testing of a nurse practitioner secondary prevention intervention for patients after acute myocardial infarction: a prospective cohort study. International Journal of Nursing Studies. 2014; 51(12):1542-1556

98 Harris R, Richardson G, Griffiths P, Hallett N, Wilson-Barnett J. Economic evaluation of a nursing-led inpatient unit: the impact of findings on management decisions of service utility and sustainability. Journal of Nursing Management. 2005; 13(5):428-438

99 Harrison L. Trial reaches halfway stage. Another step nearer to nurse practitioner in the ACT. Australian Nursing Journal. 2001; 9(3):34

100 Hartford K. Telenursing and patients' recovery from bypass surgery. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2005; 50(5):459-468

101 Hawkins JW, Thibodeau JA. 25+ and going strong: nurse practitioners and nursing practice. Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners. 1994; 6(11):525-531

102 Hayden C, Burlingame P, Thompson H, Sabol VK. Improving patient flow in the emergency department by placing a family nurse practitioner in triage: a quality-improvement project. Journal of Emergency Nursing. 2014; 40(4):346-351

103 Henry LR, Hooker RS, Yates KL. The role of physician assistants in rural health care: a systematic review of the literature. Journal of Rural Health. 2011; 27(2):220-229

104 Ho CHY, Rainer TH, Graham CA. Nurse initiated reinsertion of nasogastric tubes in the emergency department: a randomised controlled trial. Australasian Emergency Nursing Journal. 2013; 16(4):136-143

105 Hoffman LA, Tasota FJ, Zullo TG, Scharfenberg C, Donahoe MP. Outcomes of care managed by an acute care nurse practitioner/attending physician team in a subacute medical intensive care unit. American Journal of Critical Care. 2005; 14(2):121-130

106 Hooker RS, Cipher DJ, Sekscenski E. Patient satisfaction with physician assistant, nurse practitioner, and physician care: a national survey of medicare beneficiaries. Journal of Clinical Outcomes Management. 2005; 12(2):88-92

107 Hooker RS, Klocko DJ, Larkin GL. Physician assistants in emergency medicine: the impact of their role. Academic Emergency Medicine. 2011; 18(1):72-77

108 Hoskins R. Evaluating new roles within emergency care: a literature review. International Emergency Nursing. 2011; 19(3):125-140

109 Houweling ST, Kleefstra N, Meyboom-de Jong B, Bilo HJG. Diabetes specialist nurse-led intervention to treat and control glycaemic regulation, hypertension and hyperlipidemia in patients with diabetes mellitus Type 2: a randomised controlled trial. Diabetologia. 2004; 47(Suppl 1):A72

110 Houweling ST, Kleefstra N, van Hateren KJJ, Kooy A, Groenier KH, Ten Vergert E et al. Diabetes specialist nurse as main care provider for patients with type 2 diabetes. Netherlands Journal of Medicine. 2009; 67(7):279-284

111 Hylka SC, Beschle JC. Nurse practitioners, cost savings, and improved patient care in the department of surgery. Nursing Economics. 1995; 13(6):349-354

112 Imhof L, Naef R, Wallhagen MI, Schwarz J, Mahrer-Imhof R. Effects of an advanced practice nurse in-home health consultation program for community-dwelling persons aged 80 and older. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society. 2012; 60(12):2223-2231

113 Innes K, Jackson D, Plummer V, Elliott D. Care of patients in emergency department waiting rooms--an integrative review. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2015; 71(12):2702-2714

114 Jaarsma T, van der Wal MH, Lesman-Leegte I, Luttik ML, Hogenhuis J, Veeger NJ et al. Effect of moderate or intensive disease management program on outcome in patients with heart failure: Coordinating Study Evaluating Outcomes of Advising and Counseling in Heart Failure (COACH). Archives of Internal Medicine. 2008; 168(3):316-324

115 Jeanmonod R, Delcollo J, Jeanmonod D, Dombchewsky O, Reiter M. Comparison of resident and mid-level provider productivity and patient satisfaction in an emergency department fast track. Emergency Medicine Journal. 2013; 30(1):e12

116 Jennings N, Clifford S, Fox AR, O'Connell J, Gardner G. The impact of nurse practitioner services on cost, quality of care, satisfaction and waiting times in the emergency department: a systematic review. International Journal of Nursing Studies. 2015; 52(1):421-435

117 Jennings N, Gardner G, O'Reilly G. A protocol for a pragmatic randomized controlled trial evaluating outcomes of emergency nurse practitioner service. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2014; 70(9):2140-2148

118 Jennings N, Lee G, Chao K, Keating S. A survey of patient satisfaction in a metropolitan Emergency Department: comparing nurse practitioners and emergency physicians. International Journal of Nursing Practice. 2009; 15(3):213-218

119 Jennings N, O'Reilly G, Lee G, Cameron P, Free B, Bailey M. Evaluating outcomes of the emergency nurse practitioner role in a major urban emergency department, Melbourne, Australia. Journal of Clinical Nursing. 2008; 17(8):1044-1050

120 Jones ML. Role development and effective practice in specialist and advanced practice roles in acute hospital settings: systematic review and meta-synthesis. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2005; 49(2):191-209

121 Jonsson AC, Hoglund P, Brizzi M, Pessah-Rasmussen H. Secondary prevention and health promotion after stroke: can it be enhanced? Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases. 2014; 23(9):2287-2295

122 Kannusamy P. A longitudinal study of advanced practice nursing in singapore. Critical Care Nursing Clinics of North America. 2006; 18(4):545-551

123 Kartha A, Restuccia JD, Burgess JFJ, Benzer J, Glasgow J, Hockenberry J et al. Nurse practitioner and physician assistant scope of practice in 118 acute care hospitals. Journal of Hospital Medicine. 2014; 9(10):615-620

124 Kawar E, DiGiovine B. MICU care delivered by PAs versus residents: do PAs measure up? JAAPA : Official Journal of the American Academy of Physician Assistants. 2011; 24(1):36-41

125 Keane AK. Advanced nurse practitioners: improving patients' journeys. Emergency Nurse. 2008; 16(6):30-35

126 Kilpatrick K, Reid K, Carter N, Donald F, Bryant-Lukosius D, Martin-Misener R et al. A systematic review of the cost-effectiveness of clinical nurse specialists and nurse practitioners in inpatient roles. Nursing Leadership. 2015; 28(3):56-76

127 Kinley H, Czoski-Murray C, George S, McCabe C, Primrose J, Reilly C et al. Extended scope of nursing practice: a multicentre randomised controlled trial of appropriately trained nurses and pre-registration house officers in pre-operative assessment in elective general surgery. Health Technology Assessment. 2001; 5(20):iii-77

128 Kinsman L, Champion R, Lee G, Martin M, Masman K, May E et al. Assessing the impact of streaming in a regional emergency department 3233. EMA - Emergency Medicine Australasia. 2008; 20(3):221-227

129 Kirton OC, Folcik MA, Ivy ME, Calabrese R, Dobkin E, Pepe J et al. Midlevel practitioner workforce analysis at a university-affiliated teaching hospital. Archives of Surgery. 2007; 142(4):336-341

130 Kleinpell R, Goolsby MJ. American academy of nurse practitioners national nurse practitioner sample survey: focus on acute care. Journal of Emergency Nursing. 2006; 18:393-394

131 Kleinpell RM, Ely EW, Grabenkort R. Nurse practitioners and physician assistants in the intensive care unit: an evidence-based review. Critical Care Medicine. 2008; 36(10):2888-2897

132 Kroese ME, Schulpen GJ, Bessems MC, Severens JL, Nijhuis FJ, Geusens PP et al. Substitution of specialized rheumatology nurses for rheumatologists in the diagnostic process of fibromyalgia: a randomized controlled trial. Arthritis and Rheumatism (Arthritis Care and Research). 2008; 59(9):1299-1305

133 Kuethe M, Vaessen-Verberne A, Mulder P, Bindels P, van Aalderen W. Paediatric asthma outpatient care by asthma nurse, paediatrician or general practitioner: randomised controlled trial with two-year follow-up. Primary Care Respiratory Journal. 2011; 20(1):84-91

134 Kuethe MC, Vaessen-Verberne Anja APH, Elbers RG, van Aalderen W. Nurse versus physician-led care for the management of asthma. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2013; Issue 2:CD009296. DOI:10.1002/14651858.CD009296.pub2

135 Lalor JG, Casey D, Elliott N, Coyne I, Comiskey C, Higgins A et al. Using case study within a sequential explanatory design to evaluate the impact of specialist and advanced practice roles on clinical outcomes: the SCAPE study. BMC Medical Research Methodology. 2013; 13:55

136 Lambing AY, Adams DL, Fox DH, Divine G. Nurse practitioners' and physicians' care activities and clinical outcomes with an inpatient geriatric population. Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners. 2004; 16(8):343-352

137 Larkin GL, Hooker RS. Patient willingness to be seen by physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and residents in the emergency department: does the presumption of assent have an empirical basis? American Journal of Bioethics. 2010; 10(8):1-10

138 Laroche C, Pearce L, Simpson T, Hawkes J, Webb M, Sharples L. A randomised trial of the effectiveness of early follow-up by a respiratory consultant or a respiratory specialist nurse on asthma readmissions. European Respiratory Journal. 2000; 16(Suppl 31):7s

139 Latour CHM, de Vos R, Huyse FJ, de Jonge P, van Gemert LAM, Stalman WAB. Effectiveness of post-discharge case management in general-medical outpatients: a randomized, controlled trial. Psychosomatics. 2006; 47(5):421-429

140 Lau LH, Kerr D, Law I, Ritchie P. Nurse practitioners treating ankle and foot injuries using the Ottawa Ankle Rules: a comparative study in the emergency department. Australasian Emergency Nursing Journal. 2013; 16(3):110-115

141 Lewis SR, Nicholson A, Smith AF, Alderson P. Physician anaesthetists versus non-physician providers of anaesthesia for surgical patients. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2014; Issue 7:CD010357. DOI:10.1002/14651858.CD010357.pub2

142 Lilja Y, Ryden S, Fridlund B. Effects of extended preoperative information on perioperative stress: an anaesthetic nurse intervention for patients with breast cancer and total hip replacement. Intensive and Critical Care Nursing. 1998; 14(6):276-282

143 Limoges-Gonzalez M, Mann NS, Al-Juburi A, Tseng D, Inadomi J, Rossaro L. Comparisons of screening colonoscopy performed by a nurse practitioner and gastroenterologists: a single-center randomized controlled trial. Gastroenterology Nursing. 2011; 34(3):210-216

144 Lohr RH, West CP, Beliveau M, Daniels PR, Nyman MA, Mundell WC et al. Comparison of the quality of patient referrals from physicians, physician assistants, and nurse practitioners. Mayo Clinic Proceedings. 2013; 88(11):1266-1271

145 Loveman E, Royle P, Waugh N. Specialist nurses in diabetes mellitus. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2003; Issue 2:CD003286. DOI:10.1002/14651858.CD003286

146 Lutze M, Ross M, Chu M, Green T, Dinh M. Patient perceptions of emergency department fast track: a prospective pilot study comparing two models of care. Australasian Emergency Nursing Journal. 2014; 17(3):112-118

147 Mahoney D. "Justifying nurse practitioner existence: hard facts to hard figures". Nurse Practitioner. 1995; 20(10):8

148 Mahoney DF. Appropriateness of geriatric prescribing decisions made by nurse practitioners and physicians. Image--the Journal of Nursing Scholarship. 1994; 26(1):41-46

149 Martinez-Gonzalez NA, Tandjung R, Djalali S, Huber-Geismann F, Markun S, Rosemann T. Effects of physician-nurse substitution on clinical parameters: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PloS One. 2014; 9(2):e89181

150 Mason JM, Freemantle N, Gibson JM, New JP, SPLINT trial. Specialist nurse-led clinics to improve control of hypertension and hyperlipidemia in diabetes: economic analysis of the SPLINT trial. Diabetes Care. 2005; 28(1):40-46

151 Mason S, O'Keeffe C, Coleman P, O'Hara R, Dixon S, Rick J et al. A multi-centre community intervention trial to evaluate the clinical and cost effectiveness of emergency care practitioners. Report for the National co-ordinating centre for NHS service delivery and organisation R&D (NCCSDO), 2008. Available from: http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/64519/FR-08-1519-98.pdf

152 Mason S, Knowles E, Colwell B, Dixon S, Wardrope J, Gorringe R et al. Effectiveness of paramedic practitioners in attending 999 calls from elderly people in the community: cluster randomised controlled trial. BMJ. 2007; 335(7626):919

153 McCarthy ML, Ding R, Pines JM, Terwiesch C, Sattarian M, Hilton JA et al. Provider variation in fast track treatment time. Medical Care. 2012; 50(1):43-49

154 McCauley KM, Bixby MB, Naylor MD. Advanced practice nurse strategies to improve outcomes and reduce cost in elders with heart failure. Disease Management : DM. 2006; 9(5):302-310

155 McClellan CM, Cramp F, Powell J, Benger JR. A randomised trial comparing the clinical effectiveness of different emergency department healthcare professionals in soft tissue injury management. BMJ Open. 2012; 2(6):e001092

156 McClellan CM, Cramp F, Powell J, Benger JR. A randomised trial comparing the cost effectiveness of different emergency department healthcare professionals in soft tissue injury management. BMJ Open. 2013; 3(1):e001116

157 McCord C, Mbaruku G, Pereira C, Nzabuhakwa C, Bergstrom S. The quality of emergency obstetrical surgery by assistant medical officers in Tanzanian district hospitals. Health Affairs. 2009; 28(5):w876-w885

158 McCorkle R, Dowd M, Ercolano E, Schulman-Green D, Williams Al, Siefert ML et al. Effects of a nursing intervention on quality of life outcomes in post-surgical women with gynecological cancers. Psycho-Oncology. 2009; 18(1):62-70

159 McDonnell A, Goodwin E, Kennedy F, Hawley K, Gerrish K, Smith C. An evaluation of the implementation of Advanced Nurse Practitioner (ANP) roles in an acute hospital setting. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2015; 71(4):789-799

160 Melis RJF, van Eijken MIJ, Borm GF, Wensing M, Adang E, van de Lisdonk EH et al. The design of the Dutch EASYcare study: a randomised controlled trial on the effectiveness of a problem-based community intervention model for frail elderly people [NCT00105378]. BMC Health Services Research. 2005; 5:65

161 Mergenhagen KA, Blum SS, Kugler A, Livote EE, Nebeker JR, Ott MC et al. Pharmacist- versus physician-initiated admission medication reconciliation: impact on adverse drug events. American Journal of Geriatric Pharmacotherapy. 2012; 10(4):242-250

162 Meyer SC, Miers LJ. Cardiovascular surgeon and acute care nurse practitioner: collaboration on postoperative outcomes. AACN Clinical Issues. 2005; 16(2):149-158

163 Moher D, Weinberg A, Hanlon R, Runnalls K. Effects of a medical team coordinator on length of hospital stay. CMAJ Canadian Medical Association Journal. 1992; 146(4):511-515

164 Motherwell DW, Rogers J, Kellagher M, Craig D, O'Reilly DSJ, Cobbe SM. The introduction of a chest pain nurse and fast-track troponin service reduces the length of stay of patients presenting with chest pain. Scottish Medical Journal. 2007; 52(2):6-9

165 Nash K, Zachariah B, Nitschmann J, Psencik B. Evaluation of the fast track unit of a university emergency department. Journal of Emergency Nursing. 2007; 33(1):14-90

166 Nathan JA, Pearce L, Field C, Dotesio-Eyres N, Sharples LD, Cafferty F et al. A randomized controlled trial of follow-up of patients discharged from the hospital following acute asthma: best performed by specialist nurse or doctor? Chest. 2006; 130(1):51-57

167 Naylor MD, Brooten DA, Campbell RL, Maislin G, McCauley KM, Schwartz JS. Transitional care of older adults hospitalized with heart failure: a randomized, controlled trial. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society. 2004; 52(5):675-684

168 Nestler DM, Fratzke AR, Church CJ, Scanlan-Hanson L, Sadosty AT, Halasy MP et al. Effect of a physician assistant as triage liaison provider on patient throughput in an academic emergency department. Academic Emergency Medicine. 2012; 19(11):1235-1241

169 Newhouse RP, Stanik-Hutt J, White KM, Johantgen M, Bass EB, Zangaro G et al. Advanced practice nurse outcomes 1990-2008: a systematic review. Nursing Economics. 2011; 29(5):230-250

170 O'Keeffe C, Mason S, Knowles E. Patient experiences of an extended role in healthcare: comparing emergency care practitioners (ECPs) with usual providers in different emergency and urgent care settings. Emergency Medicine Journal. 2014; 31(8):673-674

171 O'Neill JL, Cunningham TL, Wiitala WL, Bartley EP. Collaborative hypertension case management by registered nurses and clinical pharmacy specialists within the Patient Aligned Care Teams (PACT) model. Journal of General Internal Medicine. 2014; 29(Suppl 2):S675-S681

172 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Purchasing power parities (PPP), 2007. Available from: http://www.oecd.org/std/ppp

173 Owens L, Butcher G, Gilmore I, Kolamunnage-Dona R, Oyee J, Perkins L et al. A randomised controlled trial of extended brief intervention for alcohol dependent patients in an acute hospital setting (ADPAC). BMC Public Health. 2011; 11:528

174 Page T, Lockwood C, Conroy-Hiller T. Effectiveness of nurse-led cardiac clinics in adult patients with a diagnosis of coronary heart disease. International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare. 2005; 3(2):2-26

175 Patel H, Shafazand M, Ekman I, Hojgard S, Swedberg K, Schaufelberger M. Home care as an option in worsening chronic heart failure -- a pilot study to evaluate feasibility, quality adjusted life years and cost-effectiveness. European Journal of Heart Failure. 2008; 10(7):675-681

176 Pear SM, Williamson TH. The RN first assistant: an expert resource for surgical site infection prevention. AORN Journal. 2009; 89(6):1093-1097

177 Peeters MJ, van Zuilen AD, van den Brand JAJG, Bots ML, van Buren M, ten Dam MAGJ et al. Nurse practitioner care improves renal outcome in patients with CKD. Journal of the American Society of Nephrology. 2014; 25(2):390-398

178 Pioro MH, Landefeld CS, Brennan PF, Daly B, Fortinsky RH, Kim U et al. Outcomes-based trial of an inpatient nurse practitioner service for general medical patients. Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice. 2001; 7(1):21-33

179 Pirret AM. The role and effectiveness of a nurse practitioner led critical care outreach service. Intensive and Critical Care Nursing. 2008; 24(6):375-382

180 Pledger J. The effect on inpatient care of a dedicated diabetes specialist nurse. Journal of Diabetes Nursing. 2005; 9(7):252-256

181 Quattrini V, Swan BA. Evaluating care in ED fast tracks. Journal of Emergency Nursing. 2011; 37(1):40-46

182 Ranzenbach EA, Poa L, Puig-Palomar M, Holtzman M, Miller S, Mohr M. The safety and efficacy of physician assistants as first assistant surgeons in cardiac surgery. JAAPA : Official Journal of the American Academy of Physician Assistants. 2012; 25(8):52

183 Rao A, Walsh J. Impact of specialist care in patients with newly diagnosed heart failure: a randomised controlled study. International Journal of Cardiology. 2007; 115(2):196-202

184 Reynolds H, Wilson-Barnett J, Richardson G. Evaluation of the role of the Parkinson's disease nurse specialist. International Journal of Nursing Studies. 2000; 37(4):337-349

185 Ridsdale L, Kwan I, Cryer C. Newly diagnosed epilepsy: can nurse specialists help? A randomized controlled trial. Epilepsy Care Evaluation Group. Epilepsia. 2000; 41(8):1014-1019

186 Robles L, Slogoff M, Ladwig-Scott E, Zank D, Larson MK, Aranha G et al. The addition of a nurse practitioner to an inpatient surgical team results in improved use of resources. Surgery. 2011; 150(4):711-717

187 Roche TE, Gardner G, Lewis PA. Effectiveness of an emergency nurse practitioner service for adults presenting to rural hospitals with chest pain: protocol for a multicentre, longitudinal nested cohort study. BMJ Open. 2015; 5(2):e006997

188 Rowe BH, Villa-Roel C, Guo X, Bullard MJ, Ospina M, Vandermeer B et al. The role of triage nurse ordering on mitigating overcrowding in emergency departments: a systematic review. Academic Emergency Medicine. 2011; 18(12):1349-1357

189 Roy CL, Liang CL, Lund M, Boyd C, Katz JT, McKean S et al. Implementation of a physician assistant/hospitalist service in an academic medical center: impact on efficiency and patient outcomes. Journal of Hospital Medicine. United States 2008; 3(5):361-368

190 Russell CL. A clinical nurse specialist-led intervention to enhance medication adherence using the plan-do-check-act cycle for continuous self-improvement. Clinical Nurse Specialist. 2010; 24(2):69-75

191 Sackett DL. A landmark randomized health care trial: the Burlington Trial of the nurse practitioner. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2009; 62(6):567-570

192 Sandhu H, Dale J, Stallard N, Crouch R, Glucksman E. Emergency nurse practitioners and doctors consulting with patients in an emergency department: a comparison of communication skills and satisfaction. Emergency Medicine Journal. 2009; 26(6):400-404

193 Sarkissian S, Wennberg R. Effects of the acute care nurse practitioner role on epilepsy monitoring outcomes. Outcomes Management for Nursing Practice. 1999; 3(4):161-166

194 Sawatzky JA, Christie S, Singal RK. Exploring outcomes of a nurse practitioner-managed cardiac surgery follow-up intervention: a randomized trial. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2013; 69(9):2076-2087

195 Shah M, Norwood CA, Farias S, Ibrahim S, Chong PH, Fogelfeld L. Diabetes transitional care from inpatient to outpatient setting: pharmacist discharge counseling. Journal of Pharmacy Practice. 2013; 26(2):120-124

196 Shum C. Nurse-led service for minor conditions. Nursing Times. 2000; 96(15):43

197 Skinner H, Skoyles J, Redfearn S, Jutley R, Mitchell I, Richens D. Advanced care nurse practitioners can safely provide sole resident cover for level three patients: impact on outcomes, cost and work patterns in a cardiac surgery programme. European Journal of Cardio-Thoracic Surgery. United Kingdom 2013; 43(1):19-22

198 Snyder JV, Sirio CA, Angus DC, Hravnak MT, Kobert SN, Sinz EH et al. Trial of nurse practitioners in intensive care. New Horizons. 1994; 2(3):296-304

199 Sonday C, Grecsek E, Casino PD. Rapid response teams: NPs lead the way. Nurse Practitioner. 2010; 35(5):40-46

200 Sridhar M, Taylor R, Dawson S, Roberts NJ, Partridge MR. A nurse led intermediate care package in patients who have been hospitalised with an acute exacerbation of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Thorax. 2008; 63(3):194-200

201 Stables RH, Booth J, Welstand J, Wright A, Ormerod OJM, Hodgson WR. A randomised controlled trial to compare a nurse practitioner to medical staff in the preparation of patients for diagnostic

cardiac catheterisation: the study of nursing intervention in practice (SNIP). European Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing. 2004; 3(1):53-59

202 Stanik-Hutt J, Newhouse RP, White KM, Johantgen M, Bass EB, Zangaro G et al. The quality and effectiveness of care provided by nurse practitioners. Journal for Nurse Practitioners. 2013; 9(8):492-500

203 Stewart S, Horowitz JD. A specialist nurse-led intervention in Australia. 2001

204 Stoller JK. Evolving roles of nonphysician respiratory care providers. Clinical Pulmonary Medicine. 2001; 8(5):279-283

205 Strand E, Nygren I, Bergkvist L, Smedh K. Nurse or surgeon follow-up after rectal cancer: a randomized trial. Colorectal Disease. 2011; 13(9):999-1003

206 Takeda A, Taylor Stephanie JC, Taylor RS, Khan F, Krum H, Underwood M. Clinical service organisation for heart failure. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2012; Issue 9:CD002752. DOI:10.1002/14651858.CD002752.pub3

207 Thomas LH, Barrett J, Cross S, French B, Leathley M, Sutton C et al. Prevention and treatment of urinary incontinence after stroke in adults. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2005; Issue 3:CD004462. DOI:10.1002/14651858.CD004462.pub2

208 Thompson DR, Roebuck A, Stewart S. Effects of a nurse-led, clinic and home-based intervention on recurrent hospital use in chronic heart failure. European Journal of Heart Failure. 2005; 7(3):377-384

209 Thourani VH, Miller J. Physicians assistants in cardiothoracic surgery: a 30-year experience in a university center. Annals of Thoracic Surgery. 2006; 81(1):195-200

210 Timmermans MJC, van Vught AJAH, Wensing M, Laurant MGH. The effectiveness of substitution of hospital ward care from medical doctors to physician assistants: a study protocol. BMC Health Services Research. 2014; 14:43

211 Vadher BD, Patterson DL, Leaning M. Comparison of oral anticoagulant control by a nurse-practitioner using a computer decision-support system with that by clinicians. Clinical and Laboratory Haematology. 1997; 19(3):203-207

212 Van Der Biezen M, Adang E, Van Der Burgt R, Wensing M, Laurant M. The impact of substituting general practitioners with nurse practitioners on resource use, production and health-care costs during out-of-hours: a quasi-experimental study. BMC Family Practice. 2016; 17(1):132

213 van der Linden C, Reijnen R, de Vos R. Diagnostic accuracy of emergency nurse practitioners versus physicians related to minor illnesses and injuries. Journal of Emergency Nursing. 2010; 36(4):311-316

214 van Zuilen AD, Blankestijn PJ, van Buren M, ten Dam MAGJ, Kaasjager KAH, Ligtenberg G et al. Nurse practitioners improve quality of care in chronic kidney disease: two-year results of a randomised study. Netherlands Journal of Medicine. 2011; 69(11):517-526

215 van Zuilen AD, Bots ML, Dulger A, van der Tweel I, van Buren M, ten Dam MAGJ et al. Multifactorial intervention with nurse practitioners does not change cardiovascular outcomes in patients with chronic kidney disease. Kidney International. 2012; 82(6):710-717

216 van Zuilen AD, Wetzels JFM, Blankestijn PJ, Bots ML, van Buren M, ten Dam MAGJ et al. Rationale and design of the MASTERPLAN study: multifactorial approach and superior treatment efficacy in renal patients with the aid of nurse practitioners. Journal of Nephrology. 2005; 18(1):30-34

217 van Zuilen AD, Wetzels JFM, Bots ML, Van Blankestijn PJ, MASTERPLAN study group. MASTERPLAN: study of the role of nurse practitioners in a multifactorial intervention to reduce cardiovascular risk in chronic kidney disease patients. Journal of Nephrology. 2008; 21(3):261-267

218 Walsh B, Steiner A, Pickering RM, Ward-Basu J. Economic evaluation of nurse led intermediate care versus standard care for post-acute medical patients: cost minimisation analysis of data from a randomised controlled trial. BMJ. 2005; 330(7493):699

219 Webb J, Brooks R, Goddard J, Meighan DJ, Hooper F, Olding A. Asthma nurse specialist ANS intervention in the management of asthma: the Asthma Resource Centre ARC project in Greenwich. Thorax. 1997; 52(Suppl 6):A46

220 Weeks G, George J, Maclure K, Stewart D. Non-medical prescribing versus medical prescribing for acute and chronic disease management in primary and secondary care. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2016; Issue 11:CD011227

221 Wheeler EC. The effect of the clinical nurse specialist on patient outcomes. Critical Care Nursing Clinics of North America. 1999; 11(2):269-275

222 Wierzchowiecki M, Poprawski K, Nowicka A, Kandziora M, Piatkowska A, Jankowiak M et al. A new programme of multidisciplinary care for patients with heart failure in Poznan: one-year follow-up. Kardiologia Polska. 2006; 64(10):1063-2

223 Williams J, Russell T, Durai D, Cheung WY, Farrin A, Bloor K et al. Effectiveness of nurse delivered endoscopy: findings from randomised multi-institution nurse endoscopy trial (MlNuET). BMJ. 2009; 338(7693):b231

224 Wright K, Hazelett S, Weinhardt J, Jarjoura D, Hua K, Gareri M. The role of the advanced practice nurse in post-stroke care management. Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases. 2003; 12(5):249

Appendices

Appendix B: Review protocols

Table 7: Review protocol: physician extenders

Review question	Do physician extenders (for example, physician assistants, and emergency nurse practitioners) improve outcomes in secondary care?
Guideline condition and its definition	Acute medical emergencies. Definition: People with suspected or confirmed acute medical emergencies or at risk of an acute medical emergency
Review population	Adults and young people (16 years and over) at risk of an AME, or with a suspected or confirmed AME
	Adults and young people (16 years and over)
	Line of therapy not an inclusion criterion
Interventions and comparators: generic/class; specific/drug (All interventions will be compared with each other, unless otherwise stated)	Physician extender in addition to usual care Specialist nurse in addition to usual care No Physician extenders/usual care; No Physician extenders/usual care (for example, junior doctors, staff nurses)
Outcomes	- Quality of life (Continuous) CRITICAL - Length of stay (Continuous) CRITICAL - Readmission up to 30 days (Dichotomous) IMPORTANT - Mortality (Dichotomous) CRITICAL - Avoidable adverse events (Dichotomous) CRITICAL - Patient and/or carer satisfaction (Dichotomous) CRITICAL - Missed or delayed treatments (Dichotomous) IMPORTANT - Staff satisfaction (Dichotomous) IMPORTANT
Study design	Systematic reviews (SRs) of RCTs, RCTs, observational studies only to be included if no relevant SRs or RCTs are identified.
Unit of randomisation	Patient
Crossover study	Permitted
Minimum duration of study	Not defined
Other stratifications	Physician extender, Specialist nurse
Subgroup analyses if there is heterogeneity	- Frail elderly (Frail elderly; Not frail elderly); The committee felt this population was significantly different - Type of physician extender (Emergency nurse practitioner; Advanced nurse practitioner; Advanced care practitioner; Physician Assistant/Physician Associate; Critical Care Practitioner; Critical Care Outreach Nurse; Independent prescribing pharmacists); These could show significant differences - Type of specialist nurse; Diabetes inpatient specialist nurse; Heart failure nurse; These could show significant differences
Search criteria	Databases: Medline, Embase, the Cochrane library Date limits for search: None Language: English

Appendix C: Clinical article selection

Figure 1: Flow chart of clinical article selection for the review of Physician extenders



Appendix D: Forest plots

D.1 Physician extender versus no physician extender/usual care

Figure 2: Adverse events.



Figure 3: Length of stay.



Figure 4: Mortality.



Figure 5: Satisfaction.



Figure 6: Readmission



D.2 Specialist nurse versus no specialist nurse/usual care

Figure 7: Adverse events

Study or Subgroup	Specialist nurse Events	Total	No specialist nurse/usual care Events	Total	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Arts 2012	10	149	17	145	100.0%	0.57 [0.27, 1.21]
Total (95% CI)		**149**		**145**	**100.0%**	**0.57 [0.27, 1.21]**
Total events	10		17			

Heterogeneity: Not applicable
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.46 (P = 0.14)



Figure 8: Mortality

Study or Subgroup	Specialist nurse Events	Total	No specialist nurse/usual care Events	Total	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Arts 2012	5	147	4	145	38.9%	1.23 [0.34, 4.50]
Davies 2001	6	148	8	152	61.1%	0.77 [0.27, 2.17]
Total (95% CI)		**295**		**297**	**100.0%**	**0.93 [0.41, 2.08]**
Total events	11		12			

Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 0.31, df = 1 (P = 0.58); I² = 0%
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.19 (P = 0.85)



Figure 9: Satisfied patients

Study or Subgroup	Physician extender Events	Total	No PE/usual care Events	Total	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Davies 2001	61	67	39	66	100.0%	1.54 [1.24, 1.91]
Total (95% CI)		**67**		**66**	**100.0%**	**1.54 [1.24, 1.91]**
Total events	61		39			

Heterogeneity: Not applicable
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.95 (P < 0.0001)



Figure 10: Readmission

Study or Subgroup	Specialist nurse Events	Total	No specialist nurse/usual care Events	Total	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Davies 2001	37	148	38	152	100.0%	1.00 [0.68, 1.48]
Total (95% CI)		**148**		**152**	**100.0%**	**1.00 [0.68, 1.48]**
Total events	37		38			

Heterogeneity: Not applicable
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00 (P = 1.00)



Appendix E: Clinical evidence tables

Study	Arts 2012[12]
Study type	RCT (Patient randomised; Parallel)
Number of studies (number of participants)	1 (n=337)
Countries and setting	Conducted in Netherlands; Setting: Academic hospital
Line of therapy	1st line
Duration of study	Intervention + follow up: 10 months + 2 year follow-up
Method of assessment of guideline condition	Adequate method of assessment/diagnosis
Stratum	Specialist nurse: Diabetes mellitus types 1 and 2 patients
Subgroup analysis within study	Not applicable
Inclusion criteria	Required treatment with either insulin or oral blood-glucose medication combined with 1 or more of the following conditions: inadequate regulation of blood glucose, blood pressure, or lipids
Exclusion criteria	Disturbed renal function (Creatinine > 180 mmol/L), pregnant or planned pregnancy, treated with continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion, recent cardiovascular event (<6 months before inclusion), Co-morbidity necessitating treatment from an internist, active or recurrent foot ulcer(s), hypertension that requires treatment including more than 4 medications
Recruitment/selection of patients	People with diabetes from the area of Maastricht, who were under the care of the 5 physicians and 2 resident endocrinologists involved in the study
Age, gender and ethnicity	Age - Mean (SD): Group 1: 59.5 (13.8), Group 2: 58.4 (14.1). Gender (M:F): 101:193. Ethnicity: NR
Further population details	1. Frail elderly: Not applicable / Not stated / Unclear
Extra comments	study reports EQ-5D scores at baseline, but insufficiently reports final scores ("EQ-5D scores remained similar over time in both groups (p=0.058)")
Indirectness of population	No indirectness
Interventions	(n=169) Intervention 1: Specialist nurse in addition to usual care. Participants received care from advanced nurse practitioners, who worked according to a protocol (no further details on protocol). Duration until discharge. Concurrent medication/care: no details given Further details: 1. Type of specialist nurse: Diabetes specialist nurses which were defined in the study as an advanced practice nurse who focus on a specific patient population in specialised area of nursing practice (Doctoral or Master's prepared registered nurses).

Study	Arts 2012[12]
	(n=168) Intervention 2: No specialist nurse/usual care (for example, junior doctors, staff nurses). Usual care provided by the 5 physicians participating in this trial. Duration until discharge. Concurrent medication/care: no details given. Further details: 1. Type of physician extender: Not applicable / Not stated / Unclear.
Funding	No funding
RESULTS (NUMBERS ANALYSED) AND RISK OF BIAS FOR COMPARISON: PHYSICIAN EXTENDER IN ADDITION TO USUAL CARE versus NO PHYSICIAN EXTENDERS/USUAL CARE (FOR EXAMPLE, JUNIOR DOCTORS, STAFF NURSES) Protocol outcome 1: Mortality during the study period - Actual outcome: Mortality at 2 years; Group 1: 5/147, Group 2: 4/145; Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - Very high, Blinding - Very high, Incomplete outcome data - High, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Very high, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness ; Baseline details: Difference in baseline diabetes-related complications (Group 1: 47%, Group 2: 42%), and smokers: (Group 1: 19.3%, Group 2: 27.6%); Group 1 Number missing: 20, Reason: dropped out; Group 2 Number missing: 23, Reason: dropped out Protocol outcome 2: Avoidable adverse events during the study period - Actual outcome: Diabetes-related complications at 2 years; Group 1: 10/149, Group 2: 17/145; Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - Very high, Blinding - Very high, Incomplete outcome data - High, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Very high, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness ; Baseline details: Difference in baseline diabetes-related complications (Group 1: 47%, Group 2: 42%), and smokers: (Group 1: 19.3%, Group 2: 27.6%); Group 1 Number missing: 20, Reason: dropped out; Group 2 Number missing: 23, Reason: dropped out Protocol outcome 3: Quality of life - Actual outcome: Mean EQ-5D quality of life (SD): Group 1: 0.86 (0.22) at baseline and 0.80 at 2 years; Group 2: 0.82 (0.22) at baseline and 0.82 at 2 years; Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - Very high, Blinding - Very high, Incomplete outcome data - High, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Very high, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness ; Baseline details: Difference in baseline diabetes-related complications (Group 1: 47%, Group 2: 42%), and smokers: (Group 1: 19.3%, Group 2: 27.6%); Group 1 Number missing: 20, Reason: dropped out; Group 2 Number missing: 23, Reason: dropped out	
Protocol outcomes not reported by the study	Readmission during the study period; Patient and/or carer satisfaction during the study period; Discharges during the

Study	Arts 2012[12]
	study period; Missed or delayed treatments during the study period; Staff satisfaction during the study period; Length of stay during the study period

Study	Cowan 2006[51]
Study type	Quasi-RCT (General medicine floor divided into control unit and experimental unit; Parallel)
Number of studies (number of participants)	1 (n=1207)
Countries and setting	Conducted in the USA; Setting: tertiary academic medical hospital
Line of therapy	First line
Duration of study	Intervention + follow up: intervention to hospital discharge + 30 days after discharge + 4 months follow-up
Method of assessment of guideline condition	Adequate method of assessment/diagnosis
Stratum	Overall: hospitalised, acutely ill general medicine patients
Subgroup analysis within study	Not applicable
Inclusion criteria	Patients admitted to the general medical floor of a tertiary academic medical hospital
Exclusion criteria	Sickle cell anaemia
Recruitment/selection of patients	Patients admitted to the general medical floor of a tertiary academic medical hospital
Age, gender and ethnicity	Age - Mean (SD): Group 1:55 (19), Group 2: 55 (19). Gender (M:F): 554:653. Ethnicity: White 820; African-American 205; Asian 67; Other 115
Further population details	1. Frail elderly: Not applicable / Not stated / Unclear
Extra comments	
Indirectness of population	No indirectness
Interventions	(n=581) Intervention 1: Presence of a Nurse Practitioner whose primary role for inpatient care were the following: case management, facilitation of communication and collaboration with physicians and nurses, leading and actively implementing timely processes after the daily multidisciplinary rounds, surveillance of cost-effective measures (that is, rational use of cardiac monitors, indwelling lines and catheters), twice-daily assessments of cultures for sensitivity with the goal of changing the antibiotic regimen to the narrowest spectrum, review of all medications for drug/drug interactions and side effects, changing intravenous medications to oral, and enforcement of disease-specific care pathways and expedition of discharge planning with post-discharge follow up. Continuous care for patients for 8 hours per day.

Study	Cowan 2006[51]
	After discharge: follow-up phone calls (2 calls in first week, once a week for the next 3 weeks); assessed issues such as medication compliance and side effects, follow up appointments with primary physician, symptom management, pain management and resumption of functional activities of daily living. They advised primary physicians to change medication orders if necessary, Home visits were offered to all patients who lived within a 20-mile geographic radius of the hospital (around 7% had home visits). Concurrent medication/care: Increase in multi-disciplinary rounds from weekly to daily (with the NP taking part in the rounds); appointment of a (hospitalist) medical director who was in charge of overseeing NP and physicians. There was 1 medical director for the first 9 months of the study and (assumed) 2 for the final duration. Duration: in hospital and for 30 days after discharge. Further details: 1. Type of physician extender: (n=626) Intervention 2: No Physician extenders/usual care - No Physician extenders/usual care (for example. junior doctors, staff nurses). Usual care provided by attending physician, 2 residents, 3 interns, medical students and nurses. Duration: in hospital Concurrent medication/care: Not stated Further details: 1. Type of physician extender: Not applicable / Not stated / Unclear
Funding	Agency for Health Care Policy and Research

RESULTS (NUMBERS ANALYSED) AND RISK OF BIAS FOR COMPARISON: PHYSICIAN EXTENDER IN ADDITION TO USUAL CARE versus NO PHYSICIAN EXTENDERS/USUAL CARE (FOR EXAMPLE, JUNIOR DOCTORS, STAFF NURSES)

Protocol outcome 1: Length of stay

- Actual outcome: Length of stay (index admission); Group 1: 5 (6.3) days; Group 2: 6.01 (6.9) days; Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - Very high, Blinding - Very high, Incomplete outcome data - Low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness

Protocol outcome 2: Mortality

- Actual outcome: Mortality at 4 months; Group 1: 58/581, Group 2: 50/626; Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - Very high, Blinding - Very high, Incomplete outcome data - Low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness

Protocol outcome 3: Readmission

- Actual outcome: Readmission at 4 months; Group 1: 183/581, Group 2: 196/626; Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - Very high, Blinding - Very high,

Study	Cowan 2006[51]
Incomplete outcome data - Low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness	
Protocol outcomes not reported by the study	Quality of life during the study period; Avoidable adverse events during the study period; Patient and/or carer satisfaction during the study period; Discharges during the study period; Missed or delayed treatments during the study period; Staff satisfaction during the study period

Study	Davies 2001[55]
Study type	RCT (Patient randomised; Parallel)
Number of studies (number of participants)	1 (n=300)
Countries and setting	Conducted in UK; Setting: secondary care
Line of therapy	1st line
Duration of study	Intervention + follow up: intervention during hospitalisation + 12 months follow-up
Method of assessment of guideline condition	Adequate method of assessment/diagnosis
Stratum	Specialist nurse: type 1 or type 2 diabetes patients
Subgroup analysis within study	Not applicable
Inclusion criteria	Sequential, unselected referrals of in-patients to the DSN service (with either type 1 or type 2 diabetes) to a university hospital
Exclusion criteria	Patients unable to complete self-reported questionnaire were selectively excluded from that outcome. (reasons for exclusion include: visually impaired, non-English, confused, or had reduced consciousness)
Recruitment/selection of patients	Sequential, unselected referrals of in-patients to the DSN service (with either type 1 or type 2 diabetes) to a university hospital
Age, gender and ethnicity	Age - Median (IQR): Group 1: 63.4 (19.1), Group 2:63.6 (19.5). Gender (M:F): 159:139. Ethnicity: Not stated
Further population details	1. Frail elderly: Not applicable / Not stated / Unclear
Extra comments	If declined to participate patients received DSN input
Indirectness of population	No indirectness
Interventions	(n=148) Intervention 1: Specialist nurse in addition to usual care. Presence of 1 of 4 diabetes specialist nurse. DSN care included individual structures patient education appropriate to need, and practical management advice including verbal and written case-note feedback to ward-based medical staff. DSN input began on the day of referral and randomisation, and continued until discharge

Study	Davies 2001[55]
	Duration: in hospital Concurrent medication/care: Not stated Further details: 1. Type of physician extender: Diabetes specialist nurse (n=152) Intervention 2: No specialist nurse /usual care (for example, junior doctors, and staff nurses). Usual care from medical, general nursing and dietetic health professionals without any input from the DSN Duration Concurrent medication/care: Not stated Further details: 1. Type of specialist nurse extender: diabetic specialist nurse
Funding	Welsh Office for Research and Development for Health and Social Care, Welsh Assembly, Cardiff, Wales, UK

RESULTS (NUMBERS ANALYSED) AND RISK OF BIAS FOR COMPARISON: PHYSICIAN EXTENDER IN ADDITION TO USUAL CARE versus NO PHYSICIAN EXTENDERS/USUAL CARE (FOR EXAMPLE, JUNIOR DOCTORS, STAFF NURSES)

Protocol outcome 1: Quality of life

- Actual outcome: Audit of Diabetes Dependent Quality of Life (ADDQoL) final score at 1 week after discharge (no details of scale used): Group 1: 0.88 (no SD, n=67); Group 2: 0.40 (no SD, n=66); Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - Very high, Blinding - Very high, Incomplete outcome data - high, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness

Protocol outcome 2: Length of stay

- Actual outcome: Median length of stay during index admission: Group 1: 8.0 days; Group 2: 11.0 days, p<0.01; Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - Very high, Blinding - Low, Incomplete outcome data - high, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness

Protocol outcome 3: Mortality during the study period

- Actual outcome: Mortality at 12 months; Group 1:6/148, Group 2: 8/152; Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - Very high, Blinding - Low, Incomplete outcome data - high, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness

Protocol outcome 4: Patient and/or carer satisfaction

- Actual outcome: Modified Diabetes Clinic Satisfaction Questionnaire (% satisfied) at 1 week post discharge; Group 1: 91% (n=67), Group 2: 59% (n=66); Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - Very high, Blinding - Very high, Incomplete outcome data - high, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness

Study	Davies 2001[55]
Protocol outcome 5: Readmission - Actual outcome: Readmission within 12 months; Group 1: 37/148; Group 2: 38/152; Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - Very high, Blinding - Low, Incomplete outcome data - high, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness	
Protocol outcomes not reported by the study	Discharges during the study period; Missed or delayed treatments during the study period; Staff satisfaction during the study period

Study	Forster 2005[81]
Study type	RCT (Patient randomised; Parallel)
Number of studies (number of participants)	1 (n=620)
Countries and setting	Conducted in Canada; Setting: Tertiary teaching hospital
Line of therapy	1st line
Duration of study	Intervention + follow up: intervention during discharge and to 3 days after discharge + follow-up to a median of 34 days
Method of assessment of guideline condition	Adequate method of assessment/diagnosis
Stratum	Overall: undifferentiated acute multi-system medical illness
Subgroup analysis within study	Not applicable
Inclusion criteria	Consecutive patients admitted from the ED or another service to the general medical service of at 2 sites of tertiary care teaching hospital
Exclusion criteria	None
Recruitment/selection of patients	Consecutive patients admitted from the ED or another service to the general medical service of at 2 sites of tertiary care teaching hospital
Age, gender and ethnicity	Age - Mean (SD): Group 1: 68.8 (18.7), Group 2: 69.9 (18.5). Gender (M:F): 306:324. Ethnicity: Not stated
Further population details	1. Frail elderly: Not applicable / Not stated / Unclear
Extra comments	
Indirectness of population	No indirectness
Interventions	(n=307) Intervention 1: Presence of clinical nurse specialist (nurse team co-ordinator). Role of the nurse was as a team

Study	Forster 2005[81]
	co-coordinator and whose in-hospital role was to facilitate hospital care by retrieving preadmission information, arranging in-hospital consolations and intervention, organising post discharge follow-up and providing patients education; and telephoning patients early after discharge (average 3 days) to answer questions and address early problems. Duration In hospital and to 3 days after discharge Concurrent medication/care: Not stated Further details: 1. Type of physician extender: clinical nurse specialist (n=313) Intervention 2: No Physician extenders/usual care - No Physician extenders/usual care (for example, junior Doctors, staff nurses). Usual care Duration: in hospital Concurrent medication/care: Not stated Further details: 1. Type of physician extender: Not applicable / Not stated / Unclear
Funding	Ottawa Internists Research Group

RESULTS (NUMBERS ANALYSED) AND RISK OF BIAS FOR COMPARISON: PHYSICIAN EXTENDER IN ADDITION TO USUAL CARE versus NO PHYSICIAN EXTENDERS/USUAL CARE (FOR EXAMPLE, JUNIOR DOCTORS, STAFF NURSES)

Protocol outcome 1: Adverse events

- Actual outcome: Adverse event (not defined) at a median of 34 days after discharge: Group 1: 37/157; Group 2: 39/171; Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - High, Blinding - Low, Incomplete outcome data - high, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness

Protocol outcome 2: Length of stay

- Actual outcome: Median (IQR) length of stay: Group 1: 6 (3-11) days; Group 2: 5 (3-10) days; Risk of bias: All domain - High, Selection - Low, Blinding - Low, Incomplete outcome data - low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness

Protocol outcome 3: Mortality in hospital

- Actual outcome: Mortality in hospital; Group 1: 28/307, Group 2: 30/313; Risk of bias: All domain - High, Selection - Low, Blinding - Low, Incomplete outcome data - low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness

Protocol outcome 4: Mortality after discharge

Study	Forster 2005[81]
- Actual outcome: Mortality up to median 34 days after discharge; Group 1: 3/135, Group 2: 4/155; Risk of bias: All domain - High, Selection - Low, Blinding - Low, Incomplete outcome data - low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness Protocol outcome 5: Patient and/or carer satisfaction - Actual outcome: Satisfaction with overall quality of care (no details of scale used) at 34 days after discharge: Group 1: 8.2 (2.2); Group 2: 7.6 (2.4); Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - High, Blinding - Low, Incomplete outcome data - high, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness Protocol outcome 6: Readmission - Actual outcome: Readmission at median 34 days after discharge; Group 1: 30/157, Group 2: 22/171; Risk of bias: All domain - Very high, Selection - High, Blinding - Low, Incomplete outcome data - high, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness	
Protocol outcomes not reported by the study	Quality of life during the study period; Readmission during the study period; Patient and/or carer satisfaction during the study period; Discharges during the study period; Missed or delayed treatments during the study period; Staff satisfaction during the study period; Length of stay during the study period

Study	Moher 1992[163]
Study type	RCT (Patient randomised; Parallel)
Number of studies (number of participants)	1 (n=267)
Countries and setting	Conducted in Canada; Setting: university teaching hospital
Line of therapy	1st line
Duration of study	Intervention + follow up: intervention during discharge + 2 weeks follow-up
Method of assessment of guideline condition	Adequate method of assessment/diagnosis
Stratum	Overall: Most patients had diseases of the circulatory, respiratory or digestive system
Subgroup analysis within study	Not applicable
Inclusion criteria	Patients admitted to general Clinical Teaching Units at a university teaching hospital
Exclusion criteria	Death expected within 48 hours, those admitted directly to ICU
Recruitment/selection of patients	Patients admitted to general Clinical Teaching Units at a university teaching hospital
Age, gender and ethnicity	Age - Mean (SD): Group 1: 66.3 (18.6), Group 2: 64.3 (19.9). Gender (M:F): 112:155. Ethnicity: Not stated
Further population details	1. Frail elderly: Not applicable / Not stated / Unclear

Study	Moher 1992[163]
Extra comments	
Indirectness of population	No indirectness
Interventions	(n=136) Intervention 1: Presence of clinical nurse specialist (nurse team co-ordinator). Role is to participate in ward rounds, collaborate with health care professionals, facilitate administrative tasks such as discharge planning, coordinate tests and procedures, and to collect and collate patient information. Duration: in hospital Concurrent medication/care: Not stated Further details: 1. Type of physician extender: "medical team coordinator" – baccalaureate nurse (n=131) Intervention 2: No Physician extenders/usual care - No Physician extenders/usual care (for example, junior doctors, and staff nurses). Usual care without the nurse team co-ordinator Duration: in hospital Concurrent medication/care: Not stated Further details: 1. Type of physician extender: Not applicable / Not stated / Unclear
Funding	Ontario Ministry of Health
RESULTS (NUMBERS ANALYSED) AND RISK OF BIAS FOR COMPARISON: PHYSICIAN EXTENDER IN ADDITION TO USUAL CARE versus NO PHYSICIAN EXTENDERS/USUAL CARE (FOR EXAMPLE, JUNIOR DOCTORS, STAFF NURSES) Protocol outcome 1: Length of stay - Actual outcome: Length of stay during index admission: Group 1: 7.43 (6.33); Group 2: 9.40 (8.97); Risk of bias: All domain - High, Selection - Low, Blinding - High, Incomplete outcome data - low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness Protocol outcome 2: Mortality during the study period - Actual outcome: Mortality in hospital; Group 1: 10/136, Group 2: 8;131; Risk of bias: All domain - High, Selection - Low, Blinding - High, Incomplete outcome data - low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness Protocol outcome 3: Readmission - Actual outcome: Readmission within 2 weeks; Group 1: 22/136, Group 2: 18/131; Risk of bias: All domain - High, Selection - Low, Blinding - High, Incomplete outcome data - low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness	
Protocol outcomes not reported by the study	Quality of life during the study period; Patient and/or carer satisfaction during the study period; Discharges during the study period; Missed or delayed treatments during the study period; Staff satisfaction during the study period

Study	Pioro 2001[178]
Study type	RCT (Patient randomised; Parallel)
Number of studies (number of participants)	1 (n=381)
Countries and setting	Conducted in USA; Setting: University hospital
Line of therapy	1st line
Duration of study	Intervention + follow up: intervention in hospital + follow-up
Method of assessment of guideline condition	Adequate method of assessment/diagnosis
Stratum	Overall: general medical patients (abdominal pain, pneumonia, acute dyspnoea, asthma, fever, gastrointestinal bleeding, congestive heart failure, diabetes mellitus, infection/cellulitis)
Subgroup analysis within study	Not applicable
Inclusion criteria	General medical patients aged 18-69
Exclusion criteria	Admitted to intensive care or other specialty units and those transferred from the intensive care. For first 5 months patients outside of core admitting times were excluded (not weekdays 0730 to 1700). Rest of duration (~ 1 year) all weekday admissions were included
Recruitment/selection of patients	Patients admitted through out-patient facilities or the emergency room at university hospital
Age, gender and ethnicity	Age - Mean (SD): Group 1: 48.0 (14.9), Group 2: 47.7 (14.4). Gender (M:F): 149:232. Ethnicity: 40% White
Further population details	1. Frail elderly: Not applicable / Not stated / Unclear
Extra comments	90/193 crossed over from intervention to control. Reasons for cross-over: bed availability (29%), doctor request (22%), NP request (22%), and other (28%)
Indirectness of population	No indirectness
Interventions	(n=193) Intervention 1: Nurse practitioner based care. Nurse practitioner's role admission assessment, assembly of patient data, co-ordination of care with patient's attending doctors and implementation of diagnostic and therapeutic plans. NPs were on weekdays 0730 to 2000 and on weekends for morning rounds. NPs were supervised by a medical director who made daily rounds. Duration: in hospital Concurrent medication/care: Not stated Further details: 1. Type of physician extender: Nurse practitioner (n=188) Intervention 2: No Physician extenders/usual care - No Physician extenders/usual care (for example, junior doctors, and staff nurses). Usual care by traditional house staff (6 teams consisting of 1 senior or junior medical

Study	Pioro 2001[178]
	resident and 2 interns, supervised by a teaching attending doctor). Duration: in hospital Concurrent medication/care: Not stated Further details: 1. Type of physician extender: Not applicable / Not stated / Unclear
Funding	Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Health Care Financing and Organization Initiative
RESULTS (NUMBERS ANALYSED) AND RISK OF BIAS FOR COMPARISON: PHYSICIAN EXTENDER IN ADDITION TO USUAL CARE versus NO PHYSICIAN EXTENDERS/USUAL CARE (FOR EXAMPLE, JUNIOR DOCTORS, STAFF NURSES) Protocol outcome 1: Quality of life - Actual outcome: Change in SF-36 at 6 weeks post discharge: Group 1: 4.7; Group 2: 2.9 (no SDs reported); Risk of bias: All domain – Very high, Selection – Very high, Blinding - High, Incomplete outcome data - High, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness Protocol outcome 2: Adverse events - Actual outcome: 1 or more hospital-acquired complication: Group 1: 10/193; Group 2: 16/188; Risk of bias: All domain – Very high, Selection – Very high, Blinding - High, Incomplete outcome data - Low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness Protocol outcome 3: Length of stay - Actual outcome: Length of stay (index admission): Group 1: 5.0 days; Group 2: 5.3 days (no SDs given); Risk of bias: All domain – Very high, Selection – Very high, Blinding - High, Incomplete outcome data - Low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness Protocol outcome 4: Mortality in hospital - Actual outcome: Mortality in hospital; Group 1: 3/193, Group 2: 2/188; Risk of bias: All domain – Very high, Selection – Very high, Blinding - High, Incomplete outcome data - Low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness Protocol outcome 5: Mortality after discharge - Actual outcome: Mortality at 30 days post discharge; Group 1: 7/193, Group 2: 6/188; Risk of bias: All domain – Very high, Selection – Very high, Blinding - High, Incomplete outcome data - Low, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectness Protocol outcome 6: Patient and/or carer satisfaction - Actual outcome: Overall rating of "overall care given at hospital" – rated using 5 response categories ranging from "poor" to "excellent" which were transformed to 0-100 scales for analysis: Group 1: 84.7; Group 2: 80.7 (no SDs given); Risk of bias: All domain – Very high, Selection – Very high, Blinding - High, Incomplete outcome data - High, Outcome reporting - Low, Measurement - Low, Crossover - Low; Indirectness of outcome: No indirectnessgro	
Protocol outcomes not reported by the study	Readmission during the study period; Discharges during the study period; Missed or delayed treatments during the

Study	Pioro 2001[178]
	study period; Staff satisfaction during the study period

Appendix F: Economic evidence tables

F.1 Physician extender versus no physician extender or usual care

No studies were included.

F.2 Specialist nurse versus no specialist nurse or usual care

Study	Arts 2012[12]			
Study details	**Population & interventions**	**Costs**	**Health outcomes**	**Cost effectiveness**
Economic analysis: CUA (health outcome: QALYs) **Study design:** economic evaluation alongside a randomised controlled study (RCT) **Approach to analysis:** Individual patient level cost and QALY data were analysed and ICER calculated. Two cost analyses were presented, 1 of costs directly affected by the intervention and another of overall costs. The former is used here. **Perspective:** Dutch Healthcare perspective **Follow-up:** 2 years	**Population:** People with diabetes mellitus type 1 and 2 who are treated by an internist at an academic hospital in Maastricht, the Netherlands. **Cohort settings: (n=285)** Mean age: Intervention 1: 58.4 years Intervention 2: 59.5 years Male: Intervention 1: 35.2% Intervention 2: 37.6% **Intervention 1: (n=145)**	**Total costs (mean per patient):** Intervention 1: £5,593 Intervention 2: £5,902 Incremental (2−1): £309 (95% CI: NR; p=0.6) **Currency & cost year:** 2007 euro (presented here as 2007 UK pounds[(b)]) **Cost components incorporated:** Outpatient visits Diabetes-related admissions	**QALYs (mean per patient):** Intervention 1:0.82 Intervention 2: 0.80 Incremental (2−1): -0.02 (95% CI: NR; p=NR)	**ICER (Intervention 2 versus Intervention 1):** Reported as £15 per QALY gained however, the results as presented show that intervention 2 is dominated **Analysis of uncertainty:** Differences in costs and QALYs were not significant. No sensitivity analysis is reported.

Treatment effect duration[(a)]: 2 years **Discounting:** No	Usual care provided by physicians (5 physicians) **Intervention 2: (n=149)** Care provided by diabetes nurse specialists (DNSs) (convenience sample of 4 nurses with advanced training in diabetes)			
Data sources				
Health outcomes: Within trial analysis with data collected at baseline and after 2 years of follow-up. **Quality-of-life weights:** EQ-5D, tariff not specified. **Cost sources:** National tariff (DBC system) was used to calculate the costs of hospital-based care.				
Comments				
Source of funding: None. **Applicability and limitations:** Some uncertainty regarding the applicability of resource use and costs from the Netherlands (2007) to current NHS context. No discounting reported. Baseline and relative treatment effects are based on a single RCT, so by definition, does not reflect all evidence in the area. Costs of medications, investigations and other staff groups' time are not included. No sensitivity analysis is reported.				
Overall applicability[(c)]:partially applicable **Overall quality[(d)]:** potentially serious limitations				

Abbreviations: 95% CI: 95% confidence interval; CUA: cost–utility analysis; EQ-5D: Euroqol 5 dimensions (scale: 0.0 [death] to 1.0 [full health], negative values mean worse than death); ICER: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; N/A: not applicable; NR: not reported; QALYs: quality-adjusted life years.

(a) For studies where the time horizon is longer than the treatment duration, an assumption needs to be made about the continuation of the study effect. For example, does a difference in utility between groups during treatment continue beyond the end of treatment and, if so, for how long?

(b) Converted using 2007 purchasing power parities[172].

(c) Directly applicable/Partially applicable/Not applicable.

(d) Minor limitations/Potentially serious limitations/Very serious limitations.

Appendix G: GRADE tables

Table 8: Clinical evidence profile: Physician extender versus no physician extender/usual care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Physician extender versus no physician extender/usual care s	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Adverse events (follow-up In-hospital to 34 days)												
2	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	none	47/350 (13.4%)	15.7%	RR 0.90 (0.64 to 1.28)	16 fewer per 1000 (from 57 fewer to 44 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Length of stay (Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	717	757	-	MD 1.14 lower (1.83 to 0.45 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Mortality (follow-up in hospital to up to 4 months)												
4	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	99/1217 (8.1%)	7.1%	RR 1.15 (0.88 to 1.51)	11 more per 1000 (from 9 fewer to 36 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Satisfaction (follow-up 34 days; range of scores: 0-10; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	135	155	-	MD 0.6 higher (0.07 to 1.13 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Readmission (follow-up 2 weeks to 4 months)												
2	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	205/717 (28.6%)	22.5%	RR 1.02 (0.87 to 1.2)	4 more per 1000 (from 29 fewer to 45 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.
[2] Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed one MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MIDs.

Table 9: Clinical evidence profile: Specialist nurse versus no specialist nurse/usual care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Specialist nurse	No specialist nurse/usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Adverse events (follow-up 2 years)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	10/149 (6.7%)	11.7%	RR 0.57 (0.27 to 1.21)	50 fewer per 1000 (from 85 fewer to 25 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Mortality (follow-up 1-2 years)												
2	randomised trials	very serious[1]	serious[3]	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	none	11/295 (3.7%)	4%	RR 0.93 (0.42 to 2.07)	3 fewer per 1000 (from 23 fewer to 43 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Satisfied patients (follow-up 1 weeks)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	61/67 (91%)	59.1%	RR 1.54 (1.24 to 1.91)	319 more per 1000 (from 142 more to 538 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Readmission (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	none	37/148 (25%)	25%	RR 1 (0.68 to 1.48)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 80 fewer to 120 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.
[2] Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed 1 MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MIDs.
[3] Downgraded by 1 increment because the point estimate varies widely across studies, unexplained by subgroup analysis.

Appendix H: Excluded clinical studies

Table 10: Studies excluded from the clinical review

Study	Reason for Exclusion
Ahern 2004[6]	Unclear setting. Study design (Observational)
Ahmed 2002[7]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Allen 2009[11]	Not secondary care (post-discharge care)
Allen 2011[8]	Not secondary care (community care)
Allen 2011A[9]	Not secondary care (community clinics). Study design (Observational)
Allen 2013A[10]	Study design (Qualitative)
Allen 2013A[10]	Study design (Qualitative)
Anon 1994[1]	Not secondary care (primary care). Study design (Descriptive)
Anon 2001[2]	Study design (case-control). Study design (Observational)
Anon 2006[3]	Review protocol
Anon 2015A[4]	Study design (Descriptive)
Anon 2015G [5]	Study design (Observational)
Bakewellsachs 1991[13]	Study design (Descriptive)
Ball 2007[14]	Study design (Observational)
Banerjee 1998[15]	Cross-sectional. Study design (Observational)
Barton 2011[16]	No comparator. Study design (Observational)
Bevis 2008[17]	Not AME (trauma surgeons for tube thoracotomies). Study design (Observational)
Black 2013[18]	No relevant comparator. Study design (Observational)
Black 2014[19]	Not AME (trauma)
Blue 2001[20]	Not secondary care (home care)
Brandon 2009[21]	Not secondary care (post-discharge care)
Broers 2009[22]	Study design (Observational)
Bryant-Lukosius 2015[23]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Burgess 2010[24]	Study design (Literature review)
Butler 2011[25]	All eligible papers ordered
Calder 2002[26]	Unable to locate a copy
Callaghan 2008[27]	Study design (Literature review)
Carberry 2013[28]	Low n number. Study design (Observational)
Carey 2008[29]	Low n number. Study design (Observational)
Carlson 2004[30]	Unable to locate a copy
Carroll 2007[31]	Not secondary care (community care)
Carter 2007[32]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Caserta 2007[33]	Study design (Descriptive)
Cheng 2013[34]	Incorrect intervention (physician-nurse team)
Christmas 2005[35]	Not AME (trauma). Study design (Observational)
Clark 2015[36]	Protocol/abstract only
Cockayne 2014[37]	Unable to locate a copy

Study	Reason for Exclusion
Cole 2014[38]	Unable to locate a copy
Colligan 2011[39]	Study design (Observational)
Comiskey 2014[40]	Cross-sectional. Low n number. Study design (Observational)
Connolly 2015[41]	Not secondary care (residential care facilities)
Considine 2006[44]	Study design (Observational)
Considine 2010[42]	Study design (Observational)
Considine 2012[43]	No relevant comparison (compared with other physician extenders). Study design (Observational)
Cook 2015[45]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Cooper 2002[46]	Study design (Observational)
Cooper 2008[47]	No comparator. No outcomes of interest. Study design (Observational)
Cope 2015[48]	Study design (Observational)
Corner 2003[49]	Systematic review - no eligible papers. Study design (literature review)
Counsell 2007[50]	Not secondary care (home care)
Dacey 2007[52]	Study design (Observational)
David 2015[53]	Study design (Observational)
Davidson 2010[54]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Dawes 2007[56]	Not AME (elective surgery)
Dean 2012A[58]	Study design (Descriptive)
Dean 2014[59]	Not secondary care (community care)
Debroe 2001[57]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Derksen 2007[60]	Not AME (trauma)
Dewar 2008[62]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic). Study design (Observational)
Dewar 2008A[61]	Low n number. Study design (Observational)
Dinh 2012[63]	Not AME (emergency department fast-track / trauma)
Dinh 2013[64]	Not AME (trauma). Low n number. Study design (Observational)
Doan 2011[65]	Systematic review of emergency department / trauma
Domingo 2012[66]	Protocol only
Donaghy 1995[67]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Donald 2013[68]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Donald 2014[70]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Donald 2015[69]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Driscoll 2008[71]	Not secondary care (primary care and clinic)
Dyar 2012[72]	Not secondary care (palliative care)
Ellis 2003[73]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Ellis 2004[74]	Unable to locate a copy
Ellis 2005[76]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Ellis 2005C[75]	Duplication of Ellis2005
Ezra 2005[77]	Low n number. Study design (Observational)
Fanta 2006[78]	Paediatric. Not AME (trauma)
Farmer 2011[79]	Study design (Qualitative)
Forbes 2003[80]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Fotheringham 2011[82]	Study design (Observational)

Study	Reason for Exclusion
Fry 2011[83]	Study design (Literature review)
Furze 2012[84]	Incorrect comparison (lay-facilitated angina management)
Gershengorn 2011[85]	Study design (Observational)
Gillard 2011[86]	Not AME (major trauma). Study design (Observational)
Goessens 2006[87]	Not secondary care (community)
Goldie 2012[88]	Not AME (inclusion of elective patients, exclusion of emergency patients)
Goldman 2014[89]	Not secondary care (post-discharge follow-up)
Goodwin 2011[90]	Study design (Qualitative)
Gracias 2008[91]	No outcomes of interest. Study design (Observational)
Gracias 2008A[91]	Duplicate of Gracias 2008
Gradwell 2002[92]	Not guideline condition (Dermatology). Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Greving 2015[93]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Griffiths 2001[94]	Not AME (medically stable)
Haan 2007[95]	Not AME (trauma). Study design (Observational)
Hamden 2014[96]	Study design (Observational)
Harbman 2014[97]	Study design (Observational)
Harris 2005A[98]	Study design (Observational)
Harrison 2001[99]	Study design (News report)
Hartford 2005[100]	Not secondary care (post-discharge care)
Hawkins 1994[101]	Cross-sectional survey. Study design (Observational)
Hayden 2014[102]	Incorrect intervention (primary care physician in the ED). Study design (Observational)
Henry 2011[103]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Ho 2013[104]	Not AME (nasogastric insertions)
Hoffman 2005[105]	Study design (Observational)
Hooker 2005[106]	Not secondary care (primary care). Study design (Observational)
Hooker 2011[107]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Hoskins 2011[108]	Study design (Literature review)
Houweling 2004[109]	Unable to locate a copy
Houweling 2009[110]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Hylka 1995[111]	No outcomes of interest. Study design (Observational)
Imhof 2012[112]	Not secondary care (primary care)
Innes 2015[113]	Integrative review
Jaarsma 2008[114]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Jeanmonod 2013[115]	Incorrect intervention (not physician extender). Study design (Observational)
Jennings 2008[119]	Not AME (trauma). Study design (Observational)
Jennings 2009[118]	Low n number. Not AME (trauma). Study design (Observational)
Jennings 2014[117]	Protocol. Not AME (fast track ED / trauma)
Jennings 2015A[116]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Jones 2005A[120]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Jonsson 2014[121]	Unable to locate a copy
Kannusamy 2006[122]	Study design (Observational)
Kartha 2014[123]	Study design (Observational)

Study	Reason for Exclusion
Kawar 2011[124]	Study design (Observational)
Keane 2008[125]	Study design (Observational)
Kilpatrick 2015[126]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Kinley 2001[127]	Not AME (elective surgery)
Kinsman 2008[128]	Not AME (trauma / fast track). Study design (Observational)
Kirton 2007[129]	No outcomes of interest. Step-up, Step-down. Study design (Observational)
Kleinpell 2006[130]	Cross-sectional survey. Study design (Observational)
Kleinpell 2008[131]	Study design (Observational)
Kroese 2008[132]	Not AME (diagnosis of fibromyalgia)
Kuethe 2011[133]	Paediatric. Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Kuethe 2013[134]	Protocol only
Lalor 2013[135]	Study design (Qualitative)
Lambing 2004[136]	Study design (Observational)
Larkin 2010[137]	No intervention
Laroche 2000[138]	Unable to locate a copy
Latour 2006[139]	Not secondary care (home-based care)
Lau 2013[140]	Not AME (trauma). Low n numbers. Study design (Observational)
Lewis 2014[141]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Lilja 1998[142]	Not AME (Total hip replacement or breast cancer surgery)
Limogesgonzalez 2011[143]	Not AME (NP delivered elective endoscopy)
Lohr 2013[144]	Study design (Observational)
Loveman 2003[145]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Lutze 2014[146]	Study design (Observational)
Mahoney 1994[148]	Not secondary care (primary care)
Mahoney 1995[147]	Study design (Descriptive)
Martinezgonzalez 2014A[149]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Mason 2005[150]	No outcomes of interest
Mason 2007C[152]	Study design (Observational)
Mason 2008A[151]	Not AME (trauma). Study design (Observational)
Mccarthy 2012[153]	Not secondary care (trauma / fast track). Study design (Observational)
Mccauley 2006[154]	Not secondary care (home-care)
Mcclellan 2012[155]	Not AME (soft tissue injury)
Mcclellan 2013[156]	Not AME (soft tissue injury)
Mccord 2009[157]	Incorrect intervention (not comparable to UK physician extenders as they performed unsupervised emergency obstetrical surgery). Study design (Observational)
Mccorkle 2009[158]	Not secondary care (post-discharge care)
Mcdonnell 2015[159]	Study design (Qualitative)
Melis 2005[160]	Not secondary care (community care)
Mergenhagen 2012[161]	Study design (Observational)
Meyer 2005[162]	Study design (Observational)
Motherwell 2007[164]	Study design (Observational)
Nash 2007[165]	Study design (Observational)
Nathan 2006[166]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)

Study	Reason for Exclusion
Naylor 2004[167]	Not secondary care (home care)
Nestler 2012[168]	Study design (Observational)
Newhouse 2011[169]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Okeeffe 2014[170]	Study design (Observational)
Oneill 2014[171]	Not secondary care (primary care and clinic). Study design (Observational)
Owens 2011[173]	Protocol only
Page 2005[174]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Patel 2008[175]	Not secondary care (home-based care)
Pear 2009[176]	Study design (Observational)
Peeters 2014[177]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Pirret 2008[179]	Low N number. Study design (Observational)
Quattrini 2011[181]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Ranzenbach 2012[182]	Study design (Observational)
Rao 2007[183]	Not secondary care (clinic and community care)
Reynolds 2000[184]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Ridsdale 2000[185]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Robles 2011[186]	Study design (Observational)
Roche 2015[187]	Protocol only. Full study not yet published
Rowe 2011[188]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Roy 2008[189]	Study design (Observational)
Russell 2010A[190]	Study design (Observational)
Sackett 2009[191]	Study design (Descriptive)
Sandhu 2009[192]	Not AME ('primary care problems' in the ED)
Sarkissian 1999[193]	Not secondary care (tertiary care, epilepsy monitoring unit). Study design (observational)
Sawatzky 2013[194]	Not secondary care (post-discharge care)
Shah 2013[195]	Incorrect intervention (pharmacist was not independently prescribing)
Shum 2000[196]	Not secondary care (primary care). Study design (Observational)
Skinner 2013[197]	Study design (Observational)
Snyder 1994[198]	Study design (Descriptive)
Sonday 2010[199]	Study design (Observational)
Sridhar 2008[200]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic and home follow-up)
Stables 2004[201]	Not AME (elective surgery)
Stanikhutt 2013[202]	Systematic review - no eligible studies
Stewart 2001[203]	Not secondary care (home care)
Stoller 2001[204]	Study design (literature review)
Strand 2011[205]	Not secondary care (outpatient follow-up)
Takeda 2012[206]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Thomas 2005[207]	Systematic review - no eligible papers
Thompson 2005[208]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic and home-based care)
Thourani 2006[209]	Study design (Descriptive)
Timmermans 2014[210]	Protocol only. Study design (Observational)
Vadher 1997[211]	Not secondary care (outpatient care)

Study	Reason for Exclusion
Vanderbiezen 2016[212]	Incorrect population (primary care patients)
Vanderlinden 2010[213]	Study design (diagnostic accuracy study)
Vanderlinden 2010A[213]	Duplicate of Vanderlinden 2010
Vanzuilen 2005[216]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Vanzuilen 2008[217]	Not secondary care (unclear - assumed to be outpatient clinic)
Vanzuilen 2011[214]	Not secondary care (unclear - assumed to be outpatient clinic)
Vanzuilen 2012[215]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Webb 1997[219]	Unable to locate a copy
Weeks 2016[220]	Cochrane review (different PICO)
Wheeler 1999[221]	Study design (literature review)
Wierzchowiecki 2006[222]	Not secondary care (outpatient clinic)
Williams 2009[223]	Not AME (nurse delivered diagnostic endoscopy)
Wright 2003B[224]	Not secondary care (home care)

1

2

Appendix I: Excluded economic studies

Table 11: Studies excluded from the clinical review

Study	Reason for Exclusion
Pledger 2005[180]	Selectively excluded because it did not evaluate health outcomes and costs were dated.
Walsh 2005[218]	Excluded because it evaluates hospital-based nurse-led care rather than physician extenders.