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1. Introduction and methods

1.1 Background

This paper is the technical report of a 'rapid' review of evidence on integrated models of care for people with long-term neurological conditions (LTNCs). The review was part of a larger project to support the development of a benchmarking tool that could be used to evaluate progress in local health and social care communities in developing integrated care for LTNCs. The final report of the project as a whole summarises the findings of the review (Bernard et al., 2010). This report, by contrast, provides full technical details about how the review was conducted and about its detailed findings.

There is an extensive literature on what people with long-term conditions (LTCs) need from health and social care services, although only a relatively small part of this is about neurological conditions, and the messages from this are clear. Much of this material was used in developing the Quality Requirements (QRs) for the National Service Framework (NSF) for Long-Term Neurological Conditions (DH, 2005a).

Similarly, there is a large literature on joint working and multi-disciplinary/professional approaches to work with people with LTCs. The NSF itself recommended ‘neuroscience networks’ as a way of helping to achieve implementation of the NSF and suggested some ‘key features’ of such a network. However, this element of the NSF document seemed less based in research evidence than are the QRs. This is, perhaps, not surprising because it is less clear what the literature tells us about what helps or hinders service integration across boundaries, or what contributes to the experience of continuity of care.

The NSF Good Practice guide (DH, 2005b) included examples of ‘evaluated’ models of good practice in relation to all the QRs. However, these were described only briefly and the models were not compared in a way that suggests any common indicators or benchmarks of good practice. The Good Practice Guide also suggested ten questions that organisations could use to assess their preparedness for implementing the NSF, drawing on the Modernisation Agency’s Managing Long Term Conditions Self-Assessment Tool. Some of the self-assessment questions give examples of ways in which elements of the NSF Quality Requirements could be met (for example, integrated health and social care working via the use of pooled budgets). Others, however, were more generic and gave few guidelines about how change might be achieved for organisations developing from a low base of integration.

To the best of our knowledge, before our project no review - systematic or otherwise – had attempted to extract from the literature or from existing services a set of indicators or benchmarks of best practice that might ensure the delivery of good quality integrated...
services. Neither had any review attempted to assess the contribution of integrated services to different types of continuity of care.

The overall aim of the larger project was to carry out such a review and to integrate its findings with the views of people affected by LTNCs (including informal carers), their organisations, and health, social care and other relevant professionals. From this, benchmarks for good models of integrated services would be developed and tested.

1.2 What kind of review?

Systematic reviews involve systematic and recorded searching of electronic and paper-based research sources, clear criteria for inclusion of identified studies in the review, and systematic and auditable extraction of data from these studies. They have become the method of choice when reviewing discrete issues of clinical effectiveness of, say, single drugs or interventions and have been highly influential in developing clinical guidelines. Their usefulness in reviewing the evidence on more complex interventions or models of service delivery has been debated, however (Mays et al., 2001), and more flexible approaches to reviewing knowledge have been developed in different settings. The Social Care Institute for Excellence, for example, has developed the ‘systematic knowledge review’ that, while relying on systematic identification of information, casts its net much more widely than research literature (Coren and Fisher, 2006). However, whether confined to research papers or including evidence from a wider range of stakeholders, it remains the case that the principles of systematically searching for, selecting and extracting evidence about an issue give a weight to the outcomes of a review that more traditional approaches cannot match (Mays et al., 2001).

Full systematic reviews in complex areas usually take a long time to carry out and new approaches to the rapid assessment of evidence are being developed (Davies, 2003). We proposed using such an approach for this project, broadly following Centre for Reviews and Dissemination Guidelines (CRD, 2001) for identifying and appraising evidence.

A rapid review, in theory, searches systematically, but not necessarily exhaustively, for available evidence, critically appraises studies and sifts out those that are of poor quality. This material is then used to collate descriptive outlines of the evidence and provide an overview of that evidence and what it is telling us (Davies, 2003). There are several reasons why such an approach might be used rather than a full systematic review (www.gsr.gov.uk/professional_guidance/rea_toolkit). The rationale that was most relevant to our research was the uncertainty about the effectiveness of models of integrated care and the existence of some recent research. It has been argued that in such situations a rapid evidence assessment ‘can provide a quick synthesis of the available evidence by shortening the traditional systematic review process’ (ibid).
1.3 Objective of the review

The objective was to carry out a rapid review of evidence on best models of integrated service provision for LTNCs, how to achieve these models, and their impact on different types of continuity of care. The original intention had been to carry out a single review, concentrating on material that referred to best practice in integrated services, best models for service configuration, and their impact on continuity of care, particularly focusing on diversity of need and the factors that help or hinder the development of integrated services. However, as we began to collect material from the searches (see below), it became clear that we were identifying two distinct sources of evidence. On the one hand, we found a tranche of evaluative research that, mostly, concentrated on the outcomes of integrated models of care. On the other hand, there was a seam of descriptive studies that more often described how models of care were established and run and that, where outcomes had been considered at all, included more qualitative assessment of impact. If we had concentrated only on the first type of evidence, we felt we would find very little to help us understand what constituted good models of integrated care. If we concentrated only on the latter type of evidence, we would miss all the research that had attempted to evaluate the outcomes of integrated care models, as against other ways of delivering care.

However, because these two types of evidence were so very different, it was difficult to see how they could be incorporated into a single review process. After discussion within the team, we decided to adopt two strategies. First, we would deal with the evaluative literature, explore the outcomes it was reporting, and synthesise the messages from this research. Secondly, we would deal with the descriptive literature, plus such descriptions as there were of the models included in the evaluative literature, and synthesise the information contained in these papers about how the models of care operated, who worked in them, what elements of provision they included, and what types of continuity of care they seemed to provide. Throughout the rest of this technical report, these two different approaches are called the ‘evaluative review’ and the ‘descriptive review’.

1.4 Review methods

1.4.1 Main search strategy

In our research proposal, we said that we would develop specific search strategies for electronic and other sources that would identify relevant published and ‘grey’ literature in health, social care and other fields (including housing, employment, social security). While preparing the proposal, simple initial searches had suggested that we would find relatively little information about models of integrated care for people with LTNCs and
we therefore suggested that we might need to extend the searches to integrated care for other types of long-term conditions.

We also proposed hand searching key journals, internet searches and contacts with key organisations and researchers as ways of identifying relevant material, alongside material referred to in the NSF document itself. The searches were to be confined to material published since 1985 and in English.

The main aim of our strategy was, therefore, to develop approaches that would provide systematic but not necessarily comprehensive retrieval of relevant studies, as appropriate for a ‘rapid’ review.

1.4.2 Databases used

Fifteen bibliographic and other electronic databases were searched, providing coverage of health and social sciences literature, grey literature and current research.

The following databases were used:

   MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, HMIC, DARE, HTA, NHSEED, SIGLE, Social Policy and Practice, Social Science Citation Index, ASSIA, Social Services Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, NRR, SOSIG and The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.

1.4.3 Keyword strategy

The electronic search strategies were developed in two phases. The information specialist (KL) worked with the team to construct keyword strategies using freetext and thesaurus terms to search the selected databases for publications related both to integrated models of care and to long-term neurological conditions.

The first stage of searching (see Appendix 1) used thesaurus terms (where available) and freetext to identify models of integrated care. Specific terms for Motor Neurone Disease and related conditions, Parkinson’s Disease and related conditions, and Multiple Sclerosis and related conditions, plus generic terms for long-term neurological conditions were also used. These strategies were run to identify material from 1985 onwards.

In an attempt to increase the relevant literature related specifically to integrated care, a second phase of searching included extra terms for multidisciplinary working, identified from the results of the first phase of searching. We also at this stage included specific terms for epilepsy and cerebral palsy (see Appendix 2). These
strategies were run to identify any material from the new terms using the original date restrictions. However, as there had been a nine months gap since the first phase of searches, a top up search was also run on the original terms. All results were de-duplicated against the material retrieved from the first phase of searches.

1.4.4 Search restrictions

We did not include methodological filters to restrict search results to specific study designs, nor were language restrictions used. Inclusion criteria date limits restricted the publication dates of retrieved studies to 1985 onwards.

The second phase and top-up searches were run in December 2006.

1.4.5 Additional strategies

The main electronic searches outlined above identified more possibly relevant material than had been anticipated when the proposal was written. As a result, given the more limited approach to identifying material that is involved in a rapid evidence assessment, we did not subsequently carry out Web searching, contact experts, or carry out any hand-searching of relevant journals. Neither did we extend the searching to other long-term conditions. However, we did carry out limited identification of relevant material from the reference lists of studies that we included in the review. After a study had been included for data extraction (see below) we checked its reference list for any apparently relevant studies. If a study thus identified was a randomised controlled trial (RCT) we obtained the full paper and submitted it to the selection methods described below. We also identified and obtained any systematic reviews identified.

1.4.6 Inclusion and exclusion criteria for selection of studies

Decisions about the inclusion and exclusion of papers were taken in two stages. The first stage was to identify from the results of the electronic searches all material that was actually about models of integrated care for people with LTNCs (i.e. selection for relevance). The point of this stage was not simply to identify papers that would eventually be reviewed, but also to allow us to determine the range of models of integrated care being described in the literature.

The second stage was to identify material that, because of its design, allowed us to say something about the comparative merits of models of integrated care against some alternative way of providing services.
1.4.7 Developing the inclusion and exclusion criteria

There are no universally recognised definitions of integrated care, and the definition of continuity of care on which we based our proposal (Freeman et al., 2001) has not yet become a recognised way of describing the outcomes of care models or services. Further, much of the literature that is about models of integrated care has a purely clinical focus; for example, research about multi-disciplinary rehabilitation teams is often solely about their impact on clinical or functional outcomes and does not consider the impact they might have on patients’ experiences of continuity of care. In order to filter the material we had identified, therefore, we developed inclusion and exclusion criteria in two stages.

The research team first examined the titles and, where available, abstracts of the material identified by the electronic searches. We then developed a first set of inclusion and exclusion criteria to guide the selection for relevance. As is common in reviews of research on service delivery and organisation (Parker et al., 2000; Mays et al., 2001; CRD, 2001) these criteria developed as the range and nature of the material identified through searching became clear. The overall focus was on material that referred to best practice in integrated services, best models for service configuration, and impact on continuity of care, particularly focusing on diversity of need and the factors that help or hinder the development of integrated services.

The final inclusion and exclusion criteria for this stage are outlined in Table 1.1. The inclusion criteria operated as an algorithm to guide decision-making; the exclusion criteria were applied individually.

Table 1.1 Inclusion and exclusion criteria for relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults AND Neurological condition AND Any aspect of integrated service delivery and organisation OR Transition to adult services OR Team working of any sort OR Patients'/families' views of service delivery OR Anything else that might throw light onto how to design and deliver integrated services</td>
<td>Mental health only Learning disability only Any other, non-neurological condition Children and adolescents, unless about transition to adult services Epidemiological studies Clinical description or management of condition Studies about developing measures e.g. quality of life, disability measures Studies about health care financing outside of UK Single case reports/studies Foreign language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The second stage of selection was to identify studies to be included for review in either the evaluation element or the description element.

The criteria for stage two are outlined in Table 1.2 and the algorithm derived from these and used to guide decision-making is at Figure 1.1. The definitions of continuity of care, evaluation, description and systematic review or meta-analysis that we used in the algorithm are at Appendix 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About a long-term neurological condition</td>
<td>Single case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About adults or about transition to adulthood</td>
<td>Foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes a method of ensuring or improving continuity of care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates a method of ensuring or improving continuity of care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic review and/or meta-analysis about ways of ensuring or improving continuity of care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.1  Algorithm used to guide selection for review**

1. **Is this about any form of LTNC?**
   - No - discard
   - Yes - go to 2.

2. **Is this about adults or transition?**
   - No - discard
   - Yes - go to 3.

3. **Is this a systematic review and/or meta-analysis?**
   - Yes - place in systematic review section
   - No - go to 4.
1.4.8 Selection of material

For the first stage, members of the team worked separately and then in pairs to select material for relevance. They used the titles and, where available, abstracts of the publications identified in the searches and applied the criteria listed in Table 1.1. In all cases, the pairs of reviewers worked to agreement – discussing and resolving any disagreements after each had independently reviewed titles and abstracts. If a disagreement could not be resolved, a third member of the team looked at the material and took a ‘casting vote’.

All material identified as of potential relevance was then obtained in hard copy form and entered the next stage of selection. This was done as in stage one – in pairs to agreement – but this time based on a full reading of the material. The criteria listed in Table 1.2, and the algorithm at Figure 1.1, were used to classify material into one of the following categories: ‘out’, ‘in for evaluation’, ‘in for description’, or ‘in as a review’. Further selection of material took place as data extraction started, often because it became clear when attempting to extract the data that the model being evaluated or described was not, in fact, delivering continuity of care. Examples of such papers included studies of rehabilitation teams described as multi-disciplinary but which, on closer inspection, did not act to facilitate continuity of care beyond a limited clinical setting.

Papers that were included in the evaluation section of the review were also reviewed for the descriptive section.

The results of the selection process are summarised in Figure 1.2.
Figure 1.2 Results of the staged selection process

Source of material
- Electronic searches: 2407 publications
- NSF report and reference lists: 115 publications

Stage 1: Screening for general topic relevance
- Stage 1 inclusion and exclusion criteria applied to all titles/abstracts
- 573 publications screened
- 1949 excluded
- 30 unobtainable
- 276 excluded

Stage 2: Selection of items for review
- Stage 2 inclusion and exclusion criteria applied, using algorithm
- 254 primary research papers
- 13 systematic reviews
- 30 unobtainable
- 276 excluded

Stage 3: Selection of items for data extraction
- Inclusion for data extraction
- 68 evaluation papers (50 studies, 48 models)
- 69 descriptive papers (79 models)
- 8 systematic reviews
- 46 evaluations
- 26 descriptions
- 5 reviews excluded

Evaluation review
- 68 papers (50 studies, 48 models)

Description review
- 69 papers + descriptions from evaluation papers (127 separate descriptions)
1.4.9 Data extraction

The main questions for the review of the evaluative studies was whether models of care designed in some way to enhance continuity of care had any effect on a range of clinical, social and economic outcomes. Data extraction for the evaluative part of the review covered:

- Publication and study details
- Details of the model of care
- Study quality
- Mortality
- Length of hospital stay
- Clinical outcomes
- Physical function/impairment
- Mental function
- Coping
- Service use
- Health and social care costs
- Costs to the patient and/or family
- Quality of life
- Patients views of the model of care
- Family impact
- Expressed need
- Social outcome (e.g. employment, finances)
- Knowledge of condition
- Staff views of the model of care
- Communication with the patient and/or family
- Other outcomes relevant to continuity of care.

By contrast, the focus of the descriptive review was on the contents of service models that might deliver continuity of care. The data extraction form for this part of the review was developed by reading a randomly selected proportion of the publications and analysing qualitatively the material that they contained. The form was then piloted, using the themes that this analysis had generated, and then amended slightly in the light of the piloting. The final version of the form covered the following broad areas:

- What is the model of care?
- Where is it delivered?
- What conditions does it cover?
- Who delivers the model?
- What service elements are included in this model?
- Aspects of service delivery and organisation
- What types of continuity of care does it deliver?
A detailed listing of the information extracted is at Appendix 4.

Both data extraction forms were created using Microsoft Excel and information was entered directly onto the spreadsheets. All researchers in the team extracted data from the papers. A different member of the team then checked the accuracy of data entry prior to analysis.

1.4.10 Quality of studies

The Jadad quality of trials algorithm and the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care (EPOC) Group’s quality criteria for randomised controlled trials (RCTs) were used for any randomised or quasi-randomised studies included in the evaluation section of the review (Jadad, 1998; EPOC, 2002). We had planned to use the EPOC quality criteria for controlled before and after studies or interrupted time series studies. However, none of the remaining studies fell clearly into these categories.

As is necessary in reviews of this sort, we excluded the Jadad criterion of double-blinded assessment of outcomes, as this is almost impossible to achieve in research where a model of care is being evaluated.

1.4.11 Analysis of evaluative data

The wide variation among models of care, combined with the different conditions covered, made analysis of the results challenging. We could simply have analysed all the studies together, on the basis that all the models were intended to improve the experience of care for people with LTNCs. Alternatively, we could have attempted some grouping, based on the underlying philosophy of care (e.g. multi-disciplinarity), the professionals involved (e.g. nurse specialists) or the condition. Further, we had a mix of research designs and could have used these to order the material. Each approach has its attractions and limitations. The one that seemed to offer most opportunity both for synthesis of common messages and exploration of the diversity that comes with different conditions, was to group studies both by model of care and by condition. We also gave more emphasis to RCTs and to before-and-after studies that had both intervention and control groups than to other research designs.

In Chapter 2, we look first at the models of care evaluated and then at condition sub-groupings. Where possible, we then analyse the findings by sub-group, although the sub-group chosen varies from outcome to outcome, depending on the number of studies available for analysis.
We present a narrative synthesis (Mays et al., 2005) of the material. The intention, when we wrote the proposal for the work was to analyse the material so that we could identify key indicators of best practice or the best models of integration, what they achieved and for whom. For reasons explored in the results chapters, we do not believe that current evidence based on published research allows us to do this with confidence.

### 1.4.12 Analysis of descriptive data

Although the descriptive material was extracted as text statements, these were converted for analysis into two categories – ‘clearly present in the description’ and ‘not clearly present in the description’. These data were then subject to simple frequency analysis and cross-tabulation by the three main commonly reported models of care in the descriptive part of the review. These were multi-disciplinary teams or clinics (41 in total), clinical nurse specialists (30 in total) and assessment and disease management initiatives (29 in total). For the analysis, we explored these three models and their characteristics separately, comparing them in each case with all other models of care.

We were able to address six of the descriptive questions outlined above:

- What is the model of care?
- Where is it delivered?
- What conditions does it cover?
- Who delivers the model?
- What service elements are included in this model?
- What types of continuity of care does it deliver?

Conclusive statements about the other question - aspects of service delivery and organisation, such as funding sources, modes of access to the service, inclusion and exclusion criteria for the service - were relatively uncommon; in most cases, at least half of the papers reported nothing about such aspects of the model of care. Given this, we did not carry out any further analysis of this part of the descriptive material.

Interpretation of the descriptive data is, of course, circumscribed by the level of detail provided in the papers we reviewed. For example, some provided detailed and exhaustive information on the staff involved in delivering care; others did not. So, if one paper about a multi-disciplinary team listed all types of professionals involved, but another detailed only the medical staff involved and referred to ‘the rest of the multi-disciplinary team’ we have no way of knowing if the two teams were similar or different in their composition. As a result, our descriptive analysis in this example represents the least that can be said about team composition across the papers.
reviewed. Other aspects of description will be similarly limited. However, our main aim in the descriptive analysis was to see how each model of integrated care compared with the others. There was no indication that descriptions of specific models were more or less likely than others to include detailed information so bias in comparing different models is unlikely.

1.4.13 Reporting of studies

To make the text in the following chapters easier to read, we refer to studies by their first author and date only. Appendix 5 gives full bibliographical details of all included studies.
2.  Findings of evaluation studies

2.1  Details of included studies

2.1.1  Numbers of studies included

Two thousand four hundred and seven papers were identified in the electronic searches, plus 115 from reference lists, hand searching and author searching. Of these, 573 were identified as being potentially relevant for the review, based on their title and, where available, abstract. Of these, 114 were initially classed as evaluations and therefore entered the next stage of this part of the review. The selected papers were obtained and read in full. After further selection, 49 separate studies, reported in 68 papers, were included in the evaluation element of the review (see Figure 1.2, Chapter 1).

The 49 studies covered 47 separate models of care provision (Table 2.1). Two of the models had been evaluated in separately reported studies but the data from these are included only once in what follows.

Table 2.1  Details of model of care evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>Compared with</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Settings for model of care being evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carne 205</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary assessment and management</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>VA Medical Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig 2003</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team management of relapse, combined with IV steroid treatment</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>In- and outpatient hospital setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds 2005 and 2006</td>
<td>Palliative care service</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>In place of patient’s choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend 2002 and associated papers</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Day hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 2001</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community team</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Community (?home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitzia 1998</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary rehab with post-discharge follow-up</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>PD and MS</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>In-patient hospital setting and home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Compared with</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Settings for model of care being evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhatt 2005</td>
<td>Onward referral from accident and emergency</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Acute hospital A&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chataway 2006</td>
<td>Home-based IV steroid administration</td>
<td>Out-patient</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman 1994</td>
<td>Personal list system in general practice</td>
<td>Seeing a different GP on different visits</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Primary care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin 2002</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary review in primary care</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Primary care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosking 2002</td>
<td>Nurse specialist in tertiary referral centre</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>In-patient and outpatient hospital setting and home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunter 2004</td>
<td>Disease management programme</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Primary care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstein 1997</td>
<td>Out-patient clinic in tertiary referral centre</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Out-patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansen 2006</td>
<td>Trans-mural care model</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Hospitals, rehabilitation setting and primary care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leach 2005</td>
<td>Review and follow-up of patients previously 'unknown' to specialist services</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Primary care and outpatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert 2001</td>
<td>GP care with access to nurse specialist</td>
<td>Usual GP care</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Primary care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmusson 2005</td>
<td>Telemedicine clinic</td>
<td>Ambulatory (out-patient) clinic</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhead 1996</td>
<td>Evidence-based care standards</td>
<td>Care before standards were introduced</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Primary care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schull 1992</td>
<td>Nurse specialist as case-manager</td>
<td>No case manager</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>In and outpatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 1996 and</td>
<td>Nurse specialist and nurse-led clinic</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Primary care and outpatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Compared with</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Settings for model of care being evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simons 2006</td>
<td>Patient education</td>
<td>Care before programme was introduced</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Day hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macht 2006</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Spain, Finland, Italy, Netherlands, UK, Estonia, Germany</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton 1996</td>
<td>Tertiary assessment centre</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery 1994</td>
<td>Patient education and health promotion programme</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Community (?home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2004</td>
<td>Individualised patient education</td>
<td>Usual printed information</td>
<td>PD, MS and other progressive neurological disorders</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds 2000</td>
<td>Nurse specialist ‘follow-up’ care</td>
<td>Usual consultant-led follow-up care</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Out-patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahanshahi 1994</td>
<td>Nurse practitioner</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>PD and dystonia</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 2000</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Local hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Hara 2002</td>
<td>Consumer-focused, professional advice about self-care</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Patient’s home and local therapy centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2004</td>
<td>Two methods of supported implementation of national care guideline</td>
<td>Postal dissemination of guideline</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Primary care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobson nd</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Out-patient clinic</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Patient’s home and ‘community’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway 2006 and associated papers</td>
<td>User-led care pathway</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Out-patient and home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Arcy 2006; Balaratnam nd</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community clinic</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Out-patient and home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLean</td>
<td>Computer-based</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Out-patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Compared with</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Settings for model of care being evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoogervoorst 2003</td>
<td>Screening instrument to facilitate appropriate referral to multi-disciplinary teams</td>
<td>Use of Expanded Disability Status Scale and Guy’s Neurological Disability Scale</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Out-patient, community and home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzilli 2002</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary home care</td>
<td>Usual care in MS centre (hospital)</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman 1999</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary in-patient rehabilitation with recommendations for post-discharge services</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>In-patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossiter 1998 and 1995</td>
<td>Integrated care pathway</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Specialist rehabilitation unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleton 2005</td>
<td>Integrated care across health and social care services</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Out-patient and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossiter 2006</td>
<td>Integrated care across hospital and community services</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>General neurological</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Community and in-patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van den Berg 2005</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary clinics for symptomatic and palliative care</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Out-patient?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traynor 2003 and other paper</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary clinic</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Community and outpatient clinics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haig 1994</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team assessment</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>‘Wide variety of</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Out-patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Compared with</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Settings for model of care being evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicks 1993</td>
<td>Respite care</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>MND</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Hospice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz 2004 and associated papers</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Usual primary care</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Primary care and home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.2 Type of studies

Table 2.2 gives brief details of the studies included in the evaluative review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
<th>Size of patient population</th>
<th>Total number of patients studied</th>
<th>% of patient population studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carne 2005</td>
<td>Retrospective record review</td>
<td>Individuals with neurologist confirmed PD who had been or were being treated with levodopa or dopamine antagonists at initial assessment and who had a follow-up evaluation between 8m and 16m after initial assessment.</td>
<td>Individuals who had undergone surgical interventions to treat their PD.</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig 2003</td>
<td>Randomised controlled trial</td>
<td>Confirmed diagnosis of MS and a relapse requiring admission as either day case or inpatient, for treatment with a three-day course of IVMP 1 g/day.</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>53 patients 'approached', 50 said to be eligible. Nine refused.</td>
<td>41 randomised</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds 2005 and 2006</td>
<td>Randomised controlled trial. Waiting list control group received service after 3 months.</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>17 people excluded from study were: clinically urgent (5), refused (5), unable to consent (4), withdrawn following protocol violation (1), lived outside study area (1), did not have MS (1).</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52 randomised</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend 2002; Wade 2003; Gage 2006</td>
<td>Randomised, single blind controlled crossover trial. Waiting list control group received intervention 6 m after entry to trial.</td>
<td>PD diagnosed clinically by a consultant neurologist, consent, able to attend day hospital using own or provided transport.</td>
<td>Score &lt;7 on Hodkinson's Mini-Mental State Test.</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>144 (seven patients dropped out and were later 're-registered' and re-randomised.</td>
<td>not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 2001</td>
<td>1. Questionnaire survey of 116 users. 2. Before and after outcome study of 38 new referrals.</td>
<td>1. Those known to team initially and those referred in first year. 2. Individuals referred to service in first 6 m.</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>116 people known and referred to team in first 12m of operation.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitzia 1998</td>
<td>Before and after study of convenience sample of service users between April 1994 and November 1996.</td>
<td>Diagnosis of PD or MS</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhatt 2005</td>
<td>Retrospective record review to audit care for suspected first seizures against practice recommendations</td>
<td>Diagnosis recorded in case notes as seizure, fit, epilepsy or epileptic fit.</td>
<td>Report of a similar previous event</td>
<td>158 presented, 38 of whom were classified as 'first fit' category</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chataway 2006</td>
<td>Randomised controlled trial</td>
<td>Older than 18 yrs. Clinically definite MS. Definite relapse of more than 24 hours but less than 4 weeks.</td>
<td>Minor relapse not requiring steroids. Relapse severe enough to require hospitalisation. Evidence of intercurrent infection. History of adverse side effects after previous steroid use. Had previously participated in this trial.</td>
<td>285 screened</td>
<td>149 eligible. 11 declined. 138 randomised</td>
<td>48% of total population. 93% of eligible population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman 1994</td>
<td>Comparative, 'semi-structured' interview survey of patients with epilepsy in four different primary care practices.</td>
<td>Active epilepsy (seizure in past two years or current antiepileptic medication). Aged 15-64 inclusive. Fit to be interviewed in own right. Registered with practice for at least 2 years. Had at least 3 recorded consultations with a GP.</td>
<td>Severely ill with other unrelated condition. Primarily alcoholic with secondary epilepsy. Mental handicap or personality disorder noted in records.</td>
<td>Not reported.</td>
<td>112 were eligible</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin 2002</td>
<td>Survey of primary care epilepsy patients and recording of outcomes of two-stage review.</td>
<td>Primary care patients with epilepsy identified via database searches using diagnostic codes and prescribing data.</td>
<td>Under 16 years. Already under specialist review.</td>
<td>506 patients on anti-epileptic drugs identified in 9 practices. 303 after application of exclusion criteria.</td>
<td>303 offered appointments, 116 attended for review by practice nurse.</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosking 2002</td>
<td>Survey of users of ENS service in tertiary referral centre</td>
<td>Newly diagnosed patients Women considering pregnancy. Patients with refractory epilepsy and treatment or compliance issues. Pre- and post-surgical patients. Survey of all patients who had one inpatient or outpatient consultation or more than one telephone contact with ENS in previous 6 months.</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>Hospital receives average 1100 new referrals of patients with seizure disorders a year and provides follow-up care for 7000 patients through outpatient clinics. 300 patients referred TO ENS by epilepsy consultants in first 6 months.</td>
<td>193 users of ENS service sent a questionnaire - no details about how selected.</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunter 2004</td>
<td>Before and after study of epilepsy patients in 9 primary care centres that did and 3 that did not implement the disease management programme.</td>
<td>Confirmed diagnosis of epilepsy, via electronic algorithm applied to drug, diagnosis and procedure codes in practice utilization data, followed by physician verification or medical record confirmation of presence of epilepsy. Continuous enrolment with the health care plan from May 1995 to June 1996.</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>Pre-intervention 630 met all three criteria for a seizure disorder, were continuously enrolled and had diagnosis confirmed by primary care provider or by chart review. Post-intervention 596 met all three criteria, enrolled and had disorder confirmed by provider.</td>
<td>Not entirely clear but probably all identified patients at both time points: 630 and 596.</td>
<td>385 (61%) pre-intervention and 362 (61%) post-intervention identified patients responded to questionnaire. Of these only 225 (36% and 38% respectively) completed both and were included in the study results. 193 were from intervention sites, 32 from comparison sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstein 1997</td>
<td>Survey of patients</td>
<td>Attending clinic between 31st January 1996 and 22 May 1996</td>
<td>Learning disability or visual impairment</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansen 2006</td>
<td>Surveys ten months apart of patients in areas with and without the TCMMS model. Not clear whether ‘baseline’ was before implementation of the TCMMS.</td>
<td>Diagnosis of MS only, but people volunteered for the study via Dutch MS Society website. Patients were then ‘accepted to participate in the study group if the neurologist or nurse specialists believed that they could benefit from the health care provided by the TCMMS’. (p.385). No further details given about</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leach 2005</td>
<td>Data collection during review and subsequent analysis. Data obtained from patients, carers, relatives and correspondence.</td>
<td>All patients in 26 general practices in DGH catchment area with diagnosis of epilepsy and on anti-epileptic drugs. Identified from practice records.</td>
<td>Children under 16. Adults already attending local epilepsy clinic. Patients aged 80 or over.</td>
<td>1156 adults (&gt;16) with epilepsy, 1033 &lt; 80 &gt;16</td>
<td>676 &gt;16 &lt; 80 and never attended epilepsy clinic. Only 275 attended for review.</td>
<td>65% of total eligible had never attended clinic. 41% attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert 2001</td>
<td>Questionnaire survey of GPs in Bristol area.</td>
<td>Working in Bristol area (not otherwise defined).</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>460 GPs</td>
<td>312 replied</td>
<td>68% of GPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmusson 2005</td>
<td>Retrospective chart review of patients in telemedicine and traditional clinic treated by the same health care professional.</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
<td>People treated by different health care professional</td>
<td>72 for traditional clinic and 83 for teleclinic between 21/4 and 12/7 2004.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100% of those with same health care professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhead 1996</td>
<td>Two audit cycles, 22m apart, in two primary care practices, using three agreed care standards. Audit based on clinical records</td>
<td>Patient with epilepsy currently taking AEDs.</td>
<td>Patient taking AEDs for reasons other than epilepsy</td>
<td>150 across two practices at first audit, 163 at second.</td>
<td>150 and 163</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schull 1992</td>
<td>Random assignment of patients to case-management or not, although</td>
<td>Adults with epilepsy admitted to hospital with 'epilepsy-related diagnosis' which could include new onset, drug toxicity.</td>
<td>Those undergoing surgical procedures for evaluation of treatment of uncontrolled seizures</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>n/k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nowhere described as an RCT</td>
<td>nowhere described as an RCT</td>
<td>uncontrolled seizures, medication overdose, seizures related to intercranial lesions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 1996 and other papers</td>
<td>RCT, apparently with waiting list control.</td>
<td>Patients over 15 with active epilepsy, defined as currently taking prescribed AED for seizures or not taking AED but reported seizure in past two years.</td>
<td>Other severe illness. Severe psychological illness. Intellectual impairment.</td>
<td>326 with epilepsy in six general practices (37 GPs)</td>
<td>283 who met inclusion criteria.</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simons 2006;</td>
<td>Before and after design, alongside programme evaluation</td>
<td>Self-selected from local branches of PD Society and responses to articles in local press.</td>
<td>Possible cognitive decline, indicated by scores of 21 or lower on Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE)</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>22 people with PD, 14 carers.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macht 2006</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Recruited from self-help groups and outpatient clinics in seven participating countries. No further details given.</td>
<td>No reference here to exclusion on basis of cognitive status. Only results reported are those for people with PD, not carers</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>22 people with PD in UK. 151 across all 7 countries. 52 ‘relatives’ of person with PD</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton 1996</td>
<td>Descriptive survey of assessment unit patients before discharge (interview with structured questionnaire) and 6 months later (postal questionnaire). Carers also</td>
<td>Patients discharged from assessment unit over nine month period (not specified when).</td>
<td>Admitted for short term (less than 3 weeks) drug changes. 'Incapable' (not otherwise defined) of 'completing the necessary information'. Discharged at short notice so no time to arrange interview.</td>
<td>99 considered suitable for inclusion</td>
<td>76 interviewed, also 76 carers</td>
<td>77% of patients. Not known for carers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery 1994</td>
<td>RCT, with waiting list control group.</td>
<td>Patient with self-reported Parkinson's Disease with diagnosis independently confirmed by their physician. Programme is available to patients with PD receiving any medications free for 9 months 'with a continuing program being provided free for patients receiving ' various drugs from Sandoz Pharmaceuticals or Somerset Pharmaceuticals.</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
<td>Not clear. Mentions 10,000 PD patients receiving the programme 'free' in the USA.</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2004</td>
<td>RCT with standard intervention for control group</td>
<td>Aged over 15. Recorded diagnosis of: multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease and other causes of progressive parkinsonism, motor neurone disease, Huntington's disease and other degenerative disorders affecting CNS, muscles or peripheral nerves. Patients of GPs within City of Nottingham boundaries.</td>
<td>Dementing disorders such as Alzheimer's disease. Participants whose clinical features seemed incompatible with recorded diagnosis. Those with neurological complications of primarily non-neurological condition.</td>
<td>438 patients identified from 53% of eligible practices that actually participated. 342 said to be eligible.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>26% of those identified, 34% of those said to be eligible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds 2000</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Seen by consultant at least once for medical assessment and confirmation of diagnosis of idiopathic Parkinson’s disease. Not previously seen by PD nurse specialist. Able to understand requirements of study and give informed consent. No clinical evidence of dementia. New referral to clinic</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>n/k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahanshahi 1994</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Diagnosis of idiopathic PD. Current treatment with dopaminergic medication. Hoehn and Yahr stage of illness II or above. Age &lt;70. No clinical evidence of dementia. Dystonia patients: primary or secondary generalised or segmented dystonia, aged 16 or more.</td>
<td>Lived more than 50 miles from hospital</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>n/k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 2000</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Aged over 17. Newly diagnosed epilepsy involving 2 or more attacks at initial treatment with AEDs</td>
<td>Learning or language difficulty that would make completion of questionnaire difficult. Severe medical or psychological disease.</td>
<td>159 referred, 128 met criteria</td>
<td>102 randomised</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Hara 2002</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>MS diagnosis confirmed by GP. Community-based and living in West London or counties ‘contiguous with Greater London’. Recruited via voluntary organisation</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>278 invited to take part</td>
<td>183 randomised</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2004</td>
<td>RCT (cluster randomised)</td>
<td>All general practices in Tayside. Patients who were receiving medication for epilepsy and were older than 16.</td>
<td>Four practices that had participated in pilot study</td>
<td>71 eligible practices, 3 declined. 53 locations randomised. 3284 patients identified as receiving AEDs. 1259 receiving AEDs for conditions other than epilepsy. Total eligible 2025</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobson nd</td>
<td>Simple costing study</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway 2006; Lloyd 2001</td>
<td>Descriptive survey-based. Recruitment interview with follow-up semi-structured interview 12</td>
<td>People with PD attending neurology outpatient clinic. Living in single LA borough</td>
<td>73 patients were initially identified</td>
<td>24 pts were recruited (note that paper 664 says 26)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Arcy 2005</td>
<td>Self-completion questionnaires sent to all patients within a week of their appointments.</td>
<td>All patients attending the clinic</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
<td>Estimated to be 150 - 170 people within PCT. 120 identified.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balaratnam nd</td>
<td>Audit to establish impact on A &amp; E attendances or hospital stays. 6 year study period: 3 years prior to the clinic starting and 3 years during the clinic's operation. Data from hospitals and patient satisfaction questionnaires.</td>
<td>All patients initially included</td>
<td>Excluded patients without diagnosis of MS by 10/09/00</td>
<td>71 patients seen between 10/09/03 and 20/12/06</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLean 2005</td>
<td>Feedback from users (no details about how collected)</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeseburg 2004</td>
<td>Open case study design. Follow up assessments at 5, 10 and 15 months after care plan implemented. Interviews with nurse specialists coordinating the intervention.</td>
<td>MS patients known to the University Medical Centre Groningen August 1999 - Dec 2000 who lived in a specific geographic area.</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoogervorst 2003</td>
<td>Comparison of INTERMED, neurologists’ assessment (Expanded Disability Status Scale: EDSS), patient self report (Guy’s Neurological Disability Scale: GNDS) and healthcare needs as defined by a professional MDT. programme.</td>
<td>Newly referred out-patient clinic patients fulfilling MS diagnostic criteria.</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
<td>100 consecutive referrals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzilli 2002</td>
<td>Randomised controlled trial.</td>
<td>Clinically definite MS. Living in Rome service area.</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
<td>297 patients screened</td>
<td>201 (96 declined to participate)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman 1999</td>
<td>Single-group, prospective, descriptive, longitudinal study.</td>
<td>Clinical or laboratory-supported diagnosis of MS In progressive phase of the disease. Considered suitable for inpatient rehabilitation.</td>
<td>Within 1 month of relapse or receiving steroids Other diseases that may interfere with outcome Cognitively impaired such that they were unable to give informed consent.</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossiter 1998 (and 1995)</td>
<td>Audit of rehabilitation programme using integrated care pathway. Three cohorts of patients.</td>
<td>Clinically definite MS. Considered at assessment to have potential for functional gains or to require an appropriate care package.</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes 1996</td>
<td>Questionnaire survey of patients' views of clinic.</td>
<td>New referrals to disability clinic at a regional rehabilitation centre during 12m period.</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleton 2005</td>
<td>Descriptive before and after study of patients, carers and staff.</td>
<td>Diagnosed as suffering with PD in one of 3 participating practices.</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>66 pts with PD identified.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy 1991</td>
<td>Retrospective record review. 1987 - Sept 1989. Also case co-ordinator surveyed about perceived outcomes.</td>
<td>Patients referred to the service.</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verza 2006</td>
<td>Before and after record review and interview survey of impact of interdisciplinary approach on equipment use.</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van den Berg 2005</td>
<td>Descriptive impact study using face to face structured interviews with patients and care givers</td>
<td>Met the El Escorial diagnostic criteria for probable or definite ALS.</td>
<td>Insufficient knowledge of Dutch language. Cognitive disorder. Other diseases that could effect the muscular-skeletal system</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traynor 2003</td>
<td>Comparison of Irish ALS Register data for those receiving specialist and non-specialist care.</td>
<td>Reviewed on more than two occasions at ALS clinic. First visit occurred within one year of the time of diagnosis.</td>
<td>ALS mimic syndrome</td>
<td>345 Irish residents diagnosed as having suspected, possible, probable or definite ALS between 1st Jan 1996 and 31st Dec 2000</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Size of patient population</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>% of patient population studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haig 1994</td>
<td>Descriptive follow-up survey using telephone standardized questionnaire one year after initial evaluation</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Information from referral or initial interview suggests assessment by multiple professionals not needed</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicks 1993</td>
<td>Retrospective record review.</td>
<td>Original referral requested inpatient respite.</td>
<td>Referred for symptom control or terminal care</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz 2004, Jarman 2002, Hurwitz 1999</td>
<td>Randomised controlled trial.</td>
<td>Taking one or more anti-parkinsonism medication A hospital or GP diagnosis of PD.</td>
<td>Aged 17 or younger Severe mental illness or cognitive impairment sufficient (in the view of their GP) to preclude valid informed consent</td>
<td>3392</td>
<td>1836 (1859 randomised but 23 died before intervention began)</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fourteen randomised controlled trials (RCTs), so described, were included, along with a fifteenth study that was not described as an RCT but which said that patients had been randomly assigned to one of two study groups. We have defined this last study as a pseudo-randomised design.

We defined 14 other studies as having used a comparative design of some type. These were studies that had measured outcome variables before the introduction of a new service or model of care and again at some point afterwards, or which had compared groups that did and did not use a particular model of care. Some before and after studies included groups that had and had not received the service or model of care; others included only groups that had received the service or model of care with no comparison group.

Four studies were based on surveys, and we defined another nine as based on audit or retrospective record review. In some of the latter, people receiving the service or model of care being evaluated were compared with those who were not.

Finally, five ‘other’ designs were included. These were: a comparison of different methods of assessing service need, a mixture of record review and survey, a case study design with follow-up assessments (which, where appropriate, we have analysed alongside the ‘before and after’ studies), a study that said it was based on ‘feedback’ from users but with no details about how this was achieved, and a simple costing study.

### 2.1.3 Numbers of people studied

At least 4,848 people were included in the 15 randomised or quasi-randomised studies. Not all papers reported the numbers randomised but only those who entered or completed the study. The individual trials ranged in size from 41 people randomised to 1,859 randomised.

The 14 before-and-after studies (which included the study that reported UK and international results in two papers) ranged in size from 24 participants to 1,226, and the four survey-based studies ranged between 54 and 312. Nine retrospective record review or audit studies included between 22 and 344 people and the five ‘other’ studies included between 31 and 100 people.

### 2.1.4 Where the studies were based

The majority of studies (33) had been carried out in the UK, and 12 of these were RCTs. One of the UK studies was part of an international project (Spain, Finland, Italy, Netherlands, UK, Estonia and Germany). Six studies (2 RCTs) were in the USA,
four in the Netherlands, two (1 RCT) in Italy, and one each in Ireland and New Zealand.

2.1.5 Conditions covered and models of care evaluated

Tables 2.3 and 2.4 summarise the conditions covered, the design of the studies, and the model of care that was evaluated.

Table 2.3 Type of study, condition, number of patients studied, and quality assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Total number of patients studied</th>
<th>Quality score for RCTs (Jadad – max 3)</th>
<th>Quality score for RCTs (EPOC – max 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chataway 2006</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>138 randomised</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig 2003</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>41 randomised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2004</td>
<td>RCT, cluster randomised</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds 2005 and 2006</td>
<td>RCT. Waiting list control group received service after 3 months.</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>52 randomised</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahanshahi 1994</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>64 randomised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery 1994</td>
<td>RCT, with waiting list control group.</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Hara 2002</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzilli 2002</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds 2000</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>185 randomised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 1996 and other papers</td>
<td>RCT, apparently with waiting list control.</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>Quality score for RCTs (Jadad – max 3)</td>
<td>Quality score for RCTs (EPOC – max 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 2000</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend 2002; Wade 2003; Gage 2006</td>
<td>Randomised, single blind controlled crossover trial. Waiting list control group received intervention 6 m after entry to trial.</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2004</td>
<td>RCT with standard intervention for control group</td>
<td>MS, PD and other</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pseudo-randomised trial**

| Schull 1992           | Random assignment of patients to case-management or not, although nowhere described as an RCT | Epilepsy | 42 | 1 | 2 |

**Before and after studies**

<p>| Barnes 1996          | Questionnaire survey of patients' views of clinic. | General neurological | 77 | - | - |
| Castleton 2005       | Descriptive before and after study of patients, carers and staff. | PD | 37 | - | - |
| Freeman 1994         | Comparative, 'semi-structured' interview survey of patients with epilepsy in four different primary care practices. | Epilepsy | 99 | - | - |
| Freeman 1999         | Single-group, prospective, descriptive, longitudinal study. | MS | 50 | - | - |
| Goodwin 2002         | Survey of primary care epilepsy patients and recording of outcomes of two-stage review. | Epilepsy | 303 offered appointments, 116 attended for review by practice nurse. | - | - |
| Gunter 2004          | Before and after study of epilepsy patients in 9 primary care | Epilepsy | Not entirely clear but probably all identified patients at both | - | - |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Total number of patients studied</th>
<th>Quality score for RCTs (Jadad – max 3)</th>
<th>Quality score for RCTs (EPOC – max 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haig 1994</td>
<td>Descriptive follow-up survey using telephone standardized questionnaire one year after initial evaluation</td>
<td>General neurological</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway 2006; Lloyd 2001</td>
<td>Descriptive survey-based. Recruitment interview with follow-up semi-structured interview 12 months later. Interviews with neurologist and PD nurse specialist</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>24 (paper 664 says 26)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosking 2002</td>
<td>Survey of users of ENS service in tertiary referral centre</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansen 2006</td>
<td>Surveys ten months apart of patients in areas with and without the TCMMS model. Not clear whether ‘baseline’ was before implementation of the TCMMS.</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 2001</td>
<td>1. Questionnaire survey of 116 users. 2. Before and after outcome study of 38 new referrals.</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Simons 2006 2. Macht 2006</td>
<td>Before and after design, alongside programme evaluation</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>1. 22 people with PD, 14 carers in UK. 2. 151 across all 7 countries. 52 relatives of people with PD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitzia 1998</td>
<td>Before and after study of convenience</td>
<td>PD or MS</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>Quality score for RCTs (Jadad – max 3)</td>
<td>Quality score for RCTs (EPOC – max 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verza 2006</td>
<td>Before and after record review and interview survey of impact of interdisciplinary approach on equipment use.</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey-based</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstein 1997</td>
<td>Survey of patients</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert 2001</td>
<td>Questionnaire survey of GPs in Bristol area.</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>312 GPs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton 1996</td>
<td>Descriptive survey of assessment unit patients before discharge (interview with structured questionnaire) and 6 months later (postal questionnaire). Carers also surveyed (postal questionnaire) soon after discharge</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>76 and 76 carers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van den Berg 2005</td>
<td>Descriptive impact study using face to face structured interviews with patients and care givers</td>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retrospective record review or audit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Balaratnam nd.</td>
<td>1. Audit to establish impact on A &amp; E attendances or hospital stays. 6 year study period: 3 years prior to the clinic starting and 3 years during the clinic's operation. Data from hospitals and patient satisfaction questionnaires.</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1. Not given 2. 27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. D'Arcy 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>Quality score for RCTs (Jadad – max 3)</td>
<td>Quality score for RCTs (EPOC – max 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhatt 2005</td>
<td>Retrospective record review to audit care for suspected first seizures against practice recommendations</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carne 2005</td>
<td>Retrospective record review</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicks 1993</td>
<td>Retrospective record review</td>
<td>MND</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmusson 2005</td>
<td>Retrospective chart review of patients in telemedicine and traditional clinic treated by the same health care professional.</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhead 1996</td>
<td>Two audit cycles, 22m apart, in two primary care practices, using three agreed care standards. Audit based on clinical records</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>150 and 163</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossiter 1998 (and 1995)</td>
<td>Audit of rehabilitation programme using integrated care pathway. Three cohorts of patients</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy 1991</td>
<td>Retrospective record review. 1987 - Sept 1989. Also case co-ordinator surveyed about perceived outcomes.</td>
<td>General neurological</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traynor 2003</td>
<td>Comparison of Irish ALS Register data for those receiving specialist and non-specialist care.</td>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Total number of patients studied</td>
<td>Quality score for RCTs (Jadad – max 3)</td>
<td>Quality score for RCTs (EPOC – max 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobson nd</td>
<td>Simple service costing study</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoogervorst 2003</td>
<td>Comparison of INTERMED, neurologists’ assessment (Expanded Disability Status Scale: EDSS), patient self report (Guy's Neurological Disability Scale: GNDS) and healthcare needs as defined by a professional MDT.</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leach 2005</td>
<td>Data collection during review and subsequent analysis. Data obtained from patients, carers, relatives and correspondence.</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLean 2005</td>
<td>Feedback from users (no details about how collected)</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeseburg 2004</td>
<td>Open case study design. Follow up assessments at 5, 10 and 15 months after care plan implemented. Interviews with nurse specialists coordinating the intervention.</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.4  Condition and model of care evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALS/MND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traynor 2003</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van den Berg 2005</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary clinics for symptomatic and palliative care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicks 1993</td>
<td>Respite care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schull 1992</td>
<td>Nurse specialist as case-manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 1996 and associated papers</td>
<td>Nurse specialist and nurse-led clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 2000</td>
<td>Two appointment with nurse specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert 2001</td>
<td>GP care with access to nurse specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosking 2002</td>
<td>Nurse specialist in tertiary referral centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin 2002</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary review in primary care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leach 2005</td>
<td>Review and follow-up of patients previously ‘unknown’ to specialist services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman 1994</td>
<td>Personal list system in general practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton 1996</td>
<td>Tertiary assessment centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstein 1997</td>
<td>Out-patient clinic in tertiary referral centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmussson 2005</td>
<td>Telemedicine clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunter 2004</td>
<td>Disease management programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhead 1996</td>
<td>Evidence-based care standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2004</td>
<td>Supported implementation of national care guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhatt 2005</td>
<td>Onward referral from accident and emergency departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple sclerosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoogervoorst 2003</td>
<td>Screening instrument to facilitate appropriate referral to multi-disciplinary teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verza 2006</td>
<td>Inter-disciplinary assessment protocol for assistive technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossiter 1998 and 1995</td>
<td>Integrated care pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman 1999</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary in-patient rehabilitation with recommendations for post-discharge services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 2001</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Arcy 2006; Balaratnam nd</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig 2003</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team management of relapse, combined with IV steroid treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzilli 2002</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary home care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chataway 2006</td>
<td>Home-based IV steroid administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeseburg 2004</td>
<td>Transmural care (same as Jansen?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansen 2006</td>
<td>Trans-mural care model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Hara 2002</td>
<td>Consumer focused, professional advice about self-care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLean 2005</td>
<td>Computer-based patient information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds 2005 and 2006</td>
<td>Palliative care service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parkinson’s disease**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trend 2002 and associated papers</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carne 2005</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary assessment and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleton 2005</td>
<td>Integrated care across health and social care services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simons 2006</td>
<td>Patient education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macht 2006</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery 1994</td>
<td>Patient education and health promotion programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway 2006 and associated papers</td>
<td>User-led care pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahanshahi 1994</td>
<td>Nurse practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobson nd</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds 2000</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz 2004 and associated papers</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed neurological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haig 1994</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes 1996</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary out-patient clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitzia 1998</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary rehab with post-discharge follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy 1991</td>
<td>Integrated care across hospital and community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2004</td>
<td>Individualised patient education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the way we constructed the electronic searches for material, we did not expect to get an even representation of LTNCs among the studies. As a result, we had 15 studies about models of integrated care for epilepsy, 14 for multiple sclerosis (MS), 11 for Parkinson’s disease (PD), three for motor neurone disease (MND) or amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), and five for more than one LTNC.

Six of the RCTs were solely about or included MS, six were solely about or included PD, and three RCTs and the pseudo-randomised trial were about epilepsy. Despite having a search strategy specifically for cerebral palsy, no evaluative studies about this condition were suitable for inclusion.

There was relatively little homogeneity among the models of care being evaluated. The biggest single grouping was of nurse specialists or practitioners (nine studies), followed by patient information or education (five studies) and multi-disciplinary clinics (four studies). However, overall, 14 of the studies referred specifically to some form of multi-disciplinary approach to service provision – whether via rehabilitation care (3), clinics (4), teams (3), review and assessment (3), or home care (1). Six studies in total evaluated some form of standards, protocols or pathways, whether for screening, assessment or care provision, and four evaluated ‘integrated’ or ‘transmural’ care’, so described.

### 2.1.6 Quality of studies selected

Table 2.3 summarises the quality scores achieved by the randomised and quasi-randomised studies included in the evaluative review. Five of fourteen such studies scored two or more on the Jadad criteria and five or more on the EPOC criteria. Another three scored two or more on the Jadad criteria but did not achieve five or more on the EPOC criteria.
These eight studies scoring relatively highly varied in their disease focus (Table 2.4). Four were exclusively about MS, two exclusively about PD, one about epilepsy and one about MS, PD and other neurological conditions. They varied even more in the model of care they were evaluating; there were eight distinct approaches to integrated care in the eight studies.

2.1.7 Outcomes reported

As one would hope from a review that attempted to find studies about integrated care, the outcome most often reported was access to or use of services (21 studies), though this means that it was not reported at all in over half. The next most commonly reported outcome was patients’ views of the model of care being evaluated (18 studies), followed by disability and impairment (16 studies), quality of life (15 studies), and clinical outcomes (15 studies). Given the emphasis on the ability of integrated care to reduce hospital admission and/or shorten hospital stay, relatively few studies (6) reported this outcome. Similarly, there were few studies (8) that reported costs to the health service of the models of care being evaluated, and none reported costs to social care services. Table 2.5 summarises the full range of outcomes reported in the evaluation studies reviewed.

Table 2.5 Outcomes reported in reviewed studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number of studies reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of or contact with services</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient’s view of model of care</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability/impairment</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical outcomes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on family and/or carers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs to health services</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other outcomes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital admission</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication in team or with patient</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient or carer expressed need</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of condition</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social outcome e.g. education, employment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff views of model of care</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs to patients or families</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping or stress</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs to social care services</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Synthesis of findings

As described in Chapter 1, the wide variation among models of care, combined with the different conditions covered, made analysis of the results challenging. In what follows, we look first at all the models of care evaluated and then at sub-groupings. In doing this we have given more emphasis to the RCTs and any before-and-after studies that had both intervention and control groups. Where possible, we have then analysed the findings by sub-group, although the sub-group chosen varies from outcome to outcome, depending on the number of studies available for analysis.

2.3 Access to and use of services

One of the key criticisms of provision for people with long-term conditions is that they experience difficulties accessing services. This seems particularly so when needed services are not ‘in the gift’ of the service providers with which the people with long-term conditions have their main or only contact. Integrated care, by definition, aims to bridge the gaps that cause these difficulties, so one might expect to see improvement in access to and use of certain sorts of services. On the other hand, there is also an assumption in much current policy that more integrated provision, as ‘close’ to the service user as possible, should reduce the demand for more expensive acute and/or hospital-based services. In analysing the data from this section of the review, then, we have looked at both increases and decreases in access to and use of services.

Twenty-one studies reported contact with or use of services (see Table 2.6).
### Table 2.6 Use of or contact with services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>Measure used</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/ before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/ after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALS/MND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van den Berg 2005</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary clinics for symptomatic and palliative care</td>
<td>Professional care giver</td>
<td>Reported n of visits</td>
<td>12m period</td>
<td>Results not reported, said to be similar for both groups</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicks 1993</td>
<td>Respite care</td>
<td>Community support services</td>
<td>N referred for additional support</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>9/15 patients received additional support</td>
<td>Not tested</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical specialities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None referred</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Some’ were referred. No other details.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schull 1992</td>
<td>Nurse specialist as case-manager</td>
<td>Emergency department visits</td>
<td>No of seizure-related visits</td>
<td>90 days after original admission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambulatory care clinic</td>
<td>% of appointments kept</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert 2001</td>
<td>Nurse specialist and general practitioner</td>
<td>Consultant follow-up</td>
<td>N and % offered and taking up follow-up</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>177/275 (64%) offered follow-up; 108/275 (39%) accepted; 87.275 (32%) continued follow-up</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosking 2002</td>
<td>Nurse specialist in tertiary referral centre</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>% reporting change in frequency of contact</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>32% less 51% no difference 6% more 11% nk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Type of service</td>
<td>Measure used</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/ before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/ after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34% less</td>
<td></td>
<td>52% no difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4% more</td>
<td></td>
<td>10% ‘invalid’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with nurse specialist for urgent advice</td>
<td>% of patients</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32% nil</td>
<td>28% once</td>
<td>28% 2-5 times</td>
<td>4% 5 or more times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any contact with nurse specialist</td>
<td>% of patients</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13% nil</td>
<td>17% once</td>
<td>43% 2-4 times</td>
<td>15% 5-9 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhead 1996</td>
<td>Evidence-based care standards</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>N (%) of epilepsy patients seen</td>
<td>In past 12m</td>
<td>First audit: 125/150 (83)</td>
<td>Second audit: 155/163 (95)</td>
<td>Not tested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2004</td>
<td>Supported implementation of national care guidelines</td>
<td>Review consultations with GP</td>
<td>Mean n of recorded consultations</td>
<td>Before and after intervention period</td>
<td>Reported as graphs only</td>
<td>Reported as graphs only</td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be no sig diffs between the groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consultations with GP</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consultations with GP that involved counselling about epilepsy</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of patients whose reviews conformed to guidelines</td>
<td>% recorded in record</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Type of service</td>
<td>Measure used</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/ before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/ after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhatt 2005</td>
<td>Onward referral from accident and emergency departments</td>
<td>Neurology clinic</td>
<td>N referred directly</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>8/12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median and mean (range) weeks from</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>16, 15 (5-20), n=10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seizure to clinic attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MRI and EEG</td>
<td>N booked</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>10/12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median, mean (range) weeks from</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>12, 12 (5-22), n=10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>referral to MRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median, mean (range) weeks from</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>16, 15 (5-20), n=10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>referral to EEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple sclerosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman 1999</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary in-patient rehabilitation with recommendations for post-</td>
<td>Wheelchair services clinic</td>
<td>N of patients recommended for and</td>
<td>At assessment</td>
<td>27/50 recommended 21/27 by</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discharge services</td>
<td></td>
<td>receiving initial contact from</td>
<td>and follow-up at 3 and 9m**</td>
<td>9m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>services by specified time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community OT</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>21/50 recommended 19/21 by 3m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21/21 by 9m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District nurse</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14/50 recommended 13/14 by 3m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/14 by 9m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Out-patient physiotherapy</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12/50 recommended 8/12 by 3m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12 by 9m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Type of service</td>
<td>Measure used</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/ before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/ after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Out-patient physiotherapy review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8/50 recommended</td>
<td>8/50 recommended 7/8 by 3m 8/8 by 9m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community physiotherapy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8/50 recommended</td>
<td>5/8 by 3m 8/8 by 9m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10/50 recommended</td>
<td>5/10 by 3m 9/10 by 9m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology/ counselling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8/50 recommended</td>
<td>8/8 by 9m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7/50 recommended</td>
<td>6/7 by 3m 6/7 by 9m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home help</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6/50 recommended</td>
<td>6/6 by 3m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Care manager</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6/50 recommended</td>
<td>3/6 by 3m 6/6 by 9m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day care</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/50 recommended</td>
<td>1/4 by 3m 3/4 by 9m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-housing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/50 recommended</td>
<td>0/3 by 3m 1/3 by 9m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing adaptations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30/50 recommended</td>
<td>20/30 by 3m 26/30 by 9m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Type of service</td>
<td>Measure used</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/ before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/ after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 2001</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community team</td>
<td>District nurse</td>
<td>Mean n of contacts in 6m*</td>
<td>Before / after referral to team</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Out-patient</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family counsellor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OT</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig 2003</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team management of relapse, combined with IV steroid treatment</td>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td>Mean hours(range) of treatment time</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>0.26 (0 to 1.3)</td>
<td>2.62 (1.25 to 5.0)</td>
<td>Not reported but difference claimed to be significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OT</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0.075 (0 to 0.75)</td>
<td>1.49 (0.25 to 4.0)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speech therapy</td>
<td>N (%) of people seen</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td>Not reported but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Type of service</td>
<td>Measure used</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/ before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/ after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by therapist</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>'distinct difference in favour of subjects is claimed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS nurse specialist</td>
<td>N (%) of people seen by nurse</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>9 (45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthoptist</td>
<td>N (%) of people seen by orthoptist</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further physiotherapy</td>
<td>N (%) of people referred</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further OT</td>
<td>N (%) of people referred</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oesefrug 2004</td>
<td>Transmural care (same as Jansen?)</td>
<td>Neurologist</td>
<td>N (and mean) frequency of contacts</td>
<td>In 5m before and 10-15m after baseline</td>
<td>39 (1.1)</td>
<td>37 (1.0)</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>17 (3.3)</td>
<td>24 (2.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation specialist</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>3 (4.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 (1.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>3 (1.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 (1.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OT</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>6 (11.0)</td>
<td>6 (5.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physiotherapist</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>17 (31.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 (20.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>3 (5.0)</td>
<td>4 (6.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home care provider</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>11 (90.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 (64.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansen 2006</td>
<td>Trans-mural care model</td>
<td>Neurologist</td>
<td>N (%) consulting in past 10m</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>68 (71)</td>
<td>66 (83)</td>
<td>Chi-squared value not reported, said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Type of service</td>
<td>Measure used</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/ before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/ after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10m later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value not reported, p = .00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| GP                    | N (%) consulting in past 10m | Baseline | 64 (67) | 61 (76) | Not reported, NS
<p>|                       |               |               |              | 10m later     |                             |                             | Value not reported, p = .01 |
| Rehabilitation specialist | N (%) consulting in past 10m | Baseline | 16 (17) | 24 (30) | Value not reported, p = .03 |
|                       |               |               |              | 10m later     |                             |                             | Value not reported, NS     |
| Nurse specialist      | N (%) consulting in past 10m | Baseline | 30 (31) | 15 (19) | Value not reported, p = .05 |
|                       |               |               |              | 10m later     |                             |                             | Value not reported, p = .01 |
| Physical therapist    | N (%) consulting in past 10m | Baseline | 36 (38) | 41 (51) | Value not reported, p = .04 |
|                       |               |               |              | 10m later     |                             |                             | Value not reported, p = .02 |
| OT                    | N (%) consulting in past 10m | Baseline | 12 (13) | 18 (23) | Value not reported, NS     |
|                       |               |               |              | 10m later     |                             |                             | Value not reported, NS     |
| Social worker         | N (%) consulting in past 10m | Baseline | 5 (5)   | 9 (11)   | Value not reported, NS     |
|                       |               |               |              | 10m later     |                             |                             | Value not reported, NS     |
| Verza 2006            | Inter-disciplinary assessment protocol for assistive technology | Assistive aids | N (%) aids supplied but then not used | 1997-1999 and 2000 -2002 (pre and post- | 25/67 (37.3%) | 8/84 (9.5%) | Chi-squared value not reported, p&lt;.001 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>Measure used</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/ before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/ after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds 2005 and 2006</td>
<td>Palliative care service</td>
<td>Paid carer</td>
<td>Days since last seen</td>
<td>At 4-6 weeks</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney, Z= -2.364, p=.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At 3 months</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported, said to be NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson's disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carne 2005</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary assessment and management</td>
<td>Nurse visits</td>
<td>% of patients receiving</td>
<td>At follow-up (between 8 and 16m after initial assessment)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neurology visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neuro-psychology evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM&amp;R visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnostic procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Therapy visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support group meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home exercise instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational ‘efforts’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleton 2005</td>
<td>Integrated care across health and social care</td>
<td>Residential care</td>
<td>N of admissions avoided</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Type of service</td>
<td>Measure used</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/ before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/ after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery 1994</td>
<td>Use of local authority services not otherwise specified</td>
<td>Doctor not otherwise specified</td>
<td>Mean (SE) reported no of visits</td>
<td>6m before baseline</td>
<td>3.0 (0.2), n=150</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3), n=139</td>
<td>Claim of overall reduction of demand on LA services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m after baseline</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3) n=147</td>
<td>2.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>Value not reported, p=.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SE) difference</td>
<td>Between baseline and follow-up</td>
<td>0.07 (0.29)</td>
<td>0.62 (0.29)</td>
<td>Paired difference t-test value not reported, p=.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahanshahi 1994</td>
<td>Patient education and health promotion programme</td>
<td>Physiotherapist</td>
<td>N (%) referred</td>
<td>At end of study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OT</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dietician</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speech therapist</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continence advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optician</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiropodist</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Type of service</td>
<td>Measure used</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/ before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/ after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychologist/ psychiatrist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neurologist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Driver assessment centre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz 2004 and associated papers</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Out-patients, day centre, or 'ancillary' therapists</td>
<td>N referred</td>
<td>24m after baseline</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Proportions of subject and controls who were referred said not to vary significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurse assessments</td>
<td>Estimated mean carried out in one year</td>
<td>During 2 one week periods separated by 6m</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed neurological</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 2004</td>
<td>Individualised patient education</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>No (%) seeing &gt;6 times</td>
<td>12m since baseline</td>
<td>10 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist nurse</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
<td>6 (11.5)</td>
<td>Adjusted OR (95%) 2.85 (0.59 to 13.73). NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-help group</td>
<td>No (%) in contact</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>9 (17)</td>
<td>8 (15)</td>
<td>Adjusted OR (95% CI) 0.98 (0.34 to 2.88) NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Calculated by us
- Study followed up patients and reported outcomes for 9m. We have also reported 3m follow-up data to reflect whether recommended services were provided speedily.
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2.3.1 RCTs

Two of the studies were RCTs of patient education or information (Montgomery, 1994; Ward, 2004) and showed no difference at follow-up between those receiving the intervention and those not in their contact with doctors, a specialist nurse or self-help groups. By contrast, an RCT of multi-disciplinary team (MDT) management of MS relapse (combined with IV steroid treatment) reported significantly higher levels of referral to and use of a range of therapy services and a nurse specialist at follow-up for those who had contact with the MDT (Craig, 2003). However, it is not clear whether the two groups had equivalent contact at baseline. The authors argue that the ‘therapy input given to the control group reflects current practice on the wards’ whereas the ‘higher number of subjects referred on for further treatment in the intervention group is a reflection of the increased contact with therapists during admission’ (p.1229).

There were two RCTs of a nurse specialist or nurse practitioner for people with PD. The first (Hurwitz, 2004) showed no difference between those who had and had not seen the nurse in their access to out-patient clinics, day centres or ‘ancillary therapists’ by 24 months after baseline. The second reported findings only for subjects and at the end of the study only. Similarly, an RCT of multi-disciplinary assessment and management for people with PD (Carne, 2005) reported findings on service use only for subjects, and only at follow-up.

The RCT of supported implementation of national care guidelines for epilepsy (Davis, 2004) reported the numbers of review consultations that primary care patients with epilepsy had with their GP and the number of GP consultations that involved discussion of epilepsy. In neither case were there any statistically significant differences between the control group (where primary care practices had simply received a copy of the guidelines through the post) and the two intervention groups (which had been offered different levels of support to implement the guidelines). Similarly, there were no differences between groups in the proportion of patients whose reviews conformed to the guidelines.

The pseudo-randomised trial of using a nurse specialist in a case manager role for people who had been admitted to hospital with epileptic seizures (Schull, 1992), showed an increase in the proportion of patients who kept appointments at an ambulatory (out-patient) clinic and a very small reduction in emergency department visits 90 days after the original admission. No statistical testing of the difference between the two groups was reported in the paper, however our reanalysis shows that, with the small numbers of patients involved (42 in total); the differences in relation to out-patient clinic compliance did not reach statistical significance.

Finally, the RCT of a palliative care service for people with MS (Edmonds, 2005; 2006), suggested that people receiving the service experienced a short-term
increase in access to the services of a paid carer, but that this difference did not persist to follow-up at three months.

2.3.2 Before and after studies

The before and after studies that reported access to or use of services varied in the extent to which they reported change over time.

For example, in a study of a nurse specialist in an epilepsy tertiary referral centre (Hosking, 2002), around a third of patients said that they had seen their GP less and a similar proportion their consultant less, since having access to the nurse specialist. However, there was no baseline information about contact with these doctors, or independent verification of numbers and frequency of contact.

Freeman (1999), a study of multi-disciplinary in-patient rehabilitation for people with MS, with recommendations for post-discharge services, did verify how many of the recommendations made at assessment had resulted in contact with services. Recommendations for contact from a wheelchair services clinic, community OT, district nurse, out-patient physiotherapy, community physiotherapy, psychology/counselling, home help, care management, and respite care had all been achieved by nine months of follow-up. By contrast, not everyone who had been recommended for contact with a social worker, day care services, re-housing, or housing adaptations had been contacted by nine months. Further, there was variation in the speed with which contact had been made. For example, contact about home help was made within three months in all cases where it had been recommended. By contrast, none of the three people recommended for re-housing had been contacted by three months.

A community-based MDT, also for people with MS (Makepeace, 2001) reported contacts with a range of service before and after people had received input from the team. Increases in the mean number of contacts over six months were evident\(^1\) for district nursing, physiotherapy, psychology services, psychiatry, out-patient attendances, family counselling, OT, and social worker. There were also small decreases in the mean number of contacts with GPs and consultants.

Two studies of ‘transmural care’ in the Netherlands for people with MS, that was explicitly intended to increase co-operation across service boundaries, showed varying impact on service access and use (Oeseburg, 2004; Jansen, 2006). Both employed a form of follow-up, but only Jansen compared people who did and those who did not receive this model of care. Oeseburg (2004) suggests that, compared with average levels of contact in the five months before receiving transmural care,

\(^1\) Calculated by us from data presented in the paper.
people had similar levels of contact with their neurologist but increased contact with their GP, rehabilitation specialists, nurse specialist and home care provider in the 10 to 15 months after starting to receive this model of care. By contrast, there was little difference in their contact with an OT, physiotherapist or social worker.

Jansen (2006) reports the numbers and proportions of people receiving transmural care who had contact with a range of services at baseline and 10 months later. Similar data are reported for people not receiving this model of care. However, the statistics reported compared the groups at baseline and then at follow-up but did not test whether or not the two groups’ contact with services changed differentially over time. In places, this makes it difficult to understand the nature of the change. As they stand, the results suggest that people who did not receive transmural care reduced their contact with a neurologist and with a GP, while those who did receive this care maintained their pre-intervention level of contact. By contrast, while those receiving transmural care both started out and ended up with a higher level of contact with a rehabilitation specialist, 10 months later their level of contact was not significantly different from those who did not receive this model of care. A small increase in contact with a social worker and with a physiotherapist was experienced by both groups, as was a reduction in contact with an OT. Overall, then, it is difficult to take a consistent message from these two studies of transmural care in relation to access to and use of services.

Verza (2006) studied the impact of an inter-disciplinary assessment protocol for assistive technology. This examined the impact of introducing the assessment on the proportion of aids and equipment people with MS were supplied with but then did not use. Comparison of data from periods before and after introducing the assessment protocol showed a significant reduction in the proportion of supplied aids that were not subsequently used, from 37 per cent to 9.5 per cent.

Finally, Castleton (2005) examined the impact of ‘integrated care’ across health and social care services on the use of residential care and local authority services by people with Parkinson’s disease. The model introduced involved a specialist treatment protocol, specialist clinics, meetings and seminars for patients and their carers, and a specialist nurse working as a key worker. Few data are reported directly in the study, but it is claimed that four admissions to residential care were avoided because of the new service organisation (out of 30 patients for whom information was collected). In addition, local authority staff felt that working in an integrated way had reduced demand for their care services.

2.3.3 Other studies

An audit of care for people with epilepsy in primary care (Redhead, 1996) showed a clear increase in the proportions of patients being seen in a 12 month period, from 83
per cent to 95 per cent, 22 months after the introduction of ‘evidence-based care standards’. As the care standard introduced was that 75 per cent of epilepsy patients should be seen every year, it seems possible that it was the introduction of auditing, rather than the care standards themselves that increased the rate of call and recall of patients.

None of the remaining studies that reported access to or use of services included pre-baseline measures or comparison groups, and the apparent impact on service use varies between them. For example, over half of people with MND using a respite care service also received additional community support services (Hicks, 1993). By contrast, Van den Berg (2005) reported no differences in the number of times patients with MND saw a ‘professional care giver’ after attending multi-disciplinary clinics for symptomatic and palliative care. Similarly while 39 per cent of people with epilepsy seen by a nurse specialist and their GP took up an offer of consultant follow-up in one study (Lambert, 2001) only small proportions of people with epilepsy seeing a nurse specialist in a tertiary centre (Hosking, 2002) reported seeing their GP or consultant more often (6% and 4% respectively).

2.4 Service users’ views of the model of care

Given that the impact on service use seems equivocal at best, how do those who use models of care that try to improve continuity feel about them?

Eighteen studies reported some quantitative assessment of service users’ views of the model of care they had received (Table 2.7). Two of these studies were RCTs of a nurse specialist (Ridsdale, 1996) or nurse practitioner (Jahanshahi, 1994) service. However, only the Ridsdale study reported findings for both the intervention and control groups, and here those who had been in contact with a nurse specialist and had access to a nurse-led clinic were asked about their experience of this care. Those in the control group were asked about their expectations of such care. Thus while the results are interesting in their own right, they do not allow us to compare the overall service experience of those with and without access to a nurse specialist.

A second RCT (Chataway, 2006) explored the impact of home-based versus hospital-based IV steroid administration. Measures of access to and co-ordination of care, access to information and experience of interpersonal care were used. Only in relation to co-ordination of care were there any statistically significant differences between those receiving treatment at home and the control group.
Table 2.7  Patients’ views of model of care: quantitative results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How views were assessed or measured</th>
<th>When assessed or measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/ after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 1996 and associated papers</td>
<td>Nurse specialist and nurse-led clinic</td>
<td>Mean score (1 = excellent, 5= poor) about actual or anticipated (for controls) nurse specialist care¹</td>
<td>6m after baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not tested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investigation of condition</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information given</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advice/ counselling</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness/ understanding</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuity of care</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prognosis</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 2000</td>
<td>Two appointments with nurse specialist</td>
<td>% reporting sufficient advice given on: Driving</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 0.1, p=.70$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 3.8, p=.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How views were assessed or measured</td>
<td>When assessed or measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/ before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/ after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epilepsy types</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 1.2, p=.30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 11.6, p&lt;.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side effects of AEDs</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$X^2= 0.7, p=.40$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 9.5, p&lt;.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-help groups</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$X^2=0.6, p=.40$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 4.9, p=.03$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epilepsy causes</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 1.0, p =.30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 4.3, p=.04$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problems with social activities</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 2.6, p =.10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 15.9, p&lt;.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problems with school/work</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 0.0, p =.90$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 7.9, p&lt;.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problems with family life</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>$X^2 = 3.0, p=.10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How views were assessed or measured</td>
<td>When assessed or measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problems with other drugs</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosking 2002</td>
<td>Nurse specialist in tertiary referral centre</td>
<td>% reporting satisfaction with aspects of nurse specialist care: support and counselling</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54% extremely/ very helpful</td>
<td>26% helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above: improved management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45% significant/ a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above: satisfied with service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67% extremely/ very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above: improvement on other services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68% significant improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% reporting difficulty contacting nurse specialist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76% no difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton 1996</td>
<td>Tertiary assessment centre</td>
<td>N (%) satisfied with services listed</td>
<td>Before discharge from assessment centre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66/76 (87)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How views were assessed or measured</td>
<td>When assessed or measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunter 2004</td>
<td>Disease management programme</td>
<td>Satisfaction questions in self-completed questionnaire: preference</td>
<td>While attending clinic or soon after</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89% hospital clinic 4% GP 7% undecided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyworker system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56/76 (74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71/76 (93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68/76 (90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seizure control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43/76 (57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71/76 (93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (%) rating services offered as 'very important' Drug changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59/76 (78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying new drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33/76 (43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to become independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27/76 (36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about epilepsy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36/76 (47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting others with epilepsy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36/76 (47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34/76 (45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34/76 (45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27/76 (36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How views were assessed or measured</td>
<td>When assessed or measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for where epilepsy is managed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above: % satisfied with clinic service</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63% satisfied 28% satisfied with some reservations 4% undecided 3% dissatisfied but with some positives 1% dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple sclerosis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How views were assessed or measured</th>
<th>When assessed or measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 2001</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community team</td>
<td>Mean score (range) on Client Satisfaction Questionnaire</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.5 (10-32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Arcy 2006; Balaratnam nd</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community clinic</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>1 week after appointment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77% clinic had been of great benefit 30% ‘delighted’ to see a specialist neurologist 30% ‘pleased’ to see whole MDT at one visit 70% thought action plans accurate 5% thought plans took too long to put into action N=27</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chataway 2006</td>
<td>Home-based IV steroid administration</td>
<td>Median score (IQR) on Multiple Sclerosis Relapse Management Scale: Access to care</td>
<td>1 week after treatment finished</td>
<td>11.1 (4.2 to 27.8)</td>
<td>11.1 (5.6 to 22.2)</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney U value not reported, p=.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above: co-ordination of care</td>
<td>12.1 (3.0 to 18.6)</td>
<td>4.5 (3.0 to 11.4)</td>
<td>As above, p=.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above: information</td>
<td>28.6 (9.5 to 45.2)</td>
<td>28.6 (14.3 to 47.6)</td>
<td>As above, p=.367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above: interpersonal care</td>
<td>5.6 (0 to 13.0)</td>
<td>7.4 (1.9 to 16.7)</td>
<td>As above, p=.130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How views were assessed or measured</td>
<td>When assessed or measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/ after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeseburg 2004</td>
<td>Transmural care (same as Jansen?)</td>
<td>% agreeing with statements. Not clear how data were collected</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>90% visits from rehabilitation team were new 80% wanted to continue with visits because very useful 85% wanted to continue with nurse specialist visits because of care monitoring, listening and presenting practical solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansen 2006</td>
<td>Transmural care model</td>
<td>Questionnaire designed to assess continuity of care</td>
<td>Baseline and 10m later</td>
<td>Data not reported</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLean 2005</td>
<td>Computer-based patient information</td>
<td>N (%) agreeing with statements. Not clear how data were collected. Information point easy to access</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>27/31 (87)</td>
<td>19/31 (61)</td>
<td>28/31 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Found all information looking for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information in clear and understandable language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information very useful or useful</td>
<td></td>
<td>14/31 (45) very useful 13/31 (42) useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information will help understanding and/or management of condition a great deal</td>
<td></td>
<td>20/31 (65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parkinson’s disease**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How views were assessed or measured</th>
<th>When assessed or measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/ after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castleton 2005</td>
<td>Integrated care across health and social care services</td>
<td>N reporting relative impact of services. Questionnaire.</td>
<td>At end of study – not clear when this was</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9/37 no opinion 3/37 other services more beneficial 13/37 consultant clinics had greatest positive impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How views were assessed or measured</td>
<td>When assessed or measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/37 nurse specialist had greatest positive impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/19 patients who attended one or more of the seminars said they provided 'significant benefit' to their care.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simons 2006, Macht 2006</td>
<td>Patient education</td>
<td>% agreeing fully with selected items of evaluation questionnaire (11 items where 50% or more agreed fully)</td>
<td>After programme completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group atmosphere comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helpful exchange experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group leader appropriately directive</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actively involved</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helpful information</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not alone with problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would recommend to others</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information understandable</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information not too theoretical</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enough practical information</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How views were assessed or measured</td>
<td>When assessed or measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/ after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macht 2006</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Mean (SD) rating from questionnaire survey of satisfaction with nurse practitioner</td>
<td>At end of study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.5 (2.0), n=26</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahanshahi 1994</td>
<td>Nurse practitioner</td>
<td>Change in score on satisfaction survey: waiting time at clinic</td>
<td>Baseline and end of study</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Kruskall Wallis H=8.35, df=3, p=.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds 2000</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Change in score on satisfaction survey: waiting time at clinic</td>
<td>Baseline and end of study</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Kruskall Wallis H=7.66, df=3, p=.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information about medication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 other variables from survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed neurological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haig 1994</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team assessment</td>
<td>N rating programme as helpful. Telephone standardised questionnaire</td>
<td>1 year after end of study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20/ 40 very helpful 9/40 somewhat helpful 9/40 not helpful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes 1996</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary out-patient clinic</td>
<td>Self-completion questionnaire: % agreeing with given statement</td>
<td>After discharge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88% useful having access to range of therapists 35% found environment inhibiting and could not talk freely 69% felt problems and questions properly addressed and were satisfied with outcome N= 62 ?</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above: overall ranking of preferred clinic formats (1 is most desirable)</td>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How views were assessed or measured</td>
<td>When assessed or measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy 1991</td>
<td>Integrated care across hospital and community services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>professionals with expertise relevant to own problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Doctor-based clinic with referral onto other therapists as appropriate
4. See all relevant therapists but on individual basis, not in group format
5. See all therapists and doctor together in same room at same time.

---

1. Questionnaire was used only with a sub-group from larger trial, selected from those in remission or with low seizure frequency.
2. Sums to 36, not the 37 said to have provided data.
3. UK results only reported. Seven item scores inverted by us to give the ‘top 11’ positive assessments.
4. Sums to 38, not the 40 said to have been followed-up.
None of the other studies reporting aspects of service users’ views had comparison groups, or reported results both before and after implementation of the service. Overall, as one would expect, they report positive accounts of the model of care. For example, 90 per cent of those surveyed about transmural care (Oeseburg, 2004) had not previously received visits from a rehabilitation team and 80 per cent wanted them to continue because they found them very useful. Similarly, 85 per cent wanted to continue with visits from a nurse specialist because they valued the care monitoring provided, the practical solutions offered and the listening.

2.5 Disability and impairment

Seventeen studies reported some aspect of disability or impairment as an outcome (Table 2.8). Of these, 12 studies were RCTs. Thus, we potentially have relatively robust information about this outcome. However, there are several difficulties in synthesising the results reported in these studies.
### Table 2.8 Summary synthesis of impact on impairment and/or disability and/or activities of daily living

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2004</td>
<td>Supported implementation of national care guidelines</td>
<td>Mean (95% CI) ESI-55 cognitive function test</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>21.0 (19.9 to 22.0)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 21.3 (20.6 to 22.0) Intensive: 20.7 (19.9 to 21.4)</td>
<td>Paired t-tests value not reported. Said to be ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12m</td>
<td>21.1 (20.2 to 22.0)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 20.9 (20.1 to 21.7) Intensive: 20.3 (19.6 to 21.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple sclerosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossiter 1998 and 1995</td>
<td>Integrated care pathway</td>
<td>Mean FIM – motor score</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Cohort 1: 60 Cohort 2: 61 Cohort 3: 60</td>
<td>Cohort 1: 69 Cohort 2: 69 Cohort 3: 67</td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be no sig, diff between each cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean FIM – cognitive score</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Cohort 1: 29 Cohort 2: 30 Cohort 3: 29</td>
<td>Cohort 1: 29 Cohort 2: 30 Cohort 3: 29</td>
<td>As above. Said to be ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 2001</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community team</td>
<td>FIM motor score</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>Wicoxon test. Not reported directly, p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig 2003</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team management of relapse, combined with IV steroid treatment</td>
<td>Mean (SD) GNDS score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>21.5 (7.2)</td>
<td>21.1 (7.1)</td>
<td>Univariate ANOVA on change from baseline to 3m. Result not reported, said to be significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzilli 2002</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary home care</td>
<td>FIM</td>
<td>Baseline and 12m</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Results not reported. Said to be no sig. diff in change between subjects and controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chataway 2006</td>
<td>Home-based IV steroid administration</td>
<td>Mean (SD) EDSS score</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>5.2 (1.3)</td>
<td>5.1 (1.5)</td>
<td>Repeated measures ANOVA of difference (95%CI) in mean score change. 0.2 (-0.2 to 0.6), p=.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 (1.9)</td>
<td>4.1 (2.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeseburg 2004</td>
<td>Transmural care (same as Jansen?)</td>
<td>Mean (range) EDSS score</td>
<td>Baseline and 15m</td>
<td>4.7 (0 to 8.5)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be no sig. change over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Hara 2002</td>
<td>Consumer focused, professional advice about self-care</td>
<td>Mean (SD) Barthel Index score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>15.73 (4.94)</td>
<td>15.5 (5.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>14.95 (5.44)</td>
<td>15.32 (5.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson’s disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend 2002 and associated papers</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support</td>
<td>Mean (SD) PD Disability Questionnaire</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>50.3 (18.0)</td>
<td>48.9 (14.4)</td>
<td>GLIM analysis of difference in change scores controlling for baseline differences. Not reported directly. p=.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 weeks</td>
<td>55.3 (19.5)</td>
<td>53.4 (17.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carne 2005</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary assessment and management</td>
<td>Mean (SD) UPDRS Part III Motor Examination Score</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up (around 12m)</td>
<td>28.72 (13.16)</td>
<td>30/43 said to have improved with mean improvement of -11.28. 11/43 said to have deteriorated with mean deterioration of +9.72 Mean improvement of -5.38 4</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery 1994</td>
<td>Patient education and health promotion programme</td>
<td>Mean (SE) UPDRS summary score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>29.2 (1.1)</td>
<td>28.8 (1.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahanshahi 1994</td>
<td>Nurse practitioner</td>
<td>Mean (SD) Functional Disability Questionnaire score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>49.7 (14.2)</td>
<td>53.1 (19.7)</td>
<td>Paired difference t-test on mean change score. Not reported directly, p said to be (.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PD patients</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>31.9 (1.2)</td>
<td>28.9 (1.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>54.2 (19.4)</td>
<td>54.2 (19.4)</td>
<td>Not reported. Appears to be within group analysis. Reported as ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean (SD) Functional Disability Questionnaire score

Dystonia patients

Baseline and possibly 12m

Not reported

Kruskall-Wallis test on change in score.

H=3.91, df=3, ns

Physical activity

H=3.18, df=3, ns

Self-care

H=7.12, df=3, ns

Leisure

H=2.67, df=3, ns

Mixed neurological

Haig 1994 | Multi-disciplinary team assessment | Reported change of overall function from telephone follow-up questionnaire | 12m after evaluation | - | 16/40 rated no change | 13/40 rated better | 8/40 rated worse | Chi-squared test of goodness of fit. \(X^2 = 2.89\), ns. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sitzia 1998</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary rehab with post-discharge follow-up</td>
<td>Median NHP (part 1) – physical mobility. PD patients</td>
<td>Baseline and one month after discharge</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Wilcoxon Z=2.1, p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above, MS patients</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>Wilcoxon Z=2.1, p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2004</td>
<td>Individualised patient education</td>
<td>Mean (SD) NEADL score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>6.15 (5.58)</td>
<td>7.83 (6.33)</td>
<td>Paired difference t-test (within group) not reported directly. Controls ns, subjects p=.002. Mean difference for subjects (95% CI) 1.62 (0.69 to 2.55), p=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12m</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.65 (6.07)</td>
<td>9.45 (7.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDSS Kurtzke’s Expanded Disability Status Scale  
ESI 55  
FIM Functional Independence Measure  
GNDS Guys Neurological Disability Scale  
NEADL Nottingham Extended Activities of Daily Living Scale  
NHP Nottingham Health Profile  
UPDRS Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale

1. Performance declined over time.  
2. Decrease in score indicates improvement  
3. Based on analysis of median scores. Means and SDs provided directly by researchers.  
4. Calculated by us.  
5. The mean change for the control group is reported to be 29.7. This is very different from the apparent mean change reported in other tables in the paper – i.e. from 29.9 to 31.9 is a mean change of 2.0. It is not clear on which of these figures the apparently statistically significant change is based.  
6. Reported values were identical for both groups. This is not explained in the paper.
First, the measures used were very varied. Some were straight measures of impairment – for example, tests of mobility or manual dexterity. Others, however, measured aspects of impairment alongside disability and, sometimes, activities of daily living.

Secondly, some studies reported more than one measure of impairment and/or disability (see Appendix 7 for all measures reported). In our analysis, we have confined ourselves to a single measure of impairment and/or disability from each RCT, and, where there was more than one to choose from, have tried to use a similar type of measure for each study.

Thirdly, not all papers reported results directly, but referred only to statistical test results or levels of significance. In all these cases, we attempted to contact the researchers to obtain results in a form that we could use for synthesis. In some cases this was successful, in others not.

Fourthly, we would have preferred to synthesise results using a social model of disability and thereby by distinguishing between:

- impairment of function (what someone is able or unable to do solely by virtue of their condition or physical state), and
- disability (what someone is able or unable to do by virtue of the help they may or may not get from others or from aids, or from adaptations to the physical environment).

However, almost none of the measures used in the sorts of studies reviewed here allowed such a distinction to be made.

Four RCTs - of multi-disciplinary team management of relapse for MS (Craig, 2003), of consumer-focused self-care advice for people with MS (O’Hara, 2002), of patient education and health promotion for people with Parkinson’s disease (Montgomery, 1994) and of individualised patient education for people with mixed neurological conditions (Ward, 2004) - showed significant improvements on measures of impairment and/or disability in favour of the intervention groups. None of the other eight RCTs showed significant positive change on any of the measures used. However, even where statistically significant difference was not reached, the results did tend to favour the intervention groups.

Among the other studies, one (Makepeace, 2001, of a multi-disciplinary community team for MS) showed patients deteriorating significantly between baseline and six months follow-up, while a study of transmural (multi-disciplinary) care for MS (Oeseburg, 2004) claimed no significant changes between baseline and 15 months, although the quantitative details of this were not reported directly.
2.6 Clinical outcomes

Fifteen studies, seven of which were RCTs, reported some aspect of clinical outcomes. These outcomes varied considerably, from adverse events, through changes in drug treatment, to changes in clinical condition (see Table 2.9).

Three trials - the Ridsdale (1996) trial of a nurse specialist for people with epilepsy, the Davis (2004) trial of supported implementation of national guidelines for epilepsy, and the Hurwitz trial of a nurse specialist for PD - reported no significant differences in any of the clinical outcome measures used.

Chataway (2006) - an RCT of home-based IV steroid administration for MS - showed some differences between subjects and controls in reported adverse events. Where these differences were statistically significant (our analysis), they were in favour of the intervention, suggesting that home-based treatment was at least as safe as hospital-based treatment and perhaps associated with fewer side effects (metallic taste and mood disturbance).

Edmonds (2005), an RCT of palliative care for people with MS, showed that the intervention group were less likely to report nausea at the ‘slight or worse’ level. However, the subjects and controls were also significantly different on this variable at baseline (our analysis) so it seems likely that the difference at follow-up simply reflected the initial differences. Both groups had, in fact, deteriorated over time. Further, the intervention group reported significantly poorer sleep at final follow-up, compared to the controls. However, no baseline figures for this outcome were reported and, because the study employed a waiting list control group, by the time of final follow-up the control group had received the service (three months previously, compared to the intervention group six months previously).

A trial of a patient education and health promotion programme for people with PD (Montgomery, 1994), reported significant changes in mean levels of drug use for Levodopa in those receiving the intervention but for no other clinical outcomes reported.
### Table 2.9  Clinical outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALS/MND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicks 1993</td>
<td>Respite care</td>
<td>% of admissions leading to medication review</td>
<td>Retrospectively from records</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>81% of admissions</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 2000</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Median months since last seizure</td>
<td>Around 6m from baseline</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Not reported, said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2004</td>
<td>Supported implementation of national guideline</td>
<td>Nature of seizures (mean (95% CI) ICTAL score)</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>16.0 (15.2 to 16.7)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 15.5 (14.8 to 16.2) Intensive: 16.1 (15.3 to 16.8)</td>
<td>Not reported, said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>16.0 (15.4 to 16.9)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 16.1 (15.3 to 16.8) Intensive: 15.9 (15.3 to 16.5)</td>
<td>Not reported, said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean score (95% CI) perceived severity of seizures</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>30.6 (29.1 to 32.1)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 33.2 (32.2 to 34.1) Intensive: 31.5 (30.1 to 32.9)</td>
<td>Not reported, said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>32.0 (30.8 to 33.3)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 32.7 (31.1 to 34.2) Intensive: 31.3 (30.0 to 32.6)</td>
<td>Not reported, said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean score (95% CI) perceived adverse drug effects</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>36.7 (35.3 to 38.2)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 37.9 (35.8 to 40.1) Intensive: 34.6 (31.9 to 37.3)</td>
<td>Not reported, said to be NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>38.2 (36.0 to 40.5)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 35.9 (33.6 to 38.1) Intensive: 34.6 (32.9 to 36.3)</td>
<td>Not reported, said to be NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin 2002</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary review in primary care</td>
<td>N taking specified drug (out of 71 reviewed by specialist):</td>
<td>After review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phenytoin</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phenobarbitone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primidone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carbamazepine</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sodium valporate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clobazam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diazepam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lamotrigine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethosuzimide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N taking: no medication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monotherapy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polytherapy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leach 2005</td>
<td>Review and follow-up of patients previously 'unknown' to specialist services</td>
<td>Overall outcome of review, accepting treatment change and receiving continued specialist care. Those with diagnostic uncertainty (n=19)</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 stopped AEDs, no events. 4 stopped AEDs, events but not seizures 2 stopped AEDs no further contact 3 treatment continued 1 reduced AEDs.</td>
<td>One sample chi-squared = 10.21, df=4, p=0.37 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Those in remission (n=13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Those with active epilepsy (n=55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton 1996</td>
<td>Tertiary assessment centre</td>
<td>N and % reporting improvement in seizure control</td>
<td>Just before discharge and 6m later</td>
<td>52/76 (68%)</td>
<td>30/56 (54%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N and % reporting improvement in drug side effects</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>46/76 (61%)</td>
<td>N not reported. 82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmusson 2005</td>
<td>Telemedicine clinic</td>
<td>Mean (SD) seizures</td>
<td>Record review over 3m period</td>
<td>4.58 (9.0)</td>
<td>4.81 (9.3)</td>
<td>t = - 0.19, p=.84, df=153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% with blood levels in</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>89% (N=72)</td>
<td>82% (N=83)</td>
<td>Not reported.Said to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhead 1996</td>
<td>Evidence-based care standards</td>
<td>N and % with record of level of seizure control</td>
<td>At first audit cycle and 22m later</td>
<td>Poor: 12/150 (8%) Moderate: 13/150 (9%) Good: 50/150 (33%) All: 75/150 (50%)</td>
<td>Poor: 12/163 (7%) Moderate: 29/163 (18%) Good: 111/163 (68%) All: 152/163 (93%)</td>
<td>be ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N and % taking AEDs no more than twice daily</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>95/150 (63%)</td>
<td>107/163 (66%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple sclerosis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chataway 2006</th>
<th>Home-based IV steroid administration</th>
<th>N and % adverse events: Metallic taste</th>
<th>During 3 days of treatment</th>
<th>37 (54%)</th>
<th>19 (28%)</th>
<th>Chi-squared $^1$ = 9.74, df=1, p=.002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facial flushing</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 (32%)</td>
<td>21 (30%)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sleep disturbance</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 (28%)</td>
<td>19 (28%)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nausea</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mood disturbance</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (12%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>Chi-squared $^1$ = 3.88, df=1, p=.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Light-headedness</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Headache</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>NS with continuity correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflux</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impaired concentration</td>
<td>4-6 weeks</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vomiting</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arthralgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palpitations</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cutaneous reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean no of adverse events</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds 2005 and 2006</td>
<td>Palliative care service</td>
<td>POS – MS N reporting nausea slightly or worse</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>10/23</td>
<td>4/26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/22</td>
<td>1/24</td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be 'borderline significant'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/21</td>
<td>13/25</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney U, Z=1.138, p= 0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>5/21</td>
<td>As above. Z=2.229, p=0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parkinson's disease
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castleton 2005</td>
<td>Integrated care across health and social care services</td>
<td>% of cases where misdiagnoses detected (professional evaluation)</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>8% (N=37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of cases where therapeutic effect of drug treatment was maximised and adverse events minimised (professional evaluation)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>30% (N=37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery 1994</td>
<td>Patient education and health promotion programme</td>
<td>% reporting end of dose exacerbations</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>47.8 (N=138)</td>
<td>46.5 (N=129)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>51.4 (N=138)</td>
<td>48.1 (N=133)</td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% reporting ‘on-off’ problem</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>26.9 (N=134)</td>
<td>35.2 (N=125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>30.5 (N=131)</td>
<td>32.1 (N=134)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% using Levodopa</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>85 (N=150)</td>
<td>86 (N=140)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>89 (N=150)</td>
<td>88 (N=140)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in mean (SE) dose of Levodopa (measure not reported)</td>
<td>From baseline to 6 months</td>
<td>61.22 (18.10)</td>
<td>-0.85 (19.05 - sic)</td>
<td>Result not reported, p=0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% using Bromocriptine</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>25 (N=150)</td>
<td>26 (N=140)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in mean (SE) dose of Bromocriptine</td>
<td>From baseline to 6 months</td>
<td>2.03 (1.05)</td>
<td>1.21 (0.66)</td>
<td>Result not reported, p=0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% using Selegilene</td>
<td>Baseline 6 months</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in mean (SE) dose</td>
<td>From baseline to 6 months</td>
<td>-0.04 (0.23)</td>
<td>0.04 (0.23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Result not reported, p=0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SE) change in side effects index</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>3.04 (1.27)</td>
<td>0.79 (1.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Result not reported, p=0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway 2006 and associated papers</td>
<td>User-led care pathway</td>
<td>Hoehn and Yahr scale estimate of severity of condition</td>
<td>Baseline and 12 months</td>
<td>3/22 mild 11/22 mild to moderate 7/22 moderate 1/22 moderate to severe</td>
<td>Not reported but said to reveal 'little change'</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz 2004 and associated papers</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Fracture rate</td>
<td>12m before baseline</td>
<td>7% (50/702) 5.4% (55/1028)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various medication results – waiting for data from researchers</td>
<td>During two year follow-up</td>
<td>11.1% (62/558) 6</td>
<td>13.2% (92/696) 2 6</td>
<td>OR (95% CI) 1.20 (0.85 to 1.69), p=.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed neurological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2004</td>
<td>Individualised patient education</td>
<td>n and % reporting falls</td>
<td>12m from baseline</td>
<td>24 (46%)</td>
<td>30 (56%)</td>
<td>OR (95% CI) adjusted for n of baseline events 2.83 (1.07 to 7.47), p=.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n and % reporting skin sores</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>7 (13.5%)</td>
<td>OR (95% CI) adjusted for n of baseline events 12.74 (1.14 to 142.6), p=0.039.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AEDs Anti-epileptic drugs  
MSIS Multiple Sclerosis Impact Scale  
POS-MS Palliative Outcome Scale – MS Version

1. Calculated by us  
2. With no baseline figures it is difficult to know what this result signifies  
3. ‘Poor control’ - one or more seizures in past month; ‘moderate control’ – 1-11 seizures in past 12 months; ‘good control’ – no seizures in past 12 months  
4. No other POS-MS results reported, so presumably no others were significant  
5. No other MSSI results reported, so presumably no others were significant  
6. The Ns on which these results are based are different from the Ns said to have survived and not been lost to follow-up (684 subjects and 541 controls)
The final trial (Ward, 2004) - of patient education for mixed neurological conditions, including PD - reported significant changes between the intervention and control groups in the proportions reporting falls and skin sores, but in both cases the changes were claimed to favour the control group, after adjusting for differences in baseline measures. After looking again at the results, we are not sure that this is correct. The proportion of people followed up in the control group who had experienced a fall in the previous 12 months changed from 22/52 (42.3%) at baseline to 24/52 (46.1%) at follow-up. In the intervention group the change was from 31/53 (58.5%) to 30/53 (56.6%). We do not see how adjustment for the differences at baseline could have generated an odds ratio that favoured the control group. By contrast, the change in proportions reporting a skin sore in the previous 12 months - from 6/52 (11.5%) to 2/52 (3.8%) for the controls and from 3/53 (5.7%) to 7/53 (13.2%)\(^2\) - does clearly favour the control group.

Three further studies provided some comparative measurements.

Upton (1996) looked at improvements in epilepsy seizure control in patients who had attended a tertiary assessment centre. The results suggest that some gains in control (reported by 68% of patients just before leaving the centre) were lost later when only just over half (54%) were still reporting improvements.

Redhead (1996) explored the effect of introducing and then auditing evidence-based care standards for epilepsy in primary care and showed substantial improvements in record keeping between the first and second audits. In the first, only 50 per cent of records of patients with epilepsy included information about their level of seizure control. At the second audit, 93 per cent of patients had their level of control recorded. While the proportion of all epilepsy patients who were recorded as having good control increased between the two audits (from 33% to 68%) it seems that this had much to do with better recording about those with good control than any real clinical improvement. Another standard introduced was that medication should be taken once or twice daily to aid compliance. At the first audit, 63 per cent of patients were taking anti-epilepsy drugs no more than twice a day; by the second audit 66 per cent were.

The third before-and-after study (Holloway, 2006) explored the impact of a user-led care pathway on a PD severity measure. Although follow-up data were not reported directly, they were said to reveal little change between baseline and 12 months later.

\(^2\) Not 13.5% as reported in the paper.
2.7 Mortality

Three studies formally reported mortality as an outcome.

Traynor (2003) compared people with ALS who attended a multi-disciplinary, specialist clinic with those who attended general neurology clinics. All patients with ALS in Ireland were identified and followed-up over a four-year period. Multivariate modelling explored the contribution of a range of variables, including attendance at the specialist clinic, to survival. Overall, median survival for those attending the specialist clinic was 677 days, compared with 448 days for those attending general neurology clinics. Cox proportional hazard modelling showed that the risk of death over the four year period in which death rates were tracked was significantly higher for those using general neurology clinics (hazard ratio 1.47, 95% CI 1.06 to 2.06, p=.02) than for those using the specialist service, once other influential variables had been controlled for. Patients with bulbar onset of ALS appeared to benefit particularly from the specialist clinics.

By contrast, Hurwitz (2004), in an RCT of a nurse specialist service for people with PD, showed no significant differences in mortality between the intervention group and the controls either two years or four years after baseline. Seventeen per cent of subjects and 18 per cent of controls had died by two years (hazard ratio 0.91, 95% CI 0.73 to 1.13, p=.38). By four years, 35 per cent and 38 per cent, respectively, had died (hazard ratio 0.89, 95% CI 0.76 to 1.03, p=.12).

Finally, the Edmonds (2005) RCT of a palliative care service for people with MS showed slightly higher death rates for controls than for the intervention group at final follow-up, between 24 and 26 weeks after baseline. One of the 26 in the intervention group and three of the 26 in the controls had died by this stage. No statistical analysis of these findings is presented.

2.8 Quality of life

Fifteen studies, nine of them RCTs, reported some measure of quality of life (QoL), usually using health-related quality of life measures or disease-specific measures. Again, then, we had some possibility of robust information about this outcome. However, even among the RCTs, the messages studies were mixed (see Table 2.10).

There were no significantly higher scores in any aspect of measured QoL in the Davis (2004) study of supported implementation of national guidelines for epilepsy.
### Table 2.10  Quality of life outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALS/MND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van den Berg 2005</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary clinics for symptomatic and palliative care</td>
<td>SF-36 Physical functioning summary score</td>
<td>At interview</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Mean difference (95% CI) between groups, adjusted in regression for range of differences between groups: -1.22 (-4.2 to 1.7), p=.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical functioning</td>
<td>As above. -0.63 (-8.6 to 7.4), p=.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role function, physical</td>
<td>As above. -1.1 (-11.5 to 9.3), p=.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General health</td>
<td>As above. 0.94 (-5.1 to 7.0), p=.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodily pain</td>
<td>As above. -2.49 (-10.9 to 5.9), p=.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental summary score</td>
<td>As above. 4.28 (1.2 to 7.8), p=.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>As above. 4.02 (-2.2 to 10.3), p=.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social functioning</td>
<td>As above. 15.0 (6.8 to 23.3), p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role functioning, emotional</td>
<td>As above. 5.1 (-7.7 to 18.0), p=.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>As above. 4.5 (-0.2 to 9.2), p=.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>Disease management programme</td>
<td>Composite mean score. Quality of Life in</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>64 (n=30)</td>
<td>68.4 (n=138)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2004</td>
<td>Supported implementation of national care guidelines</td>
<td>SF-36. Mean (95% CI) score: mental component summary</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>47.7 (45.2 to 50.2)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 49.7 (48.1 to 51.3)</td>
<td>Paired t-test change score value not reported, p=0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate: 49.8 (47.9 to 51.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intensive: 49.0 (46.5 to 51.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12m 48.0 (46.0 to 50.0)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 50.2 (47.9 to 51.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate: 49.1 (47.4 to 50.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intensive: 44.0 (41.8 to 46.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (95% CI) IMPACT score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>28.4 (27.1 to 29.6)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 29.1 (28.1 to 30.2)</td>
<td>Intensive: 27.8 (26.0 to 29.7)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzilli 2002</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary home care</td>
<td>SF36: Physical functioning</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Mean change (95% CI) in two groups, after adjusting for baseline values in regression model. 0.27 (-0.53 to 1.06), p=.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 m</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Role, physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodily pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role, emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical component score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental component score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig 2003</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team management of relapse, combined with IV steroid</td>
<td>SF36 – 8 domains reported separately.</td>
<td>Baseline and 3m</td>
<td>See paper</td>
<td>See paper</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney U analysis of mean change to 3m. No values reported, all p values ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chataway 2006</td>
<td>Home-based IV steroid administration</td>
<td>Mean (SD) SF 36 scores: Role emotional</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>42.2 (44.1)</td>
<td>44.4 (44.3)</td>
<td>Not reported but groups said to be similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>43.5 (43.9)</td>
<td>55.1 (45.5)</td>
<td>Repeated measures ANOVA of difference in mean change score (95% CI) -9.3 (-25.9 to 7.3), p=.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role physical</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>12.2 (25.5)</td>
<td>13.6 (29.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>19.8 (32.7)</td>
<td>31.1 (39.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>49.6 (29.5)</td>
<td>53.5 (34.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>58.4 (27.6)</td>
<td>65.8 (28.3)</td>
<td>As above: -3.4 (-11.8 to 5), p=.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Energy and vitality</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>29.7 (19.7)</td>
<td>29.7 (23.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>38.2 (20.9)</td>
<td>39.0 (22.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General health perception</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>46.0 (22.7)</td>
<td>48.4 (23.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>50.7 (27.1)</td>
<td>49.5 (22.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social functioning</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>38.7 (26.2)</td>
<td>46.6 (29.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>54.8 (31.9)</td>
<td>57.6 (27.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical functioning</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>33.5 (26.3)</td>
<td>38.5 (31.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>40.0 (27.7)</td>
<td>47.4 (29.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>56.0 (20.4)</td>
<td>58.3 (24.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeseburg 2004</td>
<td>Transmural care (same as Jansen?)</td>
<td>Mean (range) RAND 36 score: Physical functioning</td>
<td>Baseline and 15m</td>
<td>34.9 (0 - 95)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported directly. Said to be no sig. change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social functioning</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>60.3 (25 -100)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodily pain</td>
<td>73.4 (22-100)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role limitations physical</td>
<td>17.5 (0-100)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role limitations social</td>
<td>54.2 (0-100)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional well-being</td>
<td>64.5 (28-100)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Energy/fatigue</td>
<td>42.8 (15-95)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall health perception</td>
<td>40.5 (5-80)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean health changes</td>
<td>35.6 (25-100)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansen 2006</td>
<td>Trans-mural care model</td>
<td>RAND 36 health – related QoL: Physical functioning</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Hara 2002</td>
<td>Consumer focused, professional advice about self-care</td>
<td>Mean (SD) scores on SF-36 subscales: mental health</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>69.2 (22.4)</td>
<td>68.7 (20.1)</td>
<td>'Regression' not otherwise specified, controlling for baseline differences between the groups. Standardised regression coefficient (95% CI): -1.662 (-6.099 to 2.846), p=.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>68.0 (22.3)</td>
<td>72.4 (19.8)</td>
<td>ANOVA. F=4.54, p=.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>61.4 (27.1)</td>
<td>60.8 (29.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>60.3 (26.3)</td>
<td>63.2 (31.0)</td>
<td>F=0.98, p=.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical role</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>24.3 (35.7)</td>
<td>34.5 (38.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>23.7 (35.2)</td>
<td>28.1 (35.3)</td>
<td>F=1.02, p=.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical function</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>24.1 (25.5)</td>
<td>26.2 (28.0)</td>
<td>F=0.53, p=.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role emotional</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>57.8 (44.4)</td>
<td>64.4 (43.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social function</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>54.7 (46.1)</td>
<td>60.2 (42.5)</td>
<td>F=0.02, p=.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social function</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>61.3 (27.2)</td>
<td>60.1 (30.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social function</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>58.0 (30.4)</td>
<td>60.9 (31.3)</td>
<td>F=0.95, p=.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>38.6 (22.8)</td>
<td>38.9 (19.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General health</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>49.2 (25.2)</td>
<td>50.1 (24.6)</td>
<td>F=0.99, p=.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parkinson’s disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trend 2002 and associated papers</th>
<th>Multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support</th>
<th>Mean (SD) Euroqol score</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>0.74 (0.18)</th>
<th>0.73 (0.20)</th>
<th>GLIM modelling of difference in change scores, controlling for baseline score and group membership. Value not reported, p=.951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67 (0.27)</td>
<td>0.66 (0.22)</td>
<td>GLIM modelling of difference in change scores, controlling for baseline score and group membership. Value not reported, p=.951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD) Euroqol Visual Analogue score</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>71.4 (14.7)</td>
<td>72.7 (17.4)</td>
<td>GLIM modelling of difference in change scores, controlling for baseline score and group membership. Value not reported, p=.951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.7 (15.9)</td>
<td>68.2 (18.6)</td>
<td>As above, p=.633</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLIM modelling of difference in change scores, controlling for baseline score and group membership. Value not reported, p=.951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means (SD) Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire - 39 score *</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>27.6 (13.2)</td>
<td>26.1 (11.3)</td>
<td>GLIM modelling of difference in change scores, controlling for baseline score and group membership. Value not reported, p=.951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.2 (13.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) SF36 score: physical component summary</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above: general health subscale</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simons 2006&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Patient education</td>
<td>Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire -39 *</td>
<td>Before and after programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macht 2006&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Mean (SD) Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire -39 * score: Total</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodily discomfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montgomery 1994</td>
<td>Patient education and health promotion programme</td>
<td>Mean (SE) score on battery of 15 questions related to self-efficacy: Patient global</td>
<td>6m after baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-efficacy (symptoms)</td>
<td>256.0 (11.0)</td>
<td>297.0 (10.0)</td>
<td>As above, p said to be &lt;05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-efficacy (timed function)</td>
<td>237.0 (10.0)</td>
<td>267.0 (11.0)</td>
<td>As above, p said to be &lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-efficacy (management)</td>
<td>302.0 (14.0)</td>
<td>340.0 (13.0)</td>
<td>As above, p said to be &lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total self-efficacy</td>
<td>795.0 (22.0)</td>
<td>904.0 (24.0)</td>
<td>As above, p said to be &lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds 2000</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Change in score on SF-36. Physical functioning</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up (possibly 12m)</td>
<td>Not reported directly</td>
<td>Not reported directly</td>
<td>Kruskall – Wallis on change in score. H=9.78, df=3, p=.02 ³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H=4.15, df=3, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bodily pain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H=1.11, df=3, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H=10.51, df=3, p=.02 ³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H=4.96, df=3, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social functioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H=5.35, df=3, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H=0.98, df=3, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H=0.21, df=3, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz 2004</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Mean (SD) EuroQoL score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>0.43 (0.36)</td>
<td>0.43 (0.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>0.39 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.37 (0.35)</td>
<td>Mean difference (95% CI) estimated using linear regression: -0.02 (-0.06 to 0.02), p=.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>38.2 (21.8)</td>
<td>37.9 (21.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.2 (22.1)</td>
<td>39.7 (21.2)</td>
<td>As above. 0.47 (-2.72 to 3.66), p=.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) change in self-perceived global health questionnaire</td>
<td>At 1 and 2 year follow-up only</td>
<td>5.02 (1.38)</td>
<td>4.79 (1.5)</td>
<td>As above. -0.23 (-0.40 to -0.06), p=.008.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mixed neurological**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sitzia 1998</th>
<th>Multi-disciplinary rehab with post-discharge follow-up</th>
<th>Nottingham Health Profile (part 1) Total HRQOL score for PD patients *</th>
<th>1 week before admission and 1 m after</th>
<th>257.6</th>
<th>216.0</th>
<th>Wilcoxon Z = 2.6, p&lt;.01*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As above for MS patients *</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>268.7</td>
<td>219.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilcoxon Z = 2.6, p&lt;.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Higher scores indicate poorer outcomes

1. Domain scores were also reported for: seizure worry, overall QoL, emotional well-being, energy/fatigue, cognitive, medication effects, social function. In no case was the difference in change in mean score statistically significant different between the two groups.
2. All sub-scale results reported and also said to be ns.
3. Result favours control group
4. Macht 2006 reports results for all the countries involved in this project. Simons 2006 reports the results for the UK sub-study only.
5. Two groups were significantly different at baseline.
6. Z score and p values reported as identical, despite different scores and numbers for the two groups (PD and MS patients)
Three RCTs of different models of care for MS mostly showed no difference in QoL between intervention groups and controls - MDT management relapse (Craig, 2003), home-based IV steroid administration (Chataway, 2006), and consumer focused self-care advice (O’Hara, 2002). However, the latter study did report greater improvement in the mental health and vitality sub-scales of the SF-36 for those who had received self-care advice. By contrast, Pozzilli (2002), an RCT of multi-disciplinary home care for people with MS, reported significantly better sub-scale scores on the SF-36 for the intervention group for bodily pain, general health, social functioning and role emotional. Both the overall physical and mental component scores were thus better for the intervention group.

Among the RCTs related to PD, the Trend (2002) study of multi-disciplinary rehabilitation and group educational support showed no QoL benefit for the intervention group. Indeed, for one measure reported - the general health subscale of the SF-36 - the control group did significantly better than the intervention group. This was also true for two SF-36 sub-scales (physical functioning and general health) used in the Reynolds 2000 RCT of nurse specialists for PD patients. The third RCT related to PD, of a nurse specialist (Hurwitz, 2004) showed no significant differences on the validated QoL measures used (EuroQol and the PDQ-39) between those receiving the new model of care and those not. By contrast, an RCT of a patient education and health promotion programme for PD (Montgomery, 1994) showed significant differences in self-efficacy in relation to symptoms, timed function, management and total self-efficacy at six-month follow-up. However, it was not clear whether the measures used for this part of the study were valid or reliable, and no baseline data had been collected to ensure that the groups were equivalent at the start of the study.

Among the comparative studies, three showed no significant differences between the intervention and controls groups (Gunter, 2004, disease management programme for epilepsy; Oeseburg, 2004; Jansen, 2006, transmural care for MS; Simons, 2006/Macht, 2006, patient education for PD). By contrast, the fifth comparative study (Sitzia, 1998, multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with post-discharge follow-up) showed significant improvements for both PD and MS patients in their total health-related quality of life score, measured by the Nottingham Health Profile.

The last study reporting QoL outcomes was a survey of people attending multi-disciplinary clinics for symptomatic or palliative care for ALS, compared with those receiving usual care (Van den Berg, 2005). The researchers used regression analysis, adjusted for a range of socio-economic and impairment variables on which the two groups differed. This showed that those receiving multi-disciplinary care scored higher, all else being equal, on the mental summary and social functioning scores of the SF-36. However, without baseline measurement on the SF-36 it is difficult to ascribe these differences to the intervention.
The author of the one RCT that showed consistently positive results (Pozzilli, 2002) was unable to provide us with data that would have allowed us to include these results in our synthesis.

2.9 Mental health outcomes

Eleven studies, seven of which were RCTs, reported mental health outcomes (Table 2.11).

Two RCTs of nurse specialist support, both for people with epilepsy, used ‘caseness’ on the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale to assess mental health. In the first study (Ridsdale, 1996) results were analysed separately for those who had and those who had not had a seizure in the past six months. This was because earlier work by the researchers had shown that depression was significantly related to recent seizure. There were differences between the intervention and control groups on depression ‘risk’ at baseline. The follow-up analysis controlled for this and showed that people who had not had a seizure in the past six months and who were in the control group were more than three times as likely to be ‘at risk’ of depression as those who had seen a specialist nurse. By contrast, there was no significant difference in the risk of depression for those who had experienced a seizure in the past 6 months. A further trial of nurse specialist input by the same group, this time of two appointments only, showed no significant differences between the intervention and control groups on depression or anxiety ‘caseness’ or median score.

A single RCT, of multi-disciplinary care for people with MS showed no differences on mental health measures between intervention and control groups (Pozzilli, 2002).

Three of the RCTs involved people with PD and/or dystonia. None showed any differences in any of the mental health measures used between those who received multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support (Trend 2002) or nurse practitioner/specialist support (Jahanshahi, 1994; Reynolds, 2000) and those who did not.

The seventh RCT, of individualised patient education for people with mixed neurological conditions (Ward, 2004) similarly showed no differences between the intervention and control groups on ‘caseness’ on the General Health Questionnaire.

Two of the remaining studies used some element of comparative measurement and, as with the RCTs, demonstrated no statistically significant difference between those who did and did not receive the services of a multi-disciplinary community team for MS (Makepeace, 2001) or a patient education intervention for PD (Simons, 2006; Macht 2006).
Table 2.11  Mental health outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ridsdale 1996 and associated papers | Nurse specialist and nurse-led clinic | N and % ‘at risk’ on HAD depression score | Baseline | Seizure in past 6m: 8/29 (28%)  
No seizure in past 6m: 5/60 (8%) | Seizure in past 6m: 8/31 (26%)  
No seizure in past 6m: 9/64 (14%) | Chi-squared controlling for depression status at baseline.  
Seizure in past 6m: $\chi^2 = 0.59$, p=.44.  
No seizure in past 6m: $\chi^2 = 4.98$, p=0.03  
RR (95% CI) of depression in controls relative to intervention group.  
Seizure in past 6m: 0.72 (0.32 to 1.65)  
No seizure in past 6m: RR 3.15 (1.15 to 8.60) |
|                       |               |              | Approx 6m later | Seizure in past 6m: 7/30 (23%)  
No seizure in past 6m: 12/62 (19%) | Seizure in past 6m: 10/31 (32%)  
No seizure in past 6m: 4/65 (6%) |
|                       |               |              |               |                             |                            |                          |
| Ridsdale 2000         | Two appointments with a nurse specialist | N and % of HADS ‘cases’ – anxiety | Baseline | 20/43 (47%)  
20/47 (43%) |                             |                          |
|                       |               |              | 6m            | 18/43 (42%)  
15/47 (32%) | $\chi^2 = 0.96$, p=.33 |
|                       |               |              | Median HADS anxiety score | Baseline | 7.2  
6.3 |                          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N and % of HADS ‘cases’ – depression</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>7/43 (16%)</td>
<td>9/47 (19%)</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney U. Not reported, p=.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median HADS depression score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney U. Not reported, p=.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton 1996</td>
<td>Tertiary assessment centre</td>
<td>N and % reporting improved mood</td>
<td>Before discharge and 6m later</td>
<td>38/76 (50%)</td>
<td>Not reported for follow-up</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple sclerosis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 2001</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community team</td>
<td>Mean GHQ score</td>
<td>Baseline and 6 months</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>T-test. Not reported directly. Said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzilli 2002</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary home care</td>
<td>STAXI</td>
<td>Baseline and 12m</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not clear what test used. Result not reported. Said to be ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STAI</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% change in CDQ score</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>+ 0.7%</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
<td>As above. Claims a ‘trend in favour of the intervention group’ with a p of 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parkinson’s disease</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend 2002 and associated papers</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support</td>
<td>Mean (SD) HAD anxiety score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>6.2 (3.4)</td>
<td>6.1 (3.5)</td>
<td>GLIM of difference in change scores. Not reported directly $p=.472$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 weeks</td>
<td>5.8 (3.6)</td>
<td>6.1 (3.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) HAD depression score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>5.0 (3.6)</td>
<td>5.6 (3.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 weeks</td>
<td>4.9 (3.2)</td>
<td>5.2 (3.3)</td>
<td>As above. Not reported directly, $p=.625$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simons 2006</td>
<td>Patient education</td>
<td>Self-rating depression scale</td>
<td>Before and after programme</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported, said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macht 2006</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Mean (SD) as above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>42.4 (8.6)</td>
<td>42.7 (10.6)</td>
<td>$t=-0.4$, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahanshahi 1994</td>
<td>Nurse practitioner</td>
<td>Mean (SD) BDI for PD patients</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>14.0 (5.7)</td>
<td>13.9 (6.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>13.1 (6.3)</td>
<td>12.6 (6.6)</td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above for dystonia patients</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>15.7 (10.1)</td>
<td>9.9 (8.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>15.6 (13.9)</td>
<td>10.6 (6.5)</td>
<td>As above. Said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) STAS for PD patients</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>43.6 (11.8)</td>
<td>44.2 (8.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>43.9 (10.9)</td>
<td>43.2 (10.4)</td>
<td>As above. Said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>46.5 (12.9)</td>
<td>41.5 (13.9)</td>
<td>As above. Said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) PFS – positive affect for PD patients</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>11.2 (3.8)</td>
<td>11.5 (2.8)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>11.4 (3.1)</td>
<td>11.7 (3.6)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>10.6 (2.3)</td>
<td>12.3 (2.6)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds 2000</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>HADS – anxiety score</td>
<td>Not clear – baseline and possibly 12m</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Kruskall- Wallis on change score. H=0.45, df=3, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above. H=0.36, df=3, ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mixed neurological**

<p>| Roy 1991              | Integrated care across hospital and community services | Retrospective judgement of care co-ordinators about psychological deterioration of all patients (n=296) | At the end of the study | - | 11% deteriorated | 40% unchanged | 30% improved | 5% died | 14% not known | None reported |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above for patients who had deteriorated physically (n=63)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>25% deteriorated 2^2 54% unchanged 16% improved 5% died</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above for patients referred specifically for rehabilitation (n=73)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>21% deteriorated 27% unchanged 45% improved 7% died</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2004</td>
<td>Individualised patient education</td>
<td>N and % of GHQ ‘cases’ 4</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>22/52 (41%)</td>
<td>27/53 (57%)</td>
<td>Unadjusted OR (95% CI) 1.93 (0.86 to 4.31) Adjusted OR (95% CI) 1.60 (0.6 to 4.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12m</td>
<td>21 (n unclear) (40% if n=52) 5</td>
<td>27 (n unclear) (51% if n=53) 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BDI Beck Depression Inventory – higher score = poorer outcome  
CDQ Clinical Depression Questionnaire – reference given in paper is actually to IPAT scale for anxiety  
GHQ General Health Questionnaire  
HAD Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale – higher score = poorer outcome  
PFS Bradburn’s Present Feelings Scale  
STAI State Trait Anxiety Inventory  
STAS Spielberger Trait Anxiety Scale – higher score = poorer outcome  
STAXI State Trait Anger Expression Inventory

1. Defined by a cut-off score of 8. Analysis conducted separately for those who had and had not had a seizure in the past 5m because previous research by this group showed risk of depression was significantly related to seizure in past 6m.  
2. Anxiety scores were different between the groups at baseline.  
3. Derived by us from figures given  
4. ‘Caseness’ not defined  
5. Table in paper reports 41.2%  
6. Table in paper reports 57.4%
2.10 Coping or stress

Only one study used a coping or stress measure, so defined, as an outcome. Davis (2004), in testing the supported implementation of national guidelines on epilepsy care found no significant difference in change between baseline and follow-up between primary care patients in practices where the guidelines were implemented with varying degrees of support. The mean (95% CI) scores on what seems to be the Pearlin and Schooler coping scale at baseline were: controls 20.1 (19.4 to 20.8); intermediate support 20.2 (19.7 to 20.7); intensive support 19.9 (19.2 to 20.7). At follow up 12 months later the scores were: controls 20.3 (19.7 to 20.8); intermediate support 20.5 (19.9 to 21.0); intensive support 19.7 (19.1 to 20.4). The results of the statistical testing of these scores, by paired or un-paired t tests ‘as appropriate’, is not reported but is said to be not statistically significant.

2.11 Hospital admission

If integrated models of care aim to manage the boundaries between different parts of the health and care system, one might expect to see changes in the frequency with which people with LTNCs enter hospital and/or the amount of time they spend there when they do. Preventing, or reducing the length of, hospital stay has been a key issue in policy and practice for older people in the UK over the past 15 years, and has now moved up the agenda for people with long-term conditions, regardless of their age (Department of Health, 2005). However, only six of the evaluative studies that we included in the review, three of them RCTs, reported hospital admission and/or length of stay (see Table 2.12).

Four of the RCTs reported results for both intervention and control groups. Two of these showed no statistically significant benefit for intervention groups, whether for a nurse specialist case-manager for epilepsy (Schull, 1992) or for multi-disciplinary management of relapse in MS combined with IV steroid treatment (Craig, 2003), although the latter study did show a small improvement for the intervention groups. By contrast, Pozzilli (2002), evaluated a home-based service for people with MS against normal care and demonstrated a significant reduction in in-patient care ‘events’ for those receiving home care, as one might expect.

The fourth RCT was of home-based IV steroid administration for MS (Chataway, 2006) so, by definition, reduced use of out-patient resources, but this was not reported specifically. However, the main concern with this study was not so much with hospital admission, per se, but with hospital admission as an indicator of adverse events and, therefore, safety. One person out of the 69 treated at home was admitted to hospital for an overnight stay during the IV treatment.
### Table 2.12  Hospital admission and length of stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>Initial length of stay for controls/before</th>
<th>Initial length of stay for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
<th>Total length of stay for controls/before</th>
<th>Total length of stay for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schull 1992</td>
<td>Nurse specialist as case-manager</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mean days 6.79(^1)</td>
<td>Days 6.96(^1)</td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be ‘very similar’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N of seizure related readmissions: 3</td>
<td>N of seizure related readmissions: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmusson 2005</td>
<td>Teledicine clinic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mean ER visits: 0.125</td>
<td>Mean ER visits: 0.0963</td>
<td>Wilcoxon rank sum test. Z=0.5634, df=153, p=.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD 0.333</td>
<td>SD 0.2969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total n of visits 9</td>
<td>Total n of visits 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean n of hospitalisations: 0.0417</td>
<td>Mean n of hospitalisations: 0.012</td>
<td>Wilcoxon rank sum test. Z=1.15, df=153, p=.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD 0.2012</td>
<td>SD 0.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total n of admissions 9</td>
<td>Total n of admissions 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple sclerosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 2001</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community team</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mean over previous 6m: 2.53(^2)</td>
<td>Mean over 6m while in contact with team</td>
<td>None reported. NHS cost difference of - £15,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Arcy 2006; Balaratnam nd</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community clinic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be 38% lower in three years clinic running than in previous three years</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig 2003</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team management of relapse, combined with</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mean 4.8</td>
<td>Mean 3.45</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD 3.07</td>
<td>SD 1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>Initial length of stay for controls/before</td>
<td>Initial length of stay for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
<td>Total length of stay for controls/before</td>
<td>Total length of stay for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chataway 2006</td>
<td>Home-based IV steroid administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/69 patients admitted during 3 days of treatment – overnight stay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzilli 2002</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary home care</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mean n of inpatient care ‘events’. 1.01</td>
<td>Mean n of inpatient care ‘events’ 0.34</td>
<td>Difference of the mean (95% CI) -0.67 (-1.15 to -0.19), p=0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. LOS includes original length of stay in hospital plus readmission within 30 days of discharge.
2. Calculated by us
Of the three remaining studies, two provided comparative data on hospital admission. The study of a telemedicine clinic for people with epilepsy (Rasmusson, 2005) showed reductions in hospital admissions or visits to emergency departments for those using the clinic and the study of a multi-disciplinary community team for people with MS (Makepeace 2001) showed reductions in days of hospital bed use after the introduction of the multi-disciplinary team. The differences in the tele-medicine clinic did not reach statistical significance, and the difference was not tested in the other study. However, the latter did claim a saving on hospital bed costs of £15,363 (an average of £404.29 per patient surveyed) when comparing use in the six months before and six months after new referral to the team.

Finally, an audit of a multi-disciplinary clinic for MS, based on retrospective record review (D'Arcy, 2006), claimed a 38 per cent decrease in days in hospital for MS patients in the three years after the clinic was introduced, compared with the three years before. However, with no information about the number of patients with MS in the hospital record system over the two periods, it is difficult to interpret this apparent reduction.

The small reductions in hospital admission and/or length of stay for the models of care evaluated, particularly those that are multi-disciplinary, look promising. However, the low number of studies and the small numbers of participants within them suggest that the impact of these models of integrated care remains to be evaluated in relation to these particular outcomes.

### 2.12 Costs to health services

Eight studies reported some aspect of costs to health services of implementing new models of care (Table 2.13).

Five of the studies were RCTs – one was of multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support for people with MS (Trend, 2002); one of multi-disciplinary home care for people with MS (Pozzilli, 2002); one of home-based IV steroid administration for people with MS (Chataway, 2006); and two of nurse specialists for people with PD (Reynolds, 2000; Hurwitz, 2004).

Different methods of health economics analysis were used in the RCTs, depending upon their focus. Trend (2002) presented a cost-consequence analysis, and Chataway (2006) and Hurwitz (2004) cost-minimisation analyses. The approach adopted by Reynolds (2000) and Pozzilli (2002) is not clear. The studies also adopted different approaches to identifying costs; some used bottom-up costing, some top-down costing, and others estimated costs.
## Table 2.13 Costs to health services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How calculated</th>
<th>Over what period?</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Overall conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple sclerosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend 2002 and associated papers</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support</td>
<td>Bottom-up costing based on 1999/2000 financial year. Cost-consequence analysis</td>
<td>Annual cost</td>
<td>Not calculated – waiting list control group</td>
<td>£1069 pa for treatment (staff £360, consumables £24, space and overheads £685) £455 transport</td>
<td>Judgement ‘depends upon the value attached’ by patients, carers and funders to the mobility gains made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 2001</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community team</td>
<td>Bottom-up costing of services used by patients. Annual cost of service</td>
<td>6m before and 6m after contact with team</td>
<td>£28,797 total cost of services for 38 patients (mean £757.82 or £126.30 per month)</td>
<td>£22,804.50 total cost of services for 38 patients (mean £600.12 or £100.02 per month). £120,000 per annum cost of team.</td>
<td>Despite increased contact with most services costs reduced because of fewer contacts with GPs and consultants and fewer hospital bed days. Claims that costs of service would be offset by savings if service used by all people with MS in Newcastle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzilli 2002</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary home care</td>
<td>Top-down and estimated costs. Drugs and aids to daily living not included.</td>
<td>12m period</td>
<td>Cost per patient 2265 Euros</td>
<td>Cost per patient 1443 Euros</td>
<td>Intervention patients had significantly fewer inpatient stays but more ‘medical care’, nursing, social and psychological support. Best case scenario in sensitivity analysis predicts a saving of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How calculated</td>
<td>Over what period?</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Overall conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chataway 2006</td>
<td>Home-based IV steroid administration</td>
<td>Mean (CI) costs. Bottom-up costing. Cost minimisation analysis.</td>
<td>Not clear. During 3 days of treatment but also refers to clinical events and resource use after study period. Possibly 6 weeks after treatment.</td>
<td>£499 (£471-534) direct medical costs £61 (£49 – 76) non-medical costs. £560 (£531-598) total costs</td>
<td>£354 (fixed) direct medical costs £1 (0-2) non-medical costs. £355 (£354-356) total costs</td>
<td>Direct medical costs significantly higher for out-patient compared to home group. Non-medical costs significantly lower for home group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson’s disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds 2000</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Not clear. Primary analysis carried out on only 47 (30 subjects and 17 controls) of 185 randomised</td>
<td>Not clear – two follow-up periods 1 and 2. No baseline assessment of costs</td>
<td>Period 1 mean monthly costs of care £4.76 Period 2 mean monthly costs of care £5.41</td>
<td>Period 1 mean monthly costs of care £53.96 Period 2 mean monthly costs of care £66.77</td>
<td>Says that change in costs between two periods ‘was not significantly different between the two groups’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz 2004 and associated papers</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Appears to be based on patient recall of service use, costed using average unit costs.</td>
<td>Annualised using 1996 costs</td>
<td>Mean patient cost, year preceding study £3480² Year 2 £5530³ Individual mean increase in cost ³ £2800</td>
<td>Mean patient cost, year preceding study £4050² Year 2 £5860³ Individual mean increase in cost ³ £2540</td>
<td>Difference in individual mean increase (95% CI) -£260 (-£980 to £450) p=.47. Tested with unpaired t test with unequal variances. P value and 95% CI checked with bootstrapped samples. Improvements in patient well-being ‘achieved without an increase in healthcare costs’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobson nd</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Costed services that in absence of nurse specialist would have taken place in out-patient setting. Costed all nurse</td>
<td>12m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>On basis of nurse specialist having 321 patients and carrying out 881 ‘interventions’ claims saving of £54,992 on out-</td>
<td>Many untested assumptions made about substitution of nurse specialist follow-up for consultant-led follow-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How calculated</td>
<td>Over what period?</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Overall conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>specialist interventions that in her absence would have been done by someone else. Then deducted cost of nurse specialist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>patient clinics, £8296 on community assessments and £1203 on in-patient assessments. Total saving of £64491 claimed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Calculated by us
2. All patients entering study
3. Patients at end of study
Trend 2002 did not collect cost data for the waiting list control group so no assumptions about the relative costs of multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support can be made.

Pozzilli 2002 claims substantial reductions in costs for a home-care service but largely on the basis of estimated costs for the new model of care. Chataway (2006) also demonstrates considerable savings to health services for a home-based model of care, using bottom-up costing.

Reynolds (2000) carried out no baseline assessment of costs so all that can be said about the nurse specialist service evaluation is that between two periods of follow-up increases in costs were not different for those with and those without a nurse specialist. However, the mean monthly costs for those having access to a nurse specialist in this study appeared to be substantially higher than for the controls, but it is not clear exactly which costs were included in the analysis. By contrast, Hurwitz (2004) found no significant difference in the mean increase of costs between baseline and follow-up for those receiving nurse specialist care compared with those who were not, although the costs of health care for both the intervention and control groups had increased substantially.

Hobson (nd) was a simple costing study of a nurse specialist but based on many untested assumptions about the substitution of nurse-specialist follow-up for consultant-led follow-up. On this basis, substantial savings are claimed, but with no demonstration of outcomes, it is difficult to know how to interpret this finding.

Makepeace (2001) assessed the health service costs associated with introducing a multi-disciplinary community team for people with MS. Services for 38 patients were costed, using a bottom-up approach, for the year before and the year after the service was introduced. Although people increased their contact with most services after the team was introduced, the overall costs reduced because they had fewer contacts with GPs and consultants and spent fewer days in hospital. However, the service itself cost £120,000 per annum. The researchers claim that these costs could be offset if the savings demonstrated by the 38 patients could be replicated when the service was extended to all people in the area where the study took place. The assumption that such savings would be replicated across the board is untested. The paper itself points out that only 66 per cent of the people known to have MS in the area had actually been referred to the service. Adding the rest presumably would require additional staff or lower levels of service input, which might weaken the apparent cost-saving effect.

The final study that reports cost is Verza (2006), who compared the costs of abandoned assistive equipment for people with MS before and after an interdisciplinary assessment protocol was introduced. Using predominantly bottom-up
costing, this study suggests a considerable reduction of the costs of abandoned equipment within the context of an overall increase in the total equipment budget.

Overall, these studies suggest, as one might expect, that home-based services are cheaper than out-patient services, without any increase in adverse events (see section on in-patient admission). However, this is based on only two studies. Neither nurse specialist services for people with LTNCs nor multi-disciplinary team approaches appear yet to have been adequately researched in relation to outcomes as against costs.

### 2.13 Impact on family or carers

Eight studies, four of which were RCTs, reported the impact of the model of care on the families or informal carers of people with a LTNC (Table 2.14).

Two of the RCTs were of models of care for people with multiple sclerosis. One - of multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support (Trend 2002) - reported no significant effects on patients or carers. By contrast, the RCT of a palliative care service (Edmonds, 2005) reported significant improvements in three outcomes for families or carers when the person with MS was receiving specialist palliative care.

The other two trials were of models of care for people with PD (a patient education and health promotion programme, Montgomery, 1994) or for mixed neurological conditions, including PD (individualised patient education, Ward, 2004). In neither case were any statistically significant differences reported between the families or carers of those who did and did not receive the intervention.

Two comparative studies were both related to PD. One evaluated patient education (Simons, 2006) and the other a user-led care pathway (Holloway, 2006). Simons (2006) reports no significant differences at follow-up while Holloway (2006) reports that the number of carers stating that they ‘could not carry on’ had fallen between baseline and follow-up 12 months later.

Van den Berg (2005) compared the families and carers of people with ALS/MND who were attending specialist multi-disciplinary clinics with those who were not, using a survey design at a single point in time. Scores were adjusted for a range of variables on which the two groups differed; after adjustment there were no significant differences between the two groups of family members or carers.
### Table 2.14  Impact on family or carers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALS/MND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van den Berg 2005</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary clinics for symptomatic and palliative care</td>
<td>CSI?¹</td>
<td>At interview</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be no difference in adjusted scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton 1996</td>
<td>Tertiary assessment centre</td>
<td>N and % reporting improvement in patient immediately after discharge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48/52 (92%) reported improvement</td>
<td>60% reported improvements in seizure control</td>
<td>45% reported improvements in drug side effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple sclerosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend 2002 and associated papers</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support</td>
<td>Mean (SD) CSI Baseline 3.6 (3.4) n=28 3.0 (2.7) n=40</td>
<td>24 weeks 3.3 (3.0) n=28 3.7 (3.0) n=39</td>
<td>GLIM of difference in change scores, controlling for differences in baseline scores. Result not reported, p=0.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) Euroqol Baseline 0.83 (0.33) n=27 0.86 (0.21) n=40</td>
<td>24 weeks 0.81 (0.18) n=29 0.82 (0.20) n=39</td>
<td>As above. Not reported, p=.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) Euroqol visual analogue scale</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>79.0 (14.5) n=27</td>
<td>78.4 (17.2) n=40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 weeks</td>
<td>80.8 (14.5) n=29</td>
<td>77.8 (19.8) n=39</td>
<td>As above. Not reported, p=.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds 2005 and 2006</td>
<td>Palliative care service</td>
<td>Mean ZBI score (^2): suffering of health</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>1.63 (n=19)</td>
<td>1.15 (n=13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3m</td>
<td>1.67 (n=15)</td>
<td>0.56 (n=16)</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney U. Z=2.372, p=0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean ZBI score (^2): loss of control over life</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>1.84 (n=19)</td>
<td>1.54 (n=13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3m</td>
<td>2.00 (n=15)</td>
<td>1.06 (n=16)</td>
<td>As above. Z=2.334, p=0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZBI: n (%) reporting learning new skills</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>12/18 (67%)</td>
<td>8/13 (61%)</td>
<td>As above. Z=2.19, p=0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3m</td>
<td>7/15 (47%)</td>
<td>15/16 (94%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson's disease</td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ-5D</td>
<td>Before and after programme</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Students t not reported, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BELA-A-k</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery 1994</td>
<td>Patient education and health promotion programme</td>
<td>Patient questionnaire on self-efficacy: questions about spousal relationship (^3)</td>
<td>6m after baseline</td>
<td>38.2 (1.8)</td>
<td>35.0 (1.8)</td>
<td>Not reported, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SE) 'spousal stress'</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>11.3 (0.5)</td>
<td>12.1 (0.6)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway 2006 and associated papers</td>
<td>User-led care pathway</td>
<td>Interviews with carers</td>
<td>Baseline and 12m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Number of carers stating that they did not know if they could carry on said to have fallen. Numbers not given.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mixed neurological**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward 2004</th>
<th>Individualised patient education</th>
<th>N and % of GHQ-28 'cases'</th>
<th>12m after baseline</th>
<th>14 (41%)</th>
<th>6 (23%)</th>
<th>Unadjusted OR (95% CI) 2.36 (0.83 to 6.71) Adjusted OR 2.35 (0.65 to 7.73)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

BELA-A-k Measure of disease specific psychosocial problems – version for carers

CSI Carers Stain Index

EQ-5D Euroqol quality of life scale

GHQ General Health Questionnaire

ZBI Zarit Burden Inventory

1. The test refers to carers’ quality of life, but only the CSI appears to have been used.
2. Not clear whether or not groups were statistically equivalent at baseline
3. Not clear how the questions asked relate to the results reported
Finally, Upton (1996) surveyed the families or carers of people with epilepsy just after they had been discharged from a tertiary assessment centre. While most (92%) reported improvement in the condition of the person with epilepsy, only 60 per cent reported improvements in seizure control and 45 per cent improvements in drug side effects.

Overall, then, except in relation to specialist palliative care services for people with MS, there is no evidence from the studies reviewed here of the families or carers of people with LTNCs benefitting from the models of care evaluated. However, many of the studies were small and, given that few of the studies included in the review attempted to assess outcomes for families or carers, we have to conclude that this issue remains to be researched adequately.

2.14 Costs to service users and families

Only two studies, both of them RCTs, reported any aspect of the costs borne by patients or their families (Table 2.15). Trend (2002) reported costs for all patients who eventually used multi-disciplinary rehabilitation services with group educational support for people with MS, so there are no comparisons with the waiting list control group from the RCT. Chataway (2006) reports ‘non-medical costs’ from a study of home versus out-patient IV steroid administration that could include transport and child-care costs, but not wider costs such as loss of income from paid work. The results suggest that home-based IV is significantly less costly for patients and their families, although the transport costs reported for those who had out-patient treatment do not seem to take into account any reimbursement received.

2.15 Social and economic outcomes for service users

Three studies, none of them RCTs, reported some aspect of socio-economic outcomes (Table 2.16). Upton (1996) reported the perceived importance of a tertiary assessment centre’s services for helping people with epilepsy to be independent and giving them opportunities to meet other people with epilepsy. Sitzia (1998) explored social isolation for people with mixed neurological conditions using a multi-disciplinary service with post-discharge follow-up, via the Nottingham Health Profile. Roy (1991) asked care co-ordinators to make judgements about ‘social deterioration’ among people with mixed neurological conditions after they had received integrated care across hospital and community services.

None of the studies had a control group of any sort, but Sitzia (1998) did assess social isolation before and after people used the service being evaluated, but found no change over time.
Table 2.15  Costs to patients or families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple sclerosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend 2002 and associated papers</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support</td>
<td>Annual cost per patient of travel to hospital using estimated mileage multiplied by mileage allowance paid to volunteer hospital drivers</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>£46</td>
<td>None done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chataway 2006</td>
<td>Home-based IV steroid administration</td>
<td>Mean (95% CI) direct non-medical costs arising because of treatment, identified via CSRI</td>
<td>Not clear. During 3 days of treatment but also refers to 'clinical events and resource use after study period'. Possibly 6 weeks after treatment.</td>
<td>Transport £59 (£47 to £74)</td>
<td>Transport £0 (all cases)</td>
<td>Says that there were 'significant savings' to the patients receiving home IV.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSRI Client Service Receipt Inventory

1. But did not record what % of transport costs were reimbursed to control patients.
Table 2.16  Socio-economic outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton 1996</td>
<td>Tertiary assessment centre</td>
<td>N (%) rating service offered as 'very important': Learning to become independent</td>
<td>Before discharge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27/76 (36%)</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting others with epilepsy</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36/76 (47%)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N (%) of family members rating service offered as 'very important': Learning to become independent</td>
<td>Immediately after discharge of patient</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39/52 (75%)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting others with epilepsy</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33/52 (63%)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed neurological</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitzia 1998</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary rehab with post-discharge follow-up</td>
<td>Social isolation dimension of NHP. Median score for PD patients</td>
<td>1 week before admission and 1 month after discharge</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>Wilcoxon Z, not reported., p=0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above for MS patients</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>As above, p=0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy 1991</td>
<td>Integrated care across hospital and community services</td>
<td>Care co-ordinators were asked to make a judgement about outcome for patients</td>
<td>Retrospectively</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Social deterioration in 8% overall. Among those whose physical condition had deteriorated, 31% improved socially, 44% unchanged. Among rehabilitation patients only, 12% deteriorated socially</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It is not clear that the results reported for the two groups were actually analysed separately as both the scores and the p values are identical.
The one interesting finding from these studies is in relation to the tertiary assessment centre for people with epilepsy. Here family members were much more likely than patients to rate the services of the centre as very important in relation to helping the patient become independent and meeting others with epilepsy.

2.16 Expressed need

Only four studies made any kind of assessment of the needs that people with LTNCs had and whether the model of care being evaluated had had any effect on these (Table 2.17). None of these studies was a RCT and only two allowed any judgement about impact of the intervention.

Both Oeseburg (2004) and Jansen (2006) evaluated a model of ‘trans-mural’ care for people with MS in the Netherlands. As discussed earlier, it is not entirely clear whether the same areas and/or service users were included in both studies. Oeseburg showed overall reductions between baseline and final follow-up in most areas of expressed needs among the 40 people included in this case study. However, with no control group to compare, it is difficult to ascribe this change to the model of care. By contrast, the Jansen (2006) study did compare those who had and had not received trans-mural care in relation to change in expressed needs between baseline and follow-up. Odds ratios were calculated, adjusting for the significantly different levels of need that the intervention and comparison groups had expressed at baseline. After this adjustment, people who had received transmural care were significantly less likely to express need at follow-up in relation to personal care, defecation and vision. The paper does not refer to the apparently greater likelihood of those who received trans-mural care expressing a need in relation to communication; a difference that almost reached conventional levels of statistical significance.

The remaining studies were of two different ways of assessing people with epilepsy – the review and follow-up of patients previously ‘unknown’ to specialist services (Leach, 2005) and an out-patient clinic in a tertiary referral centre (Goldstein, 1997). In both cases, need was assessed at initial contact with the service, but not subsequently, meaning that no judgement about impact of the service can be made.
### Table 2.17  Expressed need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leach 2005</td>
<td>Review and follow-up of patients previously 'unknown' to specialist services</td>
<td>N mentioning need for information on: Discontinuing drugs</td>
<td>When assessed</td>
<td>58/275 $^2$</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driving regulations</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27/275</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reproduction or fertility</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14/275</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doubts over diagnosis</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/275</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side effects and interactions of long-term AEDs</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/275</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety, including alcohol consumption</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/275</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstein 1997</td>
<td>Out-patient clinic in tertiary referral centre</td>
<td>% wanting to talk about epilepsy to specified professional in more detail than currently possible</td>
<td>While at clinic or soon after</td>
<td>15% social worker 24% psychologist 40% nurse specialist 19% epilepsy voluntary organisation</td>
<td>33% basic information 44% extensive information 19% basic and extensive information 5% no information</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% $^1$ expressing need for information about epilepsy</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33% basic information 44% extensive information 19% basic and extensive information 5% no information</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Percentage reporting personal need for information about epilepsy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% requesting advice about specific topics</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33% advice/support/counselling for patients and families</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21% social security benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19% driving/insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17% employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17% home safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14% holidays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13% leisure activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9% accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9% vocational training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7% education matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% sheltered employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% action groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple sclerosis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oeseburg 2004</th>
<th>Transmural care (same as Jansen?)</th>
<th>Mean n of needs ¹ expressed for: Information Baseline and 15m</th>
<th>Baseline and 10m</th>
<th>0.55</th>
<th>0.24</th>
<th>None reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-actualisation</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total needs expressed</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jansen 2006</th>
<th>Trans-mural care model</th>
<th>Health care need: communication Baseline and 10m</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
<th>OR (95% CI) 2.413 (0.991 to 5.872), p=.052</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>OR (95% CI), 0.40 (0.109 to 1.578)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>OR (95% CI). 0.607 (0.219 to 1.688), p=.339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal care</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>OR (95% CI). 0.364 (0.168 to 0.790), p=.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defecation</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>β (95% CI). -.446 (-.881 to -.010) p=.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pattern of urination</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>β (95% CI). 0.185 (0.202 to .571) p=.349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>β (95% CI). -.007 (-.356 to .341) p=.967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>β (95% CI). -.172 (-.537 to .194), p=.357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sleep</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>β (95% CI). .200 (.237 to .636) p=.370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>β (95% CI). .522 (-1.009 to -.035) p=.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>β (95% CI). .020 (-.473 to .512) p=.937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psyche</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>β (95% CI). .358 (-.124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>β (95% CI). .223 (-.277 to .724) p=.382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Calculated by us
2. N in paper is not entirely clear. We have assumed it is the number of people who attended for review, rather than the number who subsequently saw a consultant (see p.515)
2.17 Knowledge of condition

Six of the models of care included in the review had explicit aims of providing information or education to people with LTNCs. These were:

- Trend (2002) - a model of care that included group educational support for people with MS.
- Montgomery (1994) - a patient education and health promotion programme for people with PD.
- O’Hara (2002) - consumer-focused, professional advice about self-care for people with MS.
- Maclean (2005) - a computer-based patient education programme for people with MS.

In addition, there were nine studies of nurse practitioner or nurse specialist services, where one might have expected information giving and education about the condition to be a key part of the nurses’ activity (see, for example, Kwan et al., 2000).

Despite this, only four studies (Table 2.18) actually reported anything about knowledge of the condition among individuals with LTNCs and/or their family members or carers (Ridsdale, 1996; 2000; Upton, 1996; Goldstein, 1997). Further, none of the models of care evaluated in these four studies was specifically about patient education or information giving. Two evaluated nurse specialist services for people with established or newly diagnosed epilepsy (Ridsdale, 1996; 2000 respectively), one a tertiary assessment centre for people with epilepsy (Upton, 1996) and one an outpatient clinic in a tertiary centre (Goldstein, 1997).

The Ridsdale (1996) RCT of a nurse specialist service for people with established epilepsy showed no impact on knowledge of the condition. By contrast, Ridsdale (2000), which was an RCT of a nurse specialist service for newly diagnosed people, showed that people who were less well informed at baseline seemed to benefit. Those in the lowest quartile of knowledge scores at baseline improved their knowledge levels significantly 6 months later, relative to the least well-informed people who had not seen the nurse specialist. This suggests, perhaps, that people who are already well-informed have less scope for improving their knowledge and that, therefore, the additional information that a nurse specialist might provide adds little. By contrast, when people are relatively poorly informed about epilepsy there is more scope for change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 1996 and associated papers</td>
<td>Nurse specialist and nurse-led clinic</td>
<td>EKP-G: medical, social and total score</td>
<td>Baseline and c. 6m later</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridsdale 2000</td>
<td>Two appointments with a nurse specialist</td>
<td>Median EKP-G total score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Quartile 1 48.5</td>
<td>Quartile 2 43.4</td>
<td>Quartile 3 41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6m later</td>
<td>Quartile 1 46.5</td>
<td>Quartile 2 43.2</td>
<td>Quartile 3 42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton 1996</td>
<td>Tertiary assessment centre</td>
<td>N (%) of patients rating service offered as 'very important' in relation to learning about epilepsy</td>
<td>Immediately before discharge</td>
<td>36/76 (47%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstein 1997</td>
<td>Out-patient clinic in tertiary referral centre</td>
<td>Mean (SD) EKP-G total score. Max possible =55</td>
<td>At clinic or soon after</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.94 (5.85)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) EKP-P (questions 3-8 only – max possible =15)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.77 (2.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EKP-G Epilepsy Knowledge Profile - General
EKP-P Epilepsy Knowledge Profile – Personal
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1. Analysed by quartile scores at baseline
2. This p value seems unlikely given the median scores reported.

Neither of the other two studies formally explored change over time, although Upton 1996 reported that 47 per cent of patients discharged from a tertiary assessment centre had found the service ‘very important’ in relation to learning about epilepsy. This was a lower proportion than was recorded for family members or carers (63%). Goldstein 1997 simply tested patients’ knowledge about epilepsy at a single point - when they attended an outpatient clinic in a tertiary centre or soon after.

2.18 Communication

Five studies, none of them RCTs, reported some aspect of communication, either between professionals, or between the person with a LTNC and professionals (Table 2.19).

Only one of the studies (Castleton, 2005) was about multi-disciplinary team working or integrated care (so described), in this case for people with PD. The others were about GP care with access to a nurse specialist for people with epilepsy (Lambert, 2001); the personal list system in general practice and its effect on epilepsy care (Freeman, 1994); an epilepsy out-patient clinic in a tertiary referral centre (Goldstein, 1997); and a user-led care pathway for people with PD that had an explicit focus on information transfer between patients and professionals (Holloway, 2006). Again, then, we find a lack of information about an outcome that might be assumed to be central to many of the models of care – and specifically those about multi-disciplinary working – evaluated in the studies we reviewed.

Of the three comparative studies only one (Castleton, 2005) formally assessed communication before and after the integrated model of care was introduced. No results were reported directly but the authors suggest that professionals ‘in general’ reported more effective communication between themselves, with a PD nurse specialist being the main channel through which this was achieved. A ‘slight increase’ in informal discussion and meetings was also mentioned.

Holloway (2006) explored with 22 PD patients their use and the perceived usefulness of two paper-based systems introduced specifically to improve communication. Seventeen people reported that the ‘Problems/Needs form’ provided an accurate description of their symptoms and problems, and 15 that it had helped them make the most of their consultation with their neurologist. Fewer - 14 - had found the Clinic Summary (a summary of need, with identification of issues for monitoring and a note of any referrals to be made) useful. Further, professionals outside of the outpatient clinic where it was completed had rarely consulted the Clinic Summary (Holloway, 2006: 68).
### Table 2.19 Communication in team or with patient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert 2001</td>
<td>GP care with access to nurse specialist</td>
<td>% of GPs without or with access to nurse specialist wanting: Joint clinics with specialist epilepsy services</td>
<td>One-off survey</td>
<td>16% yes 60% no 24% unsure (n=302)</td>
<td>2/10 yes 3/10 no 5/10 unsure</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 4.11, \text{ df}=2, p=.128$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Co-operation cards'</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>66% yes 22% no 13% unsure</td>
<td>8/10 yes 0/10 no 2/10 unsure</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 2.85, \text{ df}=2, p=.240$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular teaching on epilepsy</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>65% yes 25% no 11% unsure</td>
<td>5/10 yes 2/10 no 3/10 unsure</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 3.66, \text{ df}=2, p=.160$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman 1994</td>
<td>Personal list system in general practice</td>
<td>% 2 mentioning discussion of: Stopping treatment</td>
<td>At interview</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>55% no one 35% usual GP 7% other GP (42% any GP) 3% specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stigma</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td>82% no one 9% usual GP 5% other GP (15% any GP) 3% specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concealment</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td>64% no one 28% usual GP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstein 1997</td>
<td>Out-patient clinic in tertiary referral centre</td>
<td>% of patients reporting being given information on side-effects of AEDs</td>
<td>At the clinic</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>40% never given information</td>
<td>33% given a little but not enough information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parkinson's disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castleton 2005</td>
<td>Integrated care across health and social care services</td>
<td>Questionnaire to health and LA staff about patterns of communication</td>
<td>Pre- and post-implementation</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported directly. 'General' report of more effective communication with PD nurse being main channel. Also 'slight increase' in informal discussion and meetings as tool for problem solving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holloway 2006 and associated papers</td>
<td>User-led care pathway</td>
<td>N who felt that 'Problems/Needs form' : Provided accurate description of</td>
<td>12m after implementation of care pathway</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>symptoms and problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helped them to make most of consultation with neurologist</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N reporting usefulness of Clinic Summary form</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9/22 very useful 5/22 quite useful 5/22 not very useful 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AEDs Anti-epileptic drugs
LA Local authority

1. Our analysis
2. Calculated by us
3. Not clear what the other 2/22 felt
Freeman (1994) simply surveyed the proportions of patients who mentioned discussing a range of epilepsy-related issues with their GP or specialist. However, the data were also analysed to explore whether increased continuity of care in primary care\(^3\) was associated with patients being more likely to discuss these issues with their usual GP or any GP in the practice. The analysis suggested that this form of continuity of care was associated with a significantly greater likelihood (expressed as an odds ratio) of discussing the issues with the ‘usual’ GP, but not with discussing the issues with ‘any GP’ in the practice. It is difficult to understand what conclusion to draw from this analysis. By definition, if someone has had two or more recent consultations with the same GP (presumably their ‘usual’ GP) this, of itself, will have increased the opportunities to have discussed the issues with their usual GP. The analysis thus seems circular.

Goldstein (1997) also surveyed epilepsy patients at a single point, while they were attending an outpatient clinic. Only 25 per cent of those surveyed felt that they had ever been given sufficient information about the side effects of their AEDs. However, without comparative data it is difficult to know how to interpret this finding in relation to communication with patients.

Finally, Lambert (2001) surveyed GPs with and without access to an epilepsy nurse specialist to identify whether they felt they needed additional support in providing epilepsy care. GPs with access to a specialist nurse were slightly more likely to say that they would like joint clinics with specialist epilepsy services or to use ‘co-operation cards’\(^4\) and slightly less likely to say that they wanted regular teaching on epilepsy. None of these differences was large enough to reach statistical significance, although the numbers of GPs who had access to a nurse specialist was very much smaller than those who did not (10 and 302 respectively).

### 2.19 Staff views about the model of care

Three studies, none of them RCTs, reported some aspect of staff views about the model of care being evaluated (Table 2.20). Oeseburg (2004) interviewed nurse specialists about transmural care for people with MS; Castleton (2005) used a questionnaire to survey health and local authority staff about an integrated care system for people with PD, and Holloway (2006) carried out interviews with a neurologist and a nurse specialist about their views of a user-led care pathway for PD.

---

\(^3\) Defined as two or more of the last 12 GP consultations being with the same doctor.

\(^4\) Medical notes shared between the GP and hospital, similar to those used for ante-natal care.
## Table 2.20 Staff views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple sclerosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeseburg 2004</td>
<td>Transmural care (same as Jansen?)</td>
<td>Interviews with nurse specialists</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Were positive about model of care but identified some problem areas. 1. Patient care file improved information exchange between professionals and between professionals and patients, but was additional to other records and was time-consuming to use. 2. Despite existing records, transfer of information between professionals was scarce. Nurse specialist sometime found it difficult to get information from relevant professional, some of whom were reluctant to co-operate because co-ordination is usually GP’s task.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parkinson’s disease</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleton 2005</td>
<td>Integrated care across health and social care services</td>
<td>Questionnaire to health and LA staff</td>
<td>At end of study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Team said to have learned to work together in non-competitive, non-judgemental way. Availability of specialist help via nurses and consultant seen as helpful. PD nurse allowed increased ownership of service and allowed better co-ordination. Clinics at health centre facilitated information exchange and advice. Access to GP notes by consultant was beneficial. Protocol eliminated inappropriate diagnosis and prescribing by GPs. Patients received more personalised service from consultant at local health centre and actively sought information about condition. More accurate information available to all.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway 2006</td>
<td>User-led care pathway</td>
<td>Face to face Interview with neurologist.</td>
<td>At 12m follow-up</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Felt intervention facilitated development of partnership with patients, assisting in better treatment and management of disease.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone interview with nurse specialist</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Most important benefit identified as patient and carer empowerment, through increasing capacity for self-management and helping them to access more effective treatment</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three studies identified positive staff views about the model of care, but these positives tended to be different for each. However, there were some commonalities in two of the studies. For example, those working in an integrated care system (Castleton, 2005) referred to improvements in joint working, improved information exchange, and increase personalisation of care that, in its turn, seemed to increase the active participation of patients in seeking information about their care. Similarly, professionals involved in the user-led care pathway (Holloway, 2006) felt that it had increased the sense of partnership between patients and professionals, and empowered patients and carers by increasing their capacity for self-management.

2.20 Discussion

Despite recent growth in the evaluative literature on models of care for people with LTNCs that might enhance their experience of continuity of care, the evidence base about the best models to adopt remains under-developed. Because of the range of models evaluated, across different LTNCs, the number of high quality, controlled evaluations of any individual model is limited.

The overall picture from studies that reported access to or use of services as an outcome of the model of care was very mixed. However, this confused picture is partly because service use was not always adequately reported before and after the introduction of a new model of care, even when the evaluation was an RCT. Further, providing additional services was sometimes the point of the model of care, especially in multi-disciplinary teams, so the demonstrated increases were expected. Where models were less service-oriented (for example, patient education or information giving) less or even no impact was evident.

Introducing care standards, even with offers of support, made little difference to epilepsy care in a large RCT, mainly because so few of the primary care practices in the study implemented any aspect of the standards. By contrast, a much simpler set of epilepsy care standards, implemented and audited, did achieve change in a non-randomised study. This suggests that different mechanisms may have been at play (not least the sense of ownership of the standards when they are developed and introduced locally) which deserve to be tested more closely.

Fewer than half of the studies we reviewed included any assessment of service users’ views about the model of care. Overall, the results reviewed suggested that service users valued the new models of care that they were being offered, but with so little comparative information it is difficult to judge whether this reflects their gratitude for receiving any service, or whether the model being evaluated really was better than anything else.
Seventeen studies reported some aspect of disability or impairment but there was no consistent or conclusive evidence across the studies about positive or negative impact on this outcome. However, three RCTs of models that involved some aspect of education or training for service users did suggest better outcomes for intervention groups; this seems to be a potentially valuable avenue of future research.

There was no evidence from the studies reviewed that integrated models of care had better clinical outcomes than ‘usual care’, but neither was there any secure evidence that they had worse clinical outcomes. In terms of those models of care that involve changes in skill-mix (for example, substitution of medical specialist by nurse specialist care) or which involve delivery of care closer to the service user’s home (the home-based IV service) the apparent similarity of clinical outcomes is encouraging.

Only three studies reported mortality as an outcome. Both specialist care for people with MND/ALS and specialist palliative care for people with MS were associated with somewhat longer survival, compared to usual care. There was no difference in mortality outcomes in a study of nurse specialist care for people with PD.

Although reported in nine RCTs and six other types of study, there was little secure evidence of any beneficial effect on quality of life, as measured by the particular instruments used, from any of the models of care evaluated.

Similarly, there was little suggestion that any of the models of care studied improved (or, indeed, worsened) mental health, although there were some small changes in favour of intervention groups on a range of depression measures. Only one study reported impact on coping or stress and, again, with no evidence of positive or negative effects.

The small reductions in hospital admission and/or length of stay for the models of care evaluated, particularly those that are multi-disciplinary, look promising. However, the low number of studies and the small numbers of participants within them suggest that the impact of these models of care remains to be evaluated in relation to these particular outcomes. Related to this, the included studies that reported any type of health economics data suggest, as one might expect, that home-based services are cheaper than out-patient services, without any increase in adverse events (see above). However, this is based on only two studies. Neither nurse specialist services for people with LTNCs nor multi-disciplinary team approaches appear yet to have been adequately researched in relation to outcomes as against costs.

The one study that reported comparative costs for service users or their families suggest that home-based IV is less costly for patients and their families, although
there was a question mark over whether re-imbursement of transport costs for those who had out-patient treatment had been taken into account. The very few studies that looked at wider social or economic impacts on service users or their families came to no clear conclusions overall. Similarly, the lack of comparative data makes it impossible to say anything secure about the effect of the evaluated models of care on service users’ expressed needs for support.

None of the interventions included in our review that provided some element of patient education or advice included the service users’ knowledge of their condition as an outcome. This is a puzzling gap, especially in the context of increased emphasis on self-care and ‘personalisation’ and flags up an area that deserves further research. Only two of the four studies that did report patient knowledge as an outcome (and both of which were about nurse specialists) provided comparative data. One showed no overall improvement of knowledge levels for those receiving a nurse specialist service, while the second showed that people who started out with a low level of knowledge about their newly diagnosed epilepsy did increase their knowledge if they had received the service. Again, this suggests a potentially fruitful area for future research.

There were no clear messages overall from the studies reviewed about whether models of care that might deliver better continuity of care promoted better communication, either between professionals, or between professionals and service users. However, relatively few studies actually considered communication as a possible outcome. This relative neglect in the evaluative literature of this important issue for people with long-term conditions is puzzling.

The findings about professionals’ views about the models of care that were evaluated, albeit from only a few studies, confirm what other literature on joint or integrated working has suggested over many years - that professionals seem to like working in this way. The lack of high quality, comparative evidence about service users’ views about these ways of delivering care and services remains.
3. Descriptive studies

One hundred and twenty-seven descriptions of models of care were included in this part of the review. These were taken from publications that were exclusively descriptive, as well as papers related to the 48 models of care included in the evaluative part of the review (see Chapter 2). Full bibliographical details of papers reviewed are in Appendices 5 and 6.

The focus of this element of the review was the content of service models that might deliver continuity of care (see Chapter 1). We therefore extracted data that described the model of care, where it was delivered, the conditions it covered, who was involved in delivering the model of care, what service elements were included, aspects of service delivery and organisation, and what type of continuity of care it delivered. In order to address the last question, we used the conceptual framework of continuity of care developed by Freeman and colleagues (Freeman et al., 2001; 2002) as the basis for our analysis. This model has developed over time, and in the report of the full project we describe how these developments influenced our analysis of material in the case studies. However, the review described here was carried out relatively early in the project and we therefore used the model of continuity originally outlined in our research proposal. Our work on the review also suggested a further type of continuity of care – that of personal agency – not covered by the Freeman model. We defined this as continuity that enabled people to retain control over their own lives and to manage their own health and well-being, and we have included it in the analysis of the descriptive material that we present here.

3.1 Conditions covered

The conditions that the models of care targeted varied. None of the papers included was about migraine, muscular dystrophy, or stroke in younger people. The most commonly mentioned condition was multiple sclerosis (41 papers) followed by epilepsy (36 papers), and Parkinson's disease (36 papers). There were 17 papers about models of care for motor neurone disease, five about dystonia or ataxia, and one each about cerebral palsy, Huntington's disease, head injury, and spinal injury. Four papers mentioned ‘general' neurological conditions, 18 all or any neurological conditions, and four other, named conditions. As these figures suggest, some models of care dealt with more than one condition – 20 with two conditions, three with three and four with four conditions. Multiple sclerosis and Parkinson's Disease were the conditions most likely to be covered by models of care targeting more than one disease.
3.2 Models of care

There was a wide range of models of care reported. Overall, 59 per cent of papers (n=74) reported a single approach to delivering continuity of care. Of these, the majority were accounts of multi-disciplinary teams or clinics (26) or clinical nurse specialists (12). The other models were self-care interventions (7), assessment and disease management initiatives (6), methods to facilitate access to care (5), disease registers (3), and nurse-led clinics (2). There were 13 separate ‘other’ models of care, ranging from a clinical managed network to a project that explored the effect on continuity of care of always seeing the same general practitioner.

Among the 52 papers reporting models of care with more than one aspect to them, assessment and disease management initiatives were the most commonly mentioned (23), followed by clinical nurse specialists (18) and multi-disciplinary teams or clinics (15). The other models mentioned were nurse-led clinics (9), disease registers (7), methods to facilitate access to care (6), self-care initiatives (5), professional-led care pathways (2), GPs with special interests (3), palliative care (2), professional training (2) and a user-led care pathway. There were 32 separate ‘other’ models of care, ranging from a rapid response team for administering intra-venous therapy at home to a specialist transition clinic for young people moving onto adult services.

There was little common overlap in provision among the papers reporting more than one aspect to the model of care. Some multi-disciplinary teams and clinical nurse specialists were associated with assessment and disease management (4 and 5 cases respectively). Some initiatives to improve access to care were also associated with assessment and disease management (6 cases). Beyond these, however, there were few obvious patterns among the models of care.

Overall, then, the most commonly reported models of care were multi-disciplinary teams or clinics (41 in total), clinical nurse specialists (30 in total) and assessment and disease management initiatives (29 in total). For the purposes of the analysis that follows, we explore these three models and their characteristics separately.

3.3 Multi-disciplinary teams or clinics

Twenty-two of the 41 multi-disciplinary teams (MDTs) or clinics described were based in the UK. The next largest group was in the USA (6), followed by Australia (4), France (3), Canada (2), Ireland (2), Denmark (1) and Italy.
It was not wholly clear in seven of the 41 papers where the model of care was based or delivered. Of the remainder, 16 were delivered in a single setting, nine in two settings, six in three settings and three in four or more settings. As might be expected, multi-disciplinary teams or clinics were somewhat more likely to work in outpatient and in-patient settings although 12 also delivered services in patients’ own homes (Table 3.1). However, as Table 3.1 also shows, it was unusual for a multi-disciplinary model of care to be delivered exclusively at home; it was much more likely to be in conjunction with in-patient or/and outpatient or community delivery.

Table 3.1  Settings for multi-disciplinary teams or clinics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of setting</th>
<th>Team or clinic in one setting</th>
<th>Team or clinic in two settings</th>
<th>Team or clinic in three settings</th>
<th>Team or clinic in four settings</th>
<th>Not known or unclear</th>
<th>Total N (%) of teams or clinics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-patient</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-patient</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known/unclear</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of teams</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Sums to more than 100% because of multiple coding.

Some conditions were more and some less likely to be associated with MDTs or clinics than were others. Ten of the 17 papers on motor neurone disease (MND) and 19 of the 41 papers on multiple sclerosis (MS) reported MDTs or clinics. By contrast, only three of the 36 papers on epilepsy were about MDTs or clinics. In all these cases, the differences were statistically significant.

There were 13 accounts of MDTs or clinics for Parkinson’s Disease (PD), one for cerebral palsy, and head injury, and none for Huntington’s disease or spinal injury. In none of these conditions were MDTs or clinics more or less likely to be reported than other models of care.

Our data extraction for the descriptive review included the question, ‘What is this model of care?’ Although all the papers in this section were MDTs or clinics, some also included elements of other models of care. So, for example, four MDTs or clinics also provided assessment services, two maintained a disease register, two included a clinical nurse specialist, one a general practitioner with a special interest (GPSI), one a nurse-led clinic, and one provided palliative care. Other elements reported
included annual review (1), clinical team meetings (1), continence advisors (1), a hospital discharge and follow-up system (1), and a rehabilitation service (1).

We also extracted information on staffing of the MDTs or clinics, where given. These data need to be interpreted with care. First, if a particular profession was not mentioned in a paper, it was not always clear whether this was because this profession was not actually represented in the MDT or clinic, or was because the authors of the paper had not reported all types of staff involved. Phrases such as ‘staff involved included …’ were common. Secondly, papers did not always include detailed information about the staff. For example, a ‘specialist nurse’, with no other details reported, could have been a neurological specialist, a continence specialist, or could have had some other specialist training. Similar issues arose with doctors and therapists. In all cases where specialism was referred to but the type of specialty was not reported, we recorded ‘specialty not specified’. The proportions in Table 3.2, therefore, represent the minimum levels of different staff in each MDT or clinic and the minimum levels of neurological specialist staff in each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2  Number and proportion of MDTs or clinics with specified staff compared with other models of care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specialty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nurses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology acute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specialist community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specialist acute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General acute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Therapists:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational therapist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and language therapist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite these provisos, as Table 3.2 shows, MDTs and clinics were significantly different from other models of care in ways that one might have expected. All types of therapy staff, psychologists, social workers and care co-ordinators or care managers were more likely to be mentioned in papers describing MDTs and clinics than papers describing other models. Rehabilitation medicine specialists were also more likely in MDT teams, but they were no more or less likely to contain neurologists.

Also as might be expected in models of care described as multi-disciplinary, there were significantly higher numbers of different types of professionals working in MDTs and clinics than in other models of care; over two-thirds contained at least six different types of professional (Table 3.3).

Table 3.3  Number of different type of professionals in MDTs or clinics, compared with other models of care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>N (%) of models of care with different types of professionals by number of professionals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDT or clinic</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>12 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35 (42)</td>
<td>32 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36 (29)</td>
<td>44 (35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing = 2
Data extracted from the papers about the elements of service provided by models of care covered diagnosis, assessment, care plans, care co-ordination and care management, drugs monitoring and review, equipment supply, providing information, goal setting, overall monitoring, and multi-disciplinary meetings, among others. As Table 3.4 shows, there were relatively few significant differences in the elements reported for MDTs and clinics, compared to other models of care. As might be expected, given the higher representation of therapists in the MDTs and clinics, rehabilitation input was much more likely to be reported, alongside the assessment of disability or impairment. MDTs were also more likely, again as would be expected, to involve multi-disciplinary meetings or consultation. Other elements of care that MDTs were more likely to be providing were diagnosis of a condition and palliative care. Beyond these factors, MDTs or clinics were no more likely than other models of care to provide any other elements of care. By contrast, they were apparently less likely to provide information, education or training for professionals than were other models.

Table 3.4  Number and proportion of MDTs or clinics providing different elements of care compared with other models of care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements provided</th>
<th>N (%) of MDTs or clinics</th>
<th>N (%) of other models of care</th>
<th>p =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
<td>7 (17)</td>
<td>5 (6)</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>16 (39)</td>
<td>23 (27)</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability/impairment</td>
<td>13 (32)</td>
<td>8 (9)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service need</td>
<td>10 (24)</td>
<td>18 (21)</td>
<td>0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing need</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>9 (11)</td>
<td>0.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12 (29)</td>
<td>24 (28)</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-held care file¹</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (6)</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-held care file</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>11 (13)</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-held care plan²</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>0.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-held care plan³</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
<td>11 (13)</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care or service co-ordination</td>
<td>10 (24)</td>
<td>22 (26)</td>
<td>0.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care management</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>9 (11)</td>
<td>0.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/medication review</td>
<td>7 (17)</td>
<td>18 (21)</td>
<td>0.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/aids supply</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
<td>4 (5)</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>7 (17)</td>
<td>8 (9)</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/education/training for carer</td>
<td>16 (39)</td>
<td>31 (36)</td>
<td>0.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/education/training for patient</td>
<td>23 (56)</td>
<td>49 (57)</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/education/training for professionals</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
<td>27 (31)</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and review</td>
<td>15 (37)</td>
<td>27 (31)</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 33.005, \text{ df}=2, \text{ p}<.000\]
Finally, in this section about MDTs and clinics we turn to the issue of what type of continuity of care was delivered by this model. This was the most subjective part of our review, because while papers might use the concept of continuity of care as a way of describing what the models of care did, none were based on the Freeman conceptual framework (Freeman et al., 2001; 2002). Further, our judgements about what type of continuity might be involved in the model were necessarily limited by the details presented in the papers. Despite this, there were apparent differences in the descriptions of MDTs and clinics and other models of care (Table 3.5).

**Table 3.5 Number and proportion of MDTs and clinics delivering different types of continuity of care compared with other models of care**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of continuity of care</th>
<th>N (%) of MDTs or clinics</th>
<th>N (%) of other models of care</th>
<th>p =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-boundary, team</td>
<td>31 (76)</td>
<td>44 (51)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
<td>17 (20)</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>8 (20)</td>
<td>32 (37)</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>15 (37)</td>
<td>5 (6)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>6 (15)</td>
<td>7 (8)</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal agency</td>
<td>10 (24)</td>
<td>29 (34)</td>
<td>0.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational, personal, therapeutic</td>
<td>8 (20)</td>
<td>19 (22)</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social context</td>
<td>7 (17)</td>
<td>11 (13)</td>
<td>0.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N (100%) 35 75

p using Pearson chi-squared (two-sided)

MDTs and clinics were significantly more likely to deliver cross-boundary or team continuity (as would be expected). They were also more likely to deliver longitudinal continuity; the continuity that comes with care provided from as few professionals as possible, over time, consistent with need. There was no obvious relationship between the two types of continuity in the papers reviewed. In relation to most other types of continuity, MDTs and clinics seemed less likely than other models of care to deliver them, although, with the exception of informational continuity, not at a level that reached statistical significance.

3.4 Clinical nurse specialists

Thirty models of care in total involved clinical nurse specialists (CNSs) either as a stand-alone model or in combination with some other aspect of care. The majority of papers (22) described CNS services in the UK, four in the USA, three in France and in one it was not entirely clear where the service was based.

It was not wholly clear in two papers where the CNS service was delivered. Among the remainder, 17 services were delivered in a single setting, seven in two settings, and four in three or more settings. CNSs were no more or less likely than other models of care to be working in in-patient (30% for both), out-patient (37% and 45% respectively) and community settings (45% and 27%), but were significantly less likely to be working in patients’ own homes (17% and 39%, $\chi^2 = 5.073$, df=2, p=0.024). As Table 3.6 shows, hospital settings, whether in-patient or out-patient were the most common settings for CNSs, followed by community settings, other settings and patients’ own homes.

Table 3.6 Settings for clinical nurse specialists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of setting</th>
<th>CNS in one setting</th>
<th>CNS in two settings</th>
<th>CNS in three settings</th>
<th>CNS in four settings</th>
<th>Not known or not clear</th>
<th>Total N (%) of CNSs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-patient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-patient</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other community</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known or not clear</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of CNSs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Sums to more than 100% because of multiple coding

Twelve (40%) CNS services were associated with epilepsy, 14 (47%) with PD five (17%) with MS, three with any or all neurological conditions and one with another specific condition (dystonia/ataxia). As this suggests, some services were associated with two conditions – two for both PD and any/all neurological conditions, one for MS and any/all neurological conditions, one for both epilepsy and MS, and one for both PD and dystonia/ataxia. There were no CNS services for any other condition. Difference in provision for different conditions was statistically significant in relation to MND ($\chi^2 = 6.07, \text{df}=1, p=0.014$) and MS ($\chi^2 = 4.382, \text{df}=1, p=0.036$) where there were fewer papers about CNS services than other models of care. By contrast, there was a higher than expected proportion of papers about CNS services for PD ($\chi^2 = 6.409, \text{df}=1, p=0.011$).

As with MDTs and clinics, some CNSs provided or were associated with other models of care. Thus, two papers mentioned a model that provided screening or ‘prescription’ for access to care, five an assessment and management model, three a disease register, two a GP with special interest in neurology, five a nurse-led clinic, and two a MDT or clinic. Other elements reported (in each case once only) included self care, audit and review by a specialist team in primary care, a clinical management programme, an epilepsy liaison service, a multi-disciplinary care protocol, a national guideline, a team for younger people with physical impairments, and a rapid response service for outpatient IV treatment.

CNS services are, by definition, often uni-professional. This is reflected in the findings in Table 3.7. Here we see that CNSs were, as one would expect, significantly more likely than other models of care to involve neurology specialist nurses, whether acute- or community-based. By contrast, they were significantly less likely than other models of care to be working in teams that included neurologists, therapy professionals, psychologists and social workers. This is not to say that CNSs did not work with such professionals, of course, or that they were not seen as members of teams. Rather it reflects the intention of many of the papers reporting CNS services, which tended to focus on the single clinical role, rather than its place in a multi-professional context. However, it was the case that some CNS services, and particularly those in primary care, were effectively lone workers, albeit that they might be providing outreach from or in-reach to a hospital-based neurology service.
### Table 3.7  Number and proportion of CNS services with specified staff compared with other models of care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>N (% of CNS services)</th>
<th>N (% of other models of care)</th>
<th>p =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology</td>
<td>6 (20)</td>
<td>40 (41)</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>14 (14)</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specialty</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>17 (18)</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty not specified</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>11 (11)</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nurses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology community</td>
<td>15 (50)</td>
<td>11 (11)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology acute</td>
<td>12 (40)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specialist community</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>8 (8)</td>
<td>0.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specialist acute</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty not specified</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>17 (18)</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General community</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General acute</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General not specified</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>13 (13)</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Therapists:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapist</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>44 (45)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational therapist</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>43 (44)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and language therapist</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>34 (35)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietician</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>20 (21)</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other therapist</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>11 (11)</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty not specified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>0.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other staff:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25 (26)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>0.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>33 (34)</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services, so described</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary organisation</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>14 (14)</td>
<td>0.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator/care manager</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>13 (13)</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General practitioner</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
<td>11 (11)</td>
<td>0.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other member of staff</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>25 (26)</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N (100%)</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p using Pearson chi-squared (two-sided)

The results in Table 3.8 further underline the uni-professional nature of CNS services. This shows that they were more likely to involve teams containing only one type of professional (47% compared to 23% of other models of care) and much less likely to
involve teams containing six or more different types of professional (10% compared with 44%).

Table 3.8  Number of different type of professionals in CNS services, compared with other models of care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>1 (N=36)</th>
<th>2-5 (N=44)</th>
<th>6 or more (N=45)</th>
<th>Total (N=125)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNS service</td>
<td>14 (47)</td>
<td>12 (43)</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22 (23)</td>
<td>31 (33)</td>
<td>42 (44)</td>
<td>95 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36 (29)</td>
<td>44 (35)</td>
<td>45 (36)</td>
<td>125 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases =2
Χ² = 12.529, df=2, p=.002

Table 3.9 shows the elements of care provided by CNS services, as described in the papers. This shows only a few significant differences in the care provided by CNS services compared to other models of care. CNS services were less likely to include multi-disciplinary team meetings, reflecting the uni-professional picture described above. No CNS services involved diagnosis of condition, as might be expected, and rather more were involved in providing advice, contact or a help-line service (33% compared to 12% in other models of care).

Table 3.9  Number and proportion of CNS services providing different elements of care compared with other models of care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements provided</th>
<th>N (%) of CNS services</th>
<th>N (%) of other models of care</th>
<th>p =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (12)</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>8 (27)</td>
<td>31 (32)</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability/impairment</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>18 (19)</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service need</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td>23 (24)</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing need</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
<td>8 (8)</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>29 (29)</td>
<td>0.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-held care file¹</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-held care file</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
<td>8 (8)</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-held care plan²</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-held care plan³</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>13 (13)</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care or service co-ordination</td>
<td>9 (30)</td>
<td>23 (23)</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care management</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/medication review</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>18 (19)</td>
<td>0.565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite relatively few differences between CNS services and other models in terms of the elements of care delivered, a different pattern of provision of continuity of care was evident from the papers reviewed. As Table 3.10 shows, the papers about CNS services were much more likely to describe delivering relational, personal, therapeutic continuity and flexible continuity of care. This first difference is not entirely surprising, given that the definition of this type of continuity relates to one or more, named, individual professionals with whom the service user can establish and maintain a consistent, therapeutic relationship. Nonetheless, it does suggest that this is what CNS services are, indeed, able to do. Further, it is not something that the descriptions of MDTs referred to in any numbers.

One might have assumed that flexible continuity – where input can adjust to the needs of the individual over time – would be related to relational continuity but no pattern of this sort was obvious from these descriptive papers. Those describing relational continuity were no more or less likely also to describe flexible continuity.
Table 3.10  Number and proportion of CNS services delivering different types of continuity of care compared with other models of care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of continuity of care</th>
<th>N (%) of CNS services</th>
<th>N (%) of other models of care</th>
<th>p =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-boundary, team</td>
<td>17 (57)</td>
<td>58 (60)</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>11 (37)</td>
<td>11 (11)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>6 (20)</td>
<td>34 (35)</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>18 (19)</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>11 (11)</td>
<td>0.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal agency</td>
<td>8 (27)</td>
<td>31 (32)</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational, personal, therapeutic</td>
<td>15 (50)</td>
<td>12 (12)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social context</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>15 (16)</td>
<td>0.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (100%)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p using Pearson chi-squared (two-sided)

3.5 Assessment and disease management models of care

Thirteen of the 29 assessment and disease management models (ADMMs) of care included in the descriptive review were based in the UK. Six were in the USA, four in Canada, two in France, two in the Netherlands, and one each in Denmark and Ireland.

Over a third (11) of the models were delivered in a single setting, ten in two settings, and eight in three or more settings (Table 3.11). These models were no more or less likely than other models of care to be delivered in in-patient (35% and 29% respectively), out-patient (55% and 39%), home (45% and 30%), or other community settings (38% and 29%). They were slightly more likely to be delivered in any other setting (41% and 23%) although this, and the slightly higher proportion of ADMMs in each setting, reflects that they were somewhat more likely than other models to be delivered in three or more settings.
Table 3.11 Settings for assessment and disease management models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of setting</th>
<th>Model in one setting</th>
<th>Model in two settings</th>
<th>Model in three settings</th>
<th>Model in four settings</th>
<th>Model in five settings</th>
<th>Total N (%) assessment and disease management models ¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-patient</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-patient</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of models</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹. Sums to more than 100% because of multiple coding

None of the ADMMs described were for people with cerebral palsy, head injury, Huntington’s Disease, MND, or spinal injury. The largest number (12) focused on epilepsy, followed by MS (10), and PD (6). Three models were for general neurological conditions, five for any or all long-term neurological conditions and one specifically for dystonia/ataxia. As these figures suggest, some ADMMs provided services for more than one condition. Two targeted PD and any or another neurological conditions, two had a general neurological focus, dealing with any or all conditions, one had a general neurological focus but mentioned dystonia/ataxia specifically, one targeted epilepsy and MS, one MS and PD, and one MS with other neurological conditions. Ten per cent of ADMMs were for general neurology, compared to only one per cent of other models ($\chi^2 = 6.378$, df=2, $p=0.012$). By contrast, there were no ADMMs for MND, compared to 17 per cent of other models ($\chi^2 = 5.808$, df=2, $P=0.016$). There were no other significant differences in relation to condition targeted.

Like other models of care reviewed in this chapter, ADMMs were sometimes associated with other types of provision. Six provided access to other services, five were also associated with a CNS service and four a MDT or clinic, three were associated with self-care, two a nurse-led clinic, two with disease registers, one with a professionally-led care pathway, and one with professional training. Several (7) were also associated with specialist clinics or centres that delivered a range of services.

The staff most commonly involved in assessment and disease management models of care were, as might be expected, neurologists (Table 3.12). Further, neurologists were significantly more likely to be involved in these models of care than in others. These models were slightly less likely than others were to involve general practitioners, and a higher proportion included social workers, although neither difference was large enough to reach statistical significance. There were no other
differences in the types of professionals involved in assessment and disease management models.

Table 3.12  Number and proportion of assessment and disease management models with specified staff compared with other models of care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>N (%) of assessment and disease management models</th>
<th>N (%) of other models of care</th>
<th>p =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology</td>
<td>15 (52)</td>
<td>31 (32)</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>0.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specialty</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>17 (17)</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty not specified</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nurses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology community</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td>21 (21)</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology acute</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>19 (19)</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specialist community</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>0.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specialist acute</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>0.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty not specified</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>15 (15)</td>
<td>0.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General community</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General acute</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General not specified</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Therapists:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapist</td>
<td>11 (38)</td>
<td>36 (37)</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational therapist</td>
<td>11 (38)</td>
<td>35 (36)</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and language therapist</td>
<td>8 (28)</td>
<td>29 (30)</td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietician</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td>16 (16)</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other therapist</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty not specified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>0.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other staff:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>7 (24)</td>
<td>18 (18)</td>
<td>0.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>24 (25)</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services, so described</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary organisation</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>13 (13)</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator/care manager</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General practitioner</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>14 (14)</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other member of staff</td>
<td>7 (24)</td>
<td>21 (21)</td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (100%)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p using Pearson chi-squared (two-sided)
1. 2 cases not known
Assessment and disease management models of care were no more or less likely than other models to be uni- or multi-professional in composition (Table 3.13). Most teams (44%) had between two and five different types of professionals involved.

Table 3.13  Number of different type of professionals in assessment and disease management models, compared with other models of care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>N (%) of models with different types of professionals by number of professionals</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2-5</th>
<th>6 or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and disease management</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 1.246$, df=2, $p= 0.536$

As one might expect, assessment and disease management models of care were more likely than other models of care to provide diagnoses and to assess service users' condition (Table 3.14). Beyond this, however, there were few other differences. Assessment and disease management models were slightly more likely than other models to assess nursing need, and to provide information, education or training for professionals than were other models of care but neither difference reached conventional levels of statistical significance. They were also somewhat more likely to provide other forms of assessment. These included home safety assessment (1), multi-disciplinary assessment (1), pre-operative assessment (1), psychosocial assessment (2), and assessment of side-effects of treatment (1).

Table 3.14  Number and proportion of assessment and disease management models providing different elements of care compared with other models of care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements provided</th>
<th>N (%) of assessment and disease management models</th>
<th>N (%) of other models of care</th>
<th>$p =$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
<td>6 (21)</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>13 (45)</td>
<td>26 (26)</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability/impairment</td>
<td>6 (21)</td>
<td>15 (15)</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service need</td>
<td>8 (28)</td>
<td>20 (20)</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing need</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>24 (25)</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-held care file$^1$</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-held care file</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-held care plan$^2$</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-held care plan$^3$</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
<td>12 (12)</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements provided</td>
<td>N (%) of assessment and disease management models</td>
<td>N (%) of other models of care</td>
<td>p =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care or service co-ordination</td>
<td>9 (31)</td>
<td>23 (24)</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care management</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/medication review</td>
<td>6 (21)</td>
<td>19 (19)</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/aids supply</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>8 (8)</td>
<td>.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>13 (13)</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/education/training for carer</td>
<td>10 (35)</td>
<td>37 (38)</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/education/training for patient</td>
<td>14 (48)</td>
<td>58 (59)</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/education/training for professionals</td>
<td>11 (38)</td>
<td>21 (21)</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and review</td>
<td>10 (35)</td>
<td>32 (33)</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-disciplinary meeting/consultation</td>
<td>7 (24)</td>
<td>25 (26)</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other clinical care</td>
<td>11 (38)</td>
<td>31 (32)</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palliative care</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/contact/help line</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
<td>18 (18)</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation care</td>
<td>6 (21)</td>
<td>21 (21)</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist clinics</td>
<td>6 (21)</td>
<td>13 (13)</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carers’ support group</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients’ support group</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemedicine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling care</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>18 (18)</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (100%)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p using Pearson chi-squared (two-sided)
1. 1 case in other model of care: not clear who holds case file
2. 4 cases in other model of care: not clear who holds care plan
3. 2 cases in other model of care: not clear who holds care plan

There were few differences between the type of continuity of care described in accounts of assessment and disease management models of care and other models of care (Table 3.15). The one statistically significant difference was in relation to experienced care – three of the four models described as delivering this were assessment and disease management models. However, the numbers involved here were very small. Other differences that approached conventional levels of statistical significance were flexible (adjusting to the needs of the person over time) and cross-boundary or team continuity, both of which were more likely to be described in papers about assessment and disease management models. By contrast, assessment and disease management models were somewhat less likely to be described as providing relational, personal or therapeutic continuity (provision of one or more named professionals with whom the service user can establish and maintain a consistent therapeutic relationship). This difference, again, was not statistically significant.
Table 3.15 Number and proportion of assessment and disease management models delivering different types of continuity of care compared with other models of care

| Type of continuity of care                  | N (%) of assessment and disease management models | N (%) of other models of care | p =  
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|------
| Cross-boundary, team                       | 21 (72)                                         | 54 (55)                      | .096 |
| Flexible                                   | 8 (28)                                          | 14 (14)                      | .096 |
| Informational                              | 12 (41)                                         | 28 (29)                      | .192 |
| Longitudinal                               | 3 (10)                                          | 17 (17)                      | .363 |
| Long-term                                  | 5 (17)                                          | 8 (8)                        | .157 |
| Personal agency                            | 9 (31)                                          | 30 (31)                      | .965 |
| Relational, personal, therapeutic          | 3 (10)                                          | 24 (25)                      | .102 |
| Social context                             | 4 (14)                                          | 14 (14)                      | .947 |
| Experienced                                | 3 (10)                                          | 1 (1)                        | .012 |
| N (100%)                                   |                                                 |                              |      |

p using Pearson chi-squared (two-sided)

3.6 Aspects of service delivery and organisation

As well as the characteristics of the different models of care described above, we extracted information from the reviewed papers about aspects of service delivery and organisation, where mentioned. This covered who was able to refer to the service (including patient or carer referral), what type of access arrangements were in place, what exclusion criteria, if any, were in place to manage access to the service, the age range served, whether access was time-limited, and who funded and who provided the service. Statements about most of these aspects of the models of care were relatively uncommon; in most cases, at least half of the papers reported nothing about these aspects of the model of care. Given this, we did not carry out any further analysis of this material.

3.7 Discussion

The literature on models of care for people with LTNCs seems to be dominated by three main conditions – MS, epilepsy and PD. To some extent, this reflects the epidemiology of these conditions but means that there is little evidence about models of care for people with some of the most challenging conditions, for example Huntington’s Disease and brain injury.
The material reviewed here shows, as one might expect, that the three predominant models of care for people with LTNCs described in the literature – multi-disciplinary teams or clinics, clinical nurse specialists, and assessment and disease management models – are different in their professional composition, size and operational bases. However, they also varied in their condition focus; for example, almost two-thirds of the included papers on models of care for people with MND were on MDTs and clinics, but fewer than one in ten of the papers on epilepsy. It is difficult to know whether this reflects real differences in service provision, or simply that papers about certain models of care for particular conditions may appear more novel or interesting and are therefore more likely to be published.

The descriptions of the three main models and the elements of care that they delivered were more similar than might have been expected, and the differences that were evident were largely ones that were easily explained. For example, descriptions of MDTs were more likely to refer to diagnosis, those of CNSs to providing advice, and those of ADMMs diagnosis and assessment of condition. Beyond these, there were few major differences in the elements of care provided.

Despite the similarities, the descriptions of the models did suggest that they facilitated somewhat difference types of continuity of care. Accounts of MDTs and clinics were more likely to mention aspects of cross-boundary or team continuity and longitudinal continuity. CNSs were more often associated with relational, personal and therapeutic continuity and with flexible continuity. By contrast, there were no obvious differences between the descriptions of ADMMs and other models of care. These differences, if real, do suggest that MDTs working with or alongside CNSs could facilitate a wider range of types of continuity of care for people with LTNCs than either could alone.

Our analysis of the material here was inevitably limited by the detail about the models of care being described or evaluated in the papers reviewed. Reporting of details of service delivery or organisation was particularly poor and we were unable to take our analysis of this any further.
4. Summary and conclusions

A ‘rapid’ systematic review of evidence about the outcomes of models of integrated care for people with long-term neurological conditions (LTNCs) reported here was the first stage of a larger project evaluating the National Service Framework for Long-Term Neurological Conditions. The full report of this work, its methods and findings is available (Bernard et al, 2010). This working paper is the technical report of the review.

4.1 Objectives

The first objective was to identify models of integrated service provision for people with LTNCs from the research literature and to evaluate their impact on different types of continuity of care. The second objective was to understand what the evaluative and descriptive research literature suggested about how best to achieve models of integrated care that delivered continuity.

4.2 Methods

A ‘rapid’ review searches systematically but not necessarily exhaustively for available evidence, critically appraises studies and sifts out those that are of poor quality. The material is then used to collate descriptive outlines of the evidence, provide an overview of it and what it says (Davies, 2003). We divided the work on our review into two parts. In the first, we dealt with the evaluative literature, and messages about the outcomes that models of integrated care could deliver. In the second part, we analysed descriptions of models of integrated care included in both the evaluative literature reviewed in the first part and in the wider descriptive literature. This reviewed evidence on how integrated models of care operated, who worked in them, what elements of service provision they included, and what types of continuity they appeared to deliver. Here and in the technical report, we called these two different approaches the ‘evaluative review’ and the ‘descriptive review’.

Full details of our main search strategy, including the electronic databases searched, the keyword strategy, search restrictions, additional searching strategies, inclusion and exclusion criteria and how these were developed, the selection of material for review, data extraction and quality assessment are all included in the technical report. Overall, we followed CRD guidance for systematic reviews (CRD, 2001) in all elements of both reviews, working together as a team to develop common understandings and checking our decision making throughout.
4.3 Analysis and outcomes

The evaluative review presented a narrative synthesis of quantitative findings from the primary studies reviewed. The outcomes reported were: access to and use of services; service users’ views of the model of care; disability and impairment; quality of life; clinical outcomes; mental health outcomes; hospital admission and length of stay; impact on family or carers; expressed need; knowledge of the condition; communication; costs to the health service, costs to service users and families; socio-economic outcomes; staff views about the model of care; coping or stress; and mortality.

The descriptive review converted text statements from publications that described models of integrated care into two categories – ‘clearly present in the description’ and ‘not clearly present in the description’. These data were then subject to simple frequency analysis and cross-tabulation by model of care. The main issues covered were: What is the model of care? Where is it delivered? What conditions does it cover? Who delivers it? What service elements are included? What type of continuity of care does it deliver? For this last question, we used the Freeman et al. (2000) model as our starting point.

4.4 Included studies

Two thousand four hundred and seven publications were identified in the searching, 573 of which were initially selected as of potential relevance.

Of these, 49 separate studies, covering 47 models of care and reported in 68 publications were eventually included in the evaluative review. Fourteen randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and one pseudo-randomised study were included, alongside 14 other studies using a comparative design of some type. There were also four studies based on surveys, nine based on audit or retrospective record review and five based on ‘other’ designs. The majority of studies (33), 12 of which were RCTs, had been carried out in the UK. Most studies were about epilepsy (15), MS (14) or Parkinson’s Disease (11).

One hundred and twenty-seven descriptions of models of care, including the 47 models included in the evaluative review, were included in the descriptive review. The majority of descriptions were about models of care for MS (41), epilepsy (36) or Parkinson’s Disease (36).
4.5 Findings of the evaluative review

Table 4.1 summarises the findings from the evaluative review. As the table shows, there is little conclusive or consistent evidence of positive or negative impact on the service user or family outcomes reported in the evaluative research we reviewed. However, there is some limited evidence that home-based models of integrated care may reduce health service costs and, possibly, those of service users and their families as well. However, there is a substantial research agenda here, with few existing studies reporting these economic outcomes.

Table 4.1  Summary findings from studies included in evaluative review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number of studies reporting</th>
<th>Overall findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of or contact with services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>No consistent evidence about improved access to or use of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service users’ view of model of care</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Service users value new models of care but with little comparative information it is difficult to know whether this reflects gratitude for any service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability/impairment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Half of RCTs showed significant improvement, others did not. Evidence from other types of studies inconsistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Little secure evidence of positive impact on QoL for any model evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical outcomes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Inconsistent evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Small but not statistically significant improvements in depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on family and/or carers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Specialist palliative care services for people with MS may improve care outcomes (1 RCT only), no evidence of positive impact from any other study or model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs to health services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Some limited evidence of reduced costs for home-based services. No adequate research re: nurse specialists or multidisciplinary teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital admission</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Small but promising reductions in admission/length of stay, particularly for multidisciplinary care. Needs further research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication in team or with patient</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No conclusive evidence and lack of comparative data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient or carer expressed need</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evidence of benefit is unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of condition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Some evidence from single study of epilepsy that those with low levels of initial knowledge benefit from nurse specialist input.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcome Number of studies reporting Overall findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number of studies reporting</th>
<th>Overall findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic outcome e.g. education, employment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No controlled studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff views of model of care</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Positive views in all three studies. Integrated care systems and user-led care pathway said by staff to improve joint working, information exchange, and personalisation of care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>One study of multidisciplinary specialist clinic for motor neurone disease suggests improvement in mortality over general neurological care. No evidence of impact in other studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs to service users or families</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>One study only provided comparative data. Home-based IV may be less costly for service users and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping or stress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No evidence of impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lack of evidence of impact from these studies does not mean that there is no impact to be found. Many studies were of relatively poor methodological quality and, where of better quality, too small to demonstrate impact. Further, the choice of outcome measures for many of the studies was limited to the conventional. Given the nature of many of the conditions studied here, looking for differences in clinical or impairment outcomes is probably always going to be relatively fruitless although, when the research is of high quality and large enough, lack of difference can mean that the new model is no worse than usual care. By contrast, outcomes that might have real meaning to service users were largely notable by their absence. For example, while two studies showed that professionals felt that integrated care models increased the active participation of service users in their care, or increased their empowerment, no study seems to have asked service users themselves about these important types of outcome!

### 4.6 Findings of the descriptive review

Three main models of integrated care were identified in the descriptive review – multi-disciplinary teams or clinics (MDTs), clinical nurse specialists (CNSs) and assessment and disease management models (ADMMs). Some were delivered as a single approach, others in combination with another model or aspect of integrated care. In total, 41 descriptions involved MDTs, 20 CNSs, and 29 assessment and disease management initiatives. There were 32 separate ‘other’ models of care, ranging from a rapid response team for administering IV therapy at home, to a specialist transition clinic for young people moving onto adult services. The three main models were used to analyse the descriptive material, thus allowing us to compare and contrast different ways of delivering integrated care.
4.6.1 Multi-disciplinary teams or clinics

The 41 descriptions and evaluations of MDTs showed that they were most often based in hospital (in-patient and out-patient) settings. However, 12 of the described teams also delivered care in service users' own homes. MDTs were significantly more likely to be associated with care for people with motor neurone disease or multiple sclerosis than were other models of care, and less likely to be associated with epilepsy. Although reporting of which staff were involved in MDTs and how many was variable across the descriptions, as one might expect, MDTs were more likely to include certain types of professionals than were other models of care. All types of therapists, psychologists, social workers, and care co-ordinators or care managers were significantly more likely to be mentioned in publications about MDTs than in those about other models. However, while rehabilitation medicine specialists were also significantly more likely to be mentioned, MDTs were no more or less likely to include neurologists. Over two-thirds of the described MDTs involved at least six different types of professional staff and, again, this was significantly different (higher) than in other models of care.

Despite these differences, the service elements described as part of MDTs were not very different from those described in other models of care. MDTs were more likely to be reported as providing diagnosis, rehabilitation input, assessment of disability or impairment, and palliative care, and to involve multi-disciplinary meetings or consultation. By contrast, the descriptions were less likely than those for other models of care to refer to providing information, education or training for professionals. Beyond these differences, the service elements involved were similar to those provided in the other models of care.

The descriptions of MDTs were significantly more likely to suggest that they provided cross-boundary or team continuity (as would be expected) and longitudinal continuity (care provided from as few professionals as possible, over time, consistent with need). However, the descriptions were less likely to suggest that MDTs provided any of the other types of continuity in the Freeman model although with the exception of information continuity, the differences were not at a level that reached statistical significance.

4.6.2 Clinical nurse specialists

We included 30 descriptions or evaluations of CNSs, either as a stand-alone model or in combination with some other aspect of care, were no more or less likely than other models of care to be based in hospital (in-patient or outpatient) or community health settings. However, they were significantly less likely than other models to be working in patients’ own homes. CNSs were significantly more likely to be described
in relation to Parkinson’s disease, and less likely in relation to Motor Neurone Disease or MS, than were other models of care.

CNSs are, by definition, uni-disciplinary so it is not surprising to find that the descriptive literature reflects this, referring less often to working in teams involving neurologists, therapy professionals, psychologists and social workers. This does not mean that CNSs do not work with other professionals or as members of wider teams, rather that the descriptive literature tends to concentrate on their clinical role, rather than their place in a multi-professional context. However, some CNSs, and particularly those in primary care, were effectively lone workers, albeit that they might be providing out-reach from or in-reach to a hospital-based neurology service.

Despite their uni-professional and often solitary role, the descriptions of CNSs suggest that they were no less likely than other models of care to provide a wide range of elements of care (see footnote 1). No CNS services involved diagnostic services, as one might expect, but they were significantly more likely than other models of care to be involved in providing advice, contact or a help-line service.

There were clear differences in the types of continuity of care that the descriptions of CNSs included, compared to other models of care, with aspects of relational, personal and therapeutic continuity, and flexible continuity referred to significantly more often.

4.6.3 Assessment and disease management models of care

There were 29 descriptions or evaluations of ADMMs in the descriptive review. These were no more or less likely than other models to be delivered in hospital (in-patient and outpatient), community health settings or service users’ own homes. They were slightly different from other models in that the condition focus of the largest group was epilepsy (12), though followed by MS (10) and Parkinson’s Disease (6). ADMMs were also significantly more likely than other models to report a focus on general or ‘all and any’ neurological conditions and less likely to focus on Motor Neurone Disease.

Neurologists were more likely to be part of the staffing of ADMMs, compared to other models but there were few other differences in the types of staff involved. They were as likely as other models of care to be uni- or multi-professional; most teams involved between two and five different types of professional.

ADMMs were more likely to provide diagnosis and to assess service users’ condition, but there were few other differences in the elements of care provided.
With the relatively small numbers of ADMMs included in the review, identifying any significant differences in the types of continuity described was difficult. However, of the four descriptions that clearly outlined experienced continuity of care, three were of ADMMs and this difference did reach statistical significance. Other indicative, though not significant differences, included more descriptions of flexible continuity and of cross-boundary or team continuity. By contrast, relational, personal or therapeutic continuity was less often described.

4.6.4 Aspects of service delivery and organisation

Reporting of aspects of service delivery and organisation – such as referral and access routes, exclusion criteria, and funding – was rare in both the descriptive and evaluative accounts that we included in the descriptive review. We therefore did not carry out any further analysis of this material.

4.7 Strengths and limitations of the review

Although characterised as a ‘rapid’ systematic review, the evaluative review reported here had many of the features of a full systematic review. We carried out extensive electronic searches, systematically selected material for relevance and then for review, extracted data systematically, and carried out a full narrative synthesis of findings. We confined the evaluative review to studies that allowed some form of comparison to be made between people receiving the model of care being evaluated and those not, thus enhancing the opportunities for robust messages to emerge. We did not search exhaustively for material from the grey literature and relevant websites, and we did not included all additional material identified in the reference lists of included studies. However, we did include any RCTs of models of integrated care identified through this route. Overall, then we feel that the review was comprehensive but not exhaustive.

A conceptual limitation applies to this work. We were interested in models of care that could be described as integrated in some way and which might thereby deliver one of more types of continuity of care. Our decisions about whether the material we found through the search strategies was relevant, given this focus, were thus perhaps more subjective than would be the case with, say, a review of a clearly defined clinical intervention. However, we reduced this subjectivity to a minimum by using algorithms to guide selection and by extensive discussion between the review team members.

A related issue was how to decide whether the papers we identified through the searches could facilitate continuity of care and, if so, of which type. Again, we dealt
with this by discussion in the team, but we were inevitably restricted in our decisions by the type and extent of detail provided in the selected material.

The main limitation of the review, however, is the quality of the research we found. For example, while many of the RCTs in the evaluative review had been carried out since the CONSORT guidelines were published (Begg et al., 1996), few were of high quality. Further, the choice of ‘routine’ clinical outcomes in the evaluative literature leaves a large part of service users’ experiences of models of integrated care un-researched.

4.8 Conclusion

Our overall conclusion from the ‘rapid’ systematic review is that the evidence base, about both the impact and costs of integrated models of care for people with LTNCs and about the service delivery and organisation elements that need to be in place to make these models operate well, is weak. The evaluative literature is characterised by relatively poor quality research, regardless of its design, while the descriptive literature is variable in what it describes about how these models of care work in practice. Further, there is little sense in the evaluative research that outcomes that would be valued by service users and their families have informed the choice of outcome measures in the evaluations. Issues of personal choice, empowerment and, indeed, the experience of continuity of care (in any of its guises) are largely absent.

Despite this, the descriptive literature does suggest that multi-disciplinary team or clinics, alongside clinical nurse specialists, would provide a wider range of types of continuity of care for people with LTNCs than would either alone.
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Appendix 1  Search strategies for long-term neurological conditions

The following databases were searched:
- MEDLINE
- CINAHL
- EMBASE
- HMIC
- DARE
- HTA
- NHSEED
- SIGLE
- Social Policy and Practice
- Social Science Citation Index
- ASSIA, Social Services Abstracts
- Sociological Abstracts
- NRR SOSIG
- The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.

MEDLINE (Ovid Online – http://www.ovid.com/)
1966 to March Week 4 2006
Searched on 4/4/2006
Retrieved 334 hits

Search strategy:
1. ((Integrate$ adj3 care) or (Integrate$ adj3 healthcare) or (Integrate$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
2. (Integrat$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
3. (Integrat$ adj3 provision).ti,ab.
4. (Integrat$ adj3 provider organisation$).ti,ab.
5. (Integrat$ adj3 assessment$).ti,ab.
6. (Integrat$ adj3 team$).ti,ab.
7. (Integrat$ adj3 management).ti,ab.
8. Horizontal integration.ti,ab.
10. (Integrat$ adj3 primary adj3 community).ti,ab.
11. (Integrat$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
12. (Cluster$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
14. (Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care).ti,ab.
15. Structured service$.ti,ab.
16. (Joint$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
17. Joined-up partnership$.ti,ab.
18. (Partnership$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
19. (Joint service$ adj3 development$).ti,ab.
20. Horizontal communication$.ti,ab.
21. Partnership project$.ti,ab.
22. Horizontal partnership$.ti,ab.
23. Flexible partnership$.ti,ab.
24. (Joint$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
25. Joined-up service$.ti,ab.
26. ((Joint$ adj3 care) or (Joint$ adj3 healthcare) or (Joint$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
27. (Joined-up care or Joined-up health care or Joined-up healthcare).ti,ab.
28. ((Co-ordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 health care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 healthcare$)).ti,ab.
29. ((Coordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 healthcare$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 health care$)).ti,ab.
30. (Co-ordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
31. (Coordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
32. Seamless service$.ti,ab.
33. Seamless care.ti,ab.
34. (Contin$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
35. ((contin$ adj3 care) or (contin$ adj3 healthcare) or (contin$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
36. ((Progression adj3 care) or (Progression adj3 healthcare) or (Progression adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
37. (Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care).ti,ab.
38. Uninterrupted service$.ti,ab.
39. ((Inter-organisation$ or Inter-organization$) adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
40. (Holistic adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
41. ((Interorganisation$ or Interorganisation$) adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
42. (Multidisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
43. (Multiprofessional adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
44. (Multi-disciplinary adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
45. (Multi-professional adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
46. (Multi-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
47. (Inter-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
48. (Inter-professional adj3 (care health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
49. (Interdisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
50. (Inter-disciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
51. (Holistic adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
52. (Collaborat$ adj3 servic$).ti,ab.
53. Multidisciplinary assessment$.ti,ab.
54. single assessment$.ti,ab.
55. Care trust$.ti,ab.
56. Strategic collaboration$.ti,ab.
57. Provider partnership$.ti,ab.
58. (Pool$ adj3 budget$).ti,ab.
59. Overlapping commissioning.ti,ab.
60. Contiguous commissioning.ti,ab.
61. Joint commissioning.ti,ab.
62. Integrated commissioning.ti,ab.
63. linkwork$.ti,ab.
64. Co-located team$.ti,ab.
65. co-location.ti,ab.
66. One stop shop$.ti,ab.
67. exp "Delivery of Health Care, Integrated"/ (4591)
68. exp ambulatory care/
69. (ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare).ti,ab.
70. (ambulatory service$ or ambulatory health service$).ti,ab. (366)
71. case management.ti,ab.
72. care management.ti,ab.
73. Case Management/
74. Managed Care Program$.ti,ab.
75. Patient Care Plan$.ti,ab.
76. or/1-75
77. Motor Neuron Disease/
78. lou gehrig disease.ti,ab.
79. lou gehrig's disease.ti,ab.
80. motor neuron disease.ti,ab.
81. motor neurone disease.ti,ab.
82. MND.ti,ab.
83. lateral sclerosis.ti,ab.
84. ALS.ti,ab.
85. anterior horn cell disease.ti,ab.
86. Bulbar Palsy.ti,ab.
87. Spinal Muscular Atrophy.ti,ab.
88. PARKINSON DISEASE/
89. paralysis agitans.ti,ab.
90. Parkinson disease.ti,ab.
91. Parkinson syndrome.ti,ab.
92. Parkinson s.ti,ab.
93. parkinsonism.ti,ab.
94. Ms.ti,ab.
95. Multiple sclerosis.ti,ab.
96. exp Multiple Sclerosis/
97. degenerative neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
98. degenerative neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
99. long term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
100. long-term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
101. long term neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
102. evolving neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
103. evolving neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
104. LTNC$.ti,ab.
105. or/77-104
106. 76 and 105
107. 106
108. limit 107 to yr="1985 - 2006"

CINAHL - Cumulative Index to Nursing & Allied Health Literature (Ovid Online - http://www.ovid.com/)
1982 to March Week 5 2006
Searched on 4/4/2006
Retrieved 169 hits

Search strategy:
1. ((Integrate$ adj3 care) or (Integrate$ adj3 healthcare) or (Integrate$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
2. (Integrat$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
3. (Integrat$ adj3 provision).ti,ab.
4. (Integrat$ adj3 provider organisation$).ti,ab.
5. (Integrat$ adj3 assessment$).ti,ab.
6. (Integrat$ adj3 team$).ti,ab.
7. (Integrat$ adj3 management).ti,ab.
8. Horizontal integration.ti,ab.
10. (Integrat$ adj3 primary adj3 community).ti,ab.
11. (Integrat$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
12. (Cluster$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
14. (Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care).ti,ab.
15. Structured service$.ti,ab.
16. (Joint$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
17. Joined-up partnership$.ti,ab.
18. (Partnership$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
19. (Joint service$ adj3 development$).ti,ab.
20. Horizontal communication$.ti,ab.
21. Partnership project$.ti,ab.
22. Horizontal partnership$.ti,ab.
23. Flexible partnership$.ti,ab.
24. (Joint$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
25. Joined-up service$.ti,ab.
26. ((Joint$ adj3 care) or (Joint$ adj3 healthcare) or (Joint$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
27. (Joined-up care or Joined-up healthcare or Joined-up health care).ti,ab.
28. ((Co-ordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 health care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 healthcare$)).ti,ab.
29. ((Coordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 healthcare$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 health care$)).ti,ab.
30. (Co-ordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
31. (Coordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
32. Seamless service$.ti,ab.
33. Seamless care.ti,ab.
34. (Contin$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
35. ((contin$ adj3 care) or (contin$ adj3 healthcare) or (contin$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
36. ((Progression adj3 care) or (Progression adj3 healthcare) or (Progression adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
37. (Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care).ti,ab.

38. Uninterrupted service$.ti,ab.

39. ((Inter-organisation$ or Inter-organization$) adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.

40. (Holistic adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.

41. ((Interorganisation$ or Interoragnization$) adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.

42. (Multidisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.

43. (Multiprofessional adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.

44. (Multi-disciplinary adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.

45. (Multi-professional adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.

46. (Multi-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.

47. (Inter-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.

48. (Inter-professional adj3 (care health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.

49. (Interdisciplinary adj3 (care healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.

50. (Linkwork$.ti,ab.

51. (Collaborat$ adj3 servic$).ti,ab.

52. Multidisciplinary assessment$.ti,ab.

53. single assessment$.ti,ab.

54. Care trust$.ti,ab.

55. Strategic collaboration$.ti,ab.

56. Provider partnership$.ti,ab.

57. (Pool$ adj3 budget$).ti,ab.

58. Overlapping commissioning.ti,ab.

59. Contiguous commissioning.ti,ab.

60. Joint commissioning.ti,ab.

61. Integrated commissioning.ti,ab.

62. linkwork$.ti,ab.

63. Co-located team$.ti,ab.
co-location.ti,ab.
One stop shop$.ti,ab.
Health Care Delivery, Integrated/
ambulatory care/
(ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare).ti,ab.
(ambulatory service$ or ambulatory health service$).ti,ab.
case management.ti,ab.
care management.ti,ab.
Case Management/
Managed Care Program$.ti,ab.
Patient Care Plan$.ti,ab.
or/1-75
exp Motor Neuron Diseases/
lou gehrig disease.ti,ab.
lou gehrig's disease.ti,ab.
motor neuron disease.ti,ab.
motor neurone disease.ti,ab.
MND.ti,ab.
lateral sclerosis.ti,ab.
ALS.ti,ab.
anterior horn cell disease.ti,ab.
Bulbar Palsy.ti,ab.
Spinal Muscular Atrophy.ti,ab.
PARKINSON DISEASE/
paralysis agitans.ti,ab.
Parkinson disease.ti,ab.
Parkinson syndrome.ti,ab.
Parkinson s.ti,ab.
parkinsonism.ti,ab.
Ms.ti,ab.
Multiple sclerosis.ti,ab.
Multiple Sclerosis/
degenerative neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
degenerative neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
long term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
long-term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
long term neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
evolving neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
evolving neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
LTNCS$.ti,ab.
or/77-104
76 and 105
Search strategy:
1. ((Integrate$ adj3 care) or (Integrate$ adj3 healthcare) or (Integrate$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab. (2146)
2. (Integrate$ adj3 working).ti,ab. (226)
3. (Integrate$ adj3 provision).ti,ab. (86)
4. (Integrate$ adj3 provider organisation$).ti,ab. (0)
5. (Integrate$ adj3 assessment$).ti,ab. (907)
6. (Integrate$ adj3 team$).ti,ab. (320)
7. (Integrate$ adj3 management).ti,ab. (1898)
8. Horizontal integration.ti,ab. (44)
9. Vertical integration.ti,ab. (104)
10. (Integrate$ adj3 primary adj3 community).ti,ab. (0)
11. (Integrate$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab. (154)
12. (Cluster$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab. (4)
13. (Integrate$ adj3 service$).ti,ab. (1566)
14. (Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care).ti,ab. (71)
15. Structured service$.ti,ab. (10)
16. (Joint$ adj3 working).ti,ab. (227)
17. Joined-up partnership$.ti,ab. (1)
18. (Partnership$ adj3 working).ti,ab. (148)
19. (Joint service$ adj3 development$).ti,ab. (1)
20. Horizontal communication$.ti,ab. (2)
21. Partnership project$.ti,ab. (16)
22. Horizontal partnership$.ti,ab. (0)
23. Flexible partnership$.ti,ab. (2)
24. (Joint$ adj3 service$).ti,ab. (175)
25. Joined-up service$.ti,ab. (2)
26. ((Joint$ adj3 care) or (Joint$ adj3 healthcare) or (Joint$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab. (600)
27. (Joined-up care or Joined-up health care or Joined-up healthcare).ti,ab. (7)
28. ((Co-ordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 health care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 healthcare$)).ti,ab. (156)
29. ((Coordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 healthcare$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 health care$)).ti,ab. (1640)
30. (Co-ordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab. (135)
31. (Coordinator adj3 service$).ti,ab. (772)
32. Seamless service$.ti,ab. (13)
33. Seamless care.ti,ab. (43)
34. (Contin$ adj3 service$).ti,ab. (1236)
35. ((contin$ adj3 care) or (contin$ adj3 healthcare) or (contin$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab. (5888)
36. ((Progression adj3 care) or (Progression adj3 healthcare) or (Progression adj3 health care)).ti,ab. (99)
37. (Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care).ti,ab. (7)
38. Uninterrupted service$.ti,ab. (2)
39. ((Inter-organisation$ or Inter-organization$) adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (0)
40. (Holistic adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (328)
41. ((Interorganisation$ or Interorganization$) adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (0)
42. (Multidisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (4837)
43. (Multiprofessional adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (158)
44. (Multi-disciplinary adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (454)
45. (Multi-professional adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (77)
46. (Multi-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (40)
47. (Inter-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (53)
48. (Inter-professional adj3 (care health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (36)
49. (Interdisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (2056)
50. (Inter-disciplinary adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (31)
51. (Holistic adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab. (328)
52. (Collaborat$ adj3 servic$).ti,ab. (477)
53. Multidisciplinary assessment$.ti,ab. (150)
54. single assessment$.ti,ab. (101)
55. Care trust$.ti,ab. (324)
56. Strategic collaboration$.ti,ab. (4)
57. Provider partnership$.ti,ab. (12)
58. (Pool$ adj3 budget$).ti,ab. (7)
59. Overlapping commissioning.ti,ab. (0)
60. Contiguous commissioning.ti,ab. (0)
61. Joint commissioning.ti,ab. (13)
62. Integrated commissioning.ti,ab. (1)
63. linkwork$.ti,ab. (10)
64. Co-located team$.ti,ab. (0)
65. co-location.ti,ab. (42)
66. One stop shop$.ti,ab. (78)
67. ambulatory care/ (5424)
68. (ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare).ti,ab. (2655)
69. (ambulatory service$ or ambulatory health service$).ti,ab. (184)
70. case management.ti,ab. (2566)
71. care management.ti,ab. (1853)
72. Managed Care Program$.ti,ab. (200)
73. Patient Care Plan$.ti,ab. (52)
74. or/1-73 (34989)
75. exp Motor Neuron Diseases/ (0)
76. lou gehrig disease.ti,ab. (5)
77. lou gehrig's disease.ti,ab. (27)
78. motor neuron disease.ti,ab. (1581)
79. motor neurone disease.ti,ab. (370)
80. MND.ti,ab. (731)
81. lateral sclerosis.ti,ab. (5537)
82. ALS.ti,ab. (5839)
83. anterior horn cell disease.ti,ab. (42)
84. Bulbar Palsy.ti,ab. (210)
85. Spinal Muscular Atrophy.ti,ab. (1466)
86. PARKINSON DISEASE/ (28917)
87. paralysis agitans.ti,ab. (30)
88. Parkinson disease.ti,ab. (1830)
89. Parkinson syndrome.ti,ab. (130)
90. Parkinson s.ti,ab. (41)
91. parkinsonism.ti,ab. (6222)
92. Ms.ti,ab. (81283)
93. Multiple sclerosis.ti,ab. (21233)
94. Multiple Sclerosis/ (24693)
95. degenerative neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab. (114)
96. degenerative neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab. (22)
97. long term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab. (1)
98. long-term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab. (1)
99. long term neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab. (0)
100. evolving neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab. (0)
101. evolving neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab. (2)
102. LTNC$.ti,ab. (1)
103. or/75-102 (140114)
104. 74 and 103 (266)
105. 104 (266)
106. limit 105 to yr="1985 - 2006" (254)

HMIC (Ovid Online – http://www.ovid.com/)
March 2006
Searched on 5/4/2006
Retrieved 23 hits

Search strategy:
1. ((Integrate$ adj3 care) or (Integrate$ adj3 healthcare) or (Integrate$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
2. (Integrat$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
3. (Integrat$ adj3 provision).ti,ab.
4. (Integrat$ adj3 provider organisation$).ti,ab.
5. (Integrat$ adj3 assessment$).ti,ab.
6. (Integrat$ adj3 team$).ti,ab.
7. (Integrat$ adj3 management).ti,ab.
8. Horizontal integration.ti,ab.
10. (Integrat$ adj3 primary adj3 community).ti,ab.
11. (Integrat$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
12. (Cluster$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
14. (Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care).ti,ab.
15. Structured service$.ti,ab.
16. (Joint$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
17. Joined-up partnership$.ti,ab.
18. (Partnership$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
19. (Joint service$ adj3 development$).ti,ab.
20. Horizontal communication$.ti,ab.
21. Partnership project$.ti,ab.
22. Horizontal partnership$.ti,ab.
23. Flexible partnership$.ti,ab.
24. (Joint$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
25. Joined-up service$.ti,ab.
26. ((Joint$ adj3 care) or (Joint$ adj3 healthcare) or (Joint$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
27. (Joined-up care or Joined-up health care or Joined-up healthcare).ti,ab.
28. (((Co-ordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 health care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 healthcare$)).ti,ab.
29. (((Coordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 healthcare$)) or (Coordinat$ adj3 health care$)).ti,ab.
30. (Co-ordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
31. (Coordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
32. Seamless service$.ti,ab.
33. Seamless care.ti,ab.
34. (Contin$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
35. (((contin$ adj3 care) or (contin$ adj3 healthcare) or (contin$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
36. ((Progression adj3 care) or (Progression adj3 healthcare) or (Progression adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
37. (Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care).ti,ab.
38. Uninterrupted service$.ti,ab.
39. (((Inter-organisation$ or Inter-organization$) adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
40. (Holistic adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
41. (((Interorganisation$ or Interorganisation$) adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
42. (Multidisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
43. (Multiprofessional adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
44. (Multi-disciplinary adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
45. (Multi-professional adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
46. (Multi-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
47. (Inter-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
48. (Inter-professional adj3 (care health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
49. (Interdisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
50. (Inter-disciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
51. (Holistic adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
52. (Collaborat$ adj3 servic$).ti,ab.
53. Multidisciplinary assessment$.ti,ab.
54. single assessment$.ti,ab.
55. Care trust$.ti,ab.
56. Strategic collaboration$.ti,ab.
57. Provider partnership$.ti,ab.
58. (Pool$ adj3 budget$).ti,ab.
59. Overlapping commissioning.ti,ab.
60. Contiguous commissioning.ti,ab.
61. Joint commissioning.ti,ab.
62. Integrated commissioning.ti,ab.
63. linkwork$.ti,ab.
64. Co-located team$.ti,ab.
65. co-location.ti,ab.
66. One stop shop$.ti,ab.
67. exp AMBULATORY CARE/
68. AMBULATORY CARE SERVICES/
69. (ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare).ti,ab.
70. (ambulatory service$ or ambulatory health service$).ti,ab.
71. case management.ti,ab.
72. care management.ti,ab.
73. Case Management/ or care management/
74. Managed Care Program$.ti,ab.
75. Patient Care Plan$.ti,ab.
76. or/1-75
77. Motor Neuron Diseases/
78. lou gehrig disease.ti,ab.
79. lou gehrig’s disease.ti,ab.
80. motor neuron disease.ti,ab.
81. motor neurone disease.ti,ab.
82. MND.ti,ab.
83. lateral sclerosis.ti,ab.
84. ALS.ti,ab.
85. anterior horn cell disease.ti,ab.
86. Bulbar Palsy.ti,ab.
87. Spinal Muscular Atrophy.ti,ab.
88. parkinsons disease/
89. paralysis agitans.ti,ab.
90. Parkinson disease.ti,ab.
91. Parkinson syndrome.ti,ab.
92. Parkinson s.ti,ab.
93. parkinsonism.ti,ab.
94. Ms.ti,ab.
95. Multiple sclerosis.ti,ab.
96. multiple sclerosis/
97. degenerative neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
98. degenerative neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
99. long term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
100. long-term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
101. long term neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
102. evolving neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
103. evolving neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
104. LTNC$.ti,ab.
105. or/77-104
106. 76 and 105
107. 106
108. limit 107 to yr="1985 - 2006"

DARE – Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects, HTA (Health Technology Assessment Database and NHSEED (NHS Economic Evaluation Database) (CRD administration database))

Retrieved 28 hits from DARE, 3 hits from HTA and 14 hits from NHSEED

Search strategy:
1. s Integrate$(3w)care or Integrate$(3w)healthcare or Integrate$(3w)health(w)care
33. s Seamless(w)care
34. s Continuous(w)service or Continuous(w)services or Continuity(3w)service or Continuity(3w)services
35. s contin$(3w)care or contin$(3w)healthcare or contin$(3w)health(w)care
36. s Progression(3w)care or Progression(3w)healthcare or Progression(3w)health(w)care
37. s Uninterrupted(w)care or Uninterrupted(w)healthcare or Uninterrupted(w)health(w)care
38. s Uninterrupted(w)service or Uninterrupted(w)services
39. s Inter(w)organisation(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or working or workers or collaboration or collaborate or collaborations or co(W)ordinate or co(W)ordination or coordinate or coordination) or Inter(w)organisational(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or working or workers or collaboration or collaborate or collaborations or co(W)ordinate or co(W)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
40. s Holistic(3w)(care or health care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration$ or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
41. s ((Interorganisation or Interorganisational or Interorganization or Interorganizational)(3w)(care or health care or healthcare or service or services or team or teams or work or working or workers or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination))
42. s Multidisciplinary(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
43. s Multiprofessional(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
44. s Multi(w)disciplinary(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
45. s Multi(w)professional(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
46. s Multi(w)agency(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or
collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination
47. s Inter(w)agency(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
48. s Inter(w)professional(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
49. s Interdisciplinary(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
50. s Inter(w)disciplinary(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
51. s Holistic(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
52. s (Collaborate or collaboration or collaborations)(3w)(service or services)
53. s Multidisciplinary(w)assessment$
54. s single(w)assessment$
55. s Care(w)trust$
56. s Strategic(w)collaboration$
57. s Provider(w)partnership$
58. s Pool$(3w)budget$
59. s Overlapping(w)commissioning
60. s Contiguous(w)commissioning
61. s Joint(w)commissioning
62. s Integrated(w)commissioning
63. s linkwork$
64. s Co(w)located(w)team$
65. s co(w)location
66. s One(w)stop(w)shop$
67. s ambulatory(w)care or ambulatory(w)health(w)care or ambulatory(w)healthcare
68. s ambulatory(w)service or ambulatory(w)services or ambulatory(w)health(w)service or ambulatory(w)health(w)services
69. s case(w)management
70. s care(w)management
71. s Managed(w)Care(w)Program$
72. s Patient(w)Care(w)Plan$
73. s s1 or s2 or s3 or s4 or s5 or s6 or s7 or s8 or s9 or s10 or s11 or s12 or s13 or s14 or s15 or s16 or s17 or s18 or s19 or s20 or s21 or s22 or s23 or s24 or s25 or s26 or s27 or s28 or s29 or s30 or s31 or s32 or s33 or s34 or s35 or s36 or s37 or s38 or s39 or s40 or s41 or s42 or s43 or s44 or s45 or s46 or s47 or s48 or s49 or s50 or s51 or s52 or s53 or s54 or s55 or s56 or s57 or s58 or s59 or s60 or s61 or s62 or s63 or s64 or s65 or s66 or s67 or s68 or s69 or s70 or s71 or s72
74. s lou(w)gehrig(w)disease
75. s lou(w)gehrig(w)s(w)disease
76. s motor(w)neuron(w)disease
77. s motor(w)neurone(w)disease
78. s MND
79. s lateral(w)sclerosis
80. s ALS
81. s anterior(w)horn(w)cell(w)disease
82. s Bulbar(w)Palsy
83. s Spinal(w)Muscular(w)Atrophy
84. s paralysis(w)agitans
85. s Parkinson(w)disease
86. s Parkinson(w)syndrome
87. s Parkinson(w)s
88. s parkinsonism
89. s Ms
90. s Multiple(w)sclerosis
91. s degenerative(w)neurologic(w)disease or degenerative(w)neurological(w)disease or degenerative(w)neurologic(w)diseases or degenerative(w)neurological(w)diseases
92. s degenerative(w)neurologic(w)condition or degenerative(w)neurological(w)condition or degenerative(w)neurologic(w)conditions or degenerative(w)neurological(w)conditions
93. s long(w)term(w)neurologic(w)disease or long(w)term(w)neurological(w)disease or long(w)term(w)neurologic(w)diseases or long(w)term(w)neurological(w)diseases
94. s long(w)term(w)neurologic(w)condition or long(w)term(w)neurological(w)condition or long(w)term(w)neurologic(w)conditions or long(w)term(w)neurological(w)conditions
95. s evolving(neurologic(disease or evolving(neurological(disease or evolving(neurologic(diseases or evolving(neurological(diseases
96. s evolving(neurologic(condition or evolving(neurological(condition or evolving(neurologic(conditions or evolving(neurological(conditions
97. s LTNC$
98. s s74 or s75 or s76 or s77 or s78 or s79 or s80 or s81 or s82 or s83 or s84 or s85 or s86 or s87 or s88 or s89 or s90 or s91 or s92 or s93 or s94 or s95 or s96 or s97
99. s s98 and s73
100. s @1985:2006
101. s s99 and s100

SIGLE (Silverplatter ERL WebSPIRS – http://www.arc.uk.ovid.com/)
1980-2005/03
Retrieved 40 hits

and:

Social Policy and Practice (Silverplatter ERL WebSPIRS – http://www.arc.uk.ovid.com/)
1890-
Retrieved 23 hits

Search strategy:
#1. (Integrate* near3 care) or (Integrate* near3 healthcare) or (Integrate* near3 health care)
#2. Integrat* near3 working
#3. Integrat* near3 provision
#4. Integrat* near3 provider organisation*
#5. Integrat* near3 assessment*
#6. Integrat* near3 team*
#7. Integrat* near3 management
#8. Horizontal integration
#9. Vertical integration
#10. Integrat* near3 primary near3 community
#11. Integrat* near3 health near3 social
#12. Cluster* near3 health near3 social
#13. Integrat* near3 service*
#14. Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care
#15. Structured service*
#16. Joint* near3 working
#17. Joined-up partnership*
#18. Partnership* near3 working
#19. Joint service* near3 development*
#20. Horizontal communication*
#21. Partnership project*
#22. Horizontal partnership*
#23. Flexible partnership*
#24. Joint* near3 service*
#25. Joined-up service*
#26. (Joint* near3 care) or (Joint* near3 healthcare) or (Joint* near3 health care)
#27. Joined-up care or Joined-up healthcare or Joined-up health care
#28. (Co-ordinat* near3 care*) or (Co-ordinat* near3 health care*) or (Co-ordinat* near3 healthcare*)
#29. (Coordinat* near3 care*) or (Coordinat* near3 healthcare*) or (Coordinat* near3 health care*)
#30. Co-ordinat* near3 service*
#31. Coordinat* near3 service*
#32. Seamless service*
#33. Seamless care
#34. Contin* near3 service*
#35. (contin* near3 care) or (contin* near3 healthcare) or (contin* near3 health care)
#36. (Progression near3 care) or (Progression near3 healthcare) or (Progression near3 health care)
#37. Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care
#38. Uninterrupted service*
#39. (Inter-oragnisation* or Inter-oragnization*) near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
#40. Holistic near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
#41. (Interorganisat* or Interorganizat*) near3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
#42. Multidisciplinary near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
#43. Multiprofessional near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)

#44. Multi-disciplinary near3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)

#45. Multi-professional near3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)

#46. Multi-agency near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)

#47. Inter-agency near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)

#48. Inter-professional near3 (care health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)

#49. Interdisciplinary near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)

#50. Inter-disciplinary near3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)

#51. Holistic near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)

#52. Collaborat* near3 servic*

#53. Multidisciplinary assessment*

#54. single assessment*

#55. Care trust*

#56. Strategic collaboration*

#57. Provider partnership*

#58. Pool* near3 budget*

#59. Overlapping commissioning

#60. Contiguous commissioning

#61. Joint commissioning

#62. Integrated commissioning

#63. linkwork*

#64. Co-located team*

#65. co-location

#66. One stop shop*

#67. ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare

#68. ambulatory service* or ambulatory health service*

#69. case management

#70. care management

#71. Managed Care Program*

#72. Patient Care Plan*

#73. #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21 or #22
or #23 or #24 or #25 or #26 or #27 or #28 or #29 or #30 or #31 or #32 or #33 or #34 or #35 or #36 or #37 or #38 or #39 or #40 or #41 or #42 or #43 or #44 or #45 or #46 or #47 or #48 or #49 or #50 or #51 or #52 or #53 or #54 or #55 or #56 or #57 or #58 or #59 or #60 or #61 or #62 or #63 or #64 or #65 or #66 or #67 or #68 or #69 or #70 or #71 or #72
#74. lou gehrig disease
#75. lou gehrig's disease
#76. motor neuron disease
#77. motor neurone disease
#78. MND
#79. lateral sclerosis
#80. ALS
#81. anterior horn cell disease
#82. Bulbar Palsy
#83. Spinal Muscular Atrophy
#84. paralysis agitans
#85. Parkinson disease
#86. Parkinson syndrome
#87. Parkinson s or parkinson's
#88. parkinsonism
#89. Ms
#90. Multiple sclerosis
#91. degenerative neurologic* disease*
#92. degenerative neurologic* condition*
#93. long term neurologic* disease*
#94. long-term neurologic* disease*
#95. long term neurologic* condition*
#96. evolving neurologic* disease*
#97. evolving neurologic* condition*
#98. LTNC*
#99. #74 or #75 or #76 or #77 or #78 or #79 or #80 or #81 or #82 or #83 or #84 or #85 or #86 or #87 or #88 or #89 or #90 or #91 or #92 or #93 or #94 or #95 or #96 or #97 or #98
#100. #73 and #99

Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) (Web Of Knowledge – http://wos.mimas.ac.uk/)
(limited to)1985-2006
Retrieved 96 hits

Search strategy:
#1. TS=(Integrate* same health care))
#2. TS=((Integrate* same working))
#3. TS=(Integrate* same provision)
#4. TS=(Integrate* same provider organisation*)
#5. TS=(Integrate* same assessment*)
#6. TS=(Integrate* same team*)
#7. TS=(Integrate* same management)
#8. TS=(Horizontal integration)
#9. TS=(Vertical integration)
#10. TS=(Integrate* same primary same community)
#11. TS=(Integrate* same health same social)
#12. TS=(Cluster* same health same social)
#13. TS=(Integrate* same service*)
#14. TS=(Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care)
#15. TS=(Structured service*)
#16. TS=(Joint* same working)
#17. TS=(Joined-up partnership*)
#18. TS=(Partnership* same working)
#19. TS=(Joint service* same development*)
#20. TS=(Horizontal communication*)
#21. TS=(Partnership project*)
#22. TS=(Horizontal partnership*)
#23. TS=(Flexible partnership*)
#24. TS=(Joint* same service*)
#25. TS=(Joined-up service*)
#26. TS=((Joint* same care) or (Joint* same healthcare) or (Joint* same health care))
#27. TS=(Joined-up care or Joined-up health care or Joined-up healthcare)
#28. TS=((Co-ordinat* same care*) or (Co-ordinat* same health care*) or (Co-ordinat* same healthcare*))
#29. TS=((Coordinat* same care*) or (Coordinat* same healthcare*) or (Coordinat* same health care*))
#30. TS=(Co-ordinat* same service*)
#31. TS=(Coordinat* same service*)
#32. TS=(Seamless service*)
#33. TS=(Seamless care)
#34. TS=(Conti* same service*)
#35. TS=((contin* same care) or (contin* same healthcare) or (contin* same health care))
#36. TS=((Progression same care) or (Progression same healthcare) or (Progression same health care))
#37. TS=(Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care)
#38. TS=(Uninterrupted service*)
#39. TS=((Inter-oragnisation* or Inter-oragnization*) same (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#40. TS=((Holistic same (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)))
#41. TS=((Interoragnisation* or Interoragnization*) same (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)))
#42. TS=(Multidisciplinary same (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#43. TS=(Multiprofessional same (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#44. TS=(Multi-disciplinary same (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#45. TS=(Multi-professional same (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#46. TS=(Multi-agency same (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#47. TS=(Inter-agency same (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#48. TS=(Inter-professional same (care healthcare or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#49. TS=(Interdisciplinary same (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#50. TS=(Inter-disciplinary same (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#51. TS=(Holistic same (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#52. TS=(Collaborat* same servic*)
#53. TS=(Multidisciplinary assessment*)
#54. TS=(single assessment*)
#55. TS=(Care trust*)
#56. TS=(Strategic collaboration*)
#57. TS=(Provider partnership*)
#58. TS=(Pool* same budget*)
#59. TS=(Overlapping commissioning)
#60. TS=(Contiguous commissioning)
#61. TS=(Joint commissioning)
#62. TS=(Integrated commissioning)
#63. TS=(linkwork*)
#64. TS=(Co-located team*)
#65. TS=(co-location)
#66. TS=(One stop shop*)
#67. TS=(ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare)
#68. TS=(ambulatory service* or ambulatory health service*)
#69. TS=(case management)
#70. TS=(care management)
#71. TS=(Managed Care Program*)
#72. TS=(Patient Care Plan*)
#73. #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24
#74. #25 or #26 or #27 or #28 or #29 or #30 or #31 or #32 or #33 or #34 or #35 or #36 or #37 or #38 or #39 or #40 or #41 or #42 or #43 or #44 or #45 or #46 or #47 or #48 or #49 or #50
#75. #51 or #52 or #53 or #54 or #55 or #56 or #57 or #58 or #59 or #60 or #61 or #62 or #63 or #64 or #65 or #66 or #67 or #68 or #69 or #70 or #71 or #72
#76. #73 or #74 or #75
#77. TS=(lou gehrig disease)
#78. TS=(lou gehrig’s disease)
#79. TS=(motor neuron disease)
#80. TS=(motor neurone disease)
#81. TS=(MND)
#82. TS=(lateral sclerosis)
#83. TS=(ALS)
#84. TS=(anterior horn cell disease)
#85. TS=(Bulbar Palsy)
#86. TS=(Spinal Muscular Atrophy)
#87. TS=(paralysis agitans)
#88. TS=(Parkinson disease)
#89. TS=(Parkinson syndrome)
#90. TS=(Parkinson s or Parkinson's)
#91. TS=(parkinsonism)
#92. TS=(Ms)
#93. TS=(Multiple sclerosis)
#94. TS=(degenerative neurologic* disease*)
#95. TS=(degenerative neurologic* condition*)
#96. TS=(long term neurologic* condition*)
#97. #77 or #78 or #79 or #80 or #81 or #82 or #83 or #84 or #85 or #86 or #87 or #88 or #89 or #90 or #91 or #92 or #93 or #94 or #95 or #96
#98. #97 and #76

Due to limitations of the database, it was not possible to include all the desired terms in this search. The following terms retrieved no hits on the database and so were omitted from the final search:

- evolving neurologic* disease*
- evolving neurologic* condition*
- LTNC*
- Long term neurologic* disease*

**ASSIA (CSA Illumina – http://ca2.csa.com/)**

1987 to 2006
Searched on 7/4/2006
Retrieved 23 hits

and

**Social Services Abstracts (CSA Illumina – http://ca2.csa.com/)**

1979 to 2006
Searched on 7/4/2006
Retrieved 28 hits

and

**Sociological Abstracts (CSA Illumina – http://ca2.csa.com/)**

1952 to 2006
Searched on 7/4/2006
Retrieved 34 hits

Search strategy:
1. (Integrate* within 3 care) or (Integrate* within 3 healthcare) or (Integrate* within 3 health care)
2. Integrat* within 3 working
3. Integrat* within 3 provision
4. Integrat* within 3 provider organisation*
5. Integrat* within 3 assessment*
6. Integrat* within 3 team*
7. Integrat* within 3 management
8. Horizontal integration
9. Vertical integration
10. Integrat* within 3 primary within 3 community
11. Integrat* within 3 health within 3 social
12. Cluster* within 3 health within 3 social
13. Integrat* within 3 service*
14. Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care
15. Structured service*
16. Joint* within 3 working
17. Joined-up partnership*
18. Partnership* within 3 working
19. Joint service* within 3 development*
20. Horizontal communication*
21. Partnership project*
22. Horizontal partnership*
23. Flexible partnership*
24. Joint* within 3 service*
25. Joined-up service*
26. (Joint* within 3 care) or (Joint* within 3 healthcare) or (Joint* within 3 health care)
27. Joined-up care or Joined-up health care or Joined-up healthcare
28. (Co-ordinat* within 3 care*) or (Co-ordinat* within 3 health care*) or (Co-ordinat* within 3 healthcare*)
29. (Coordinat* within 3 care*) or (Coordinat* within 3 healthcare*) or (Coordinat* within 3 health care*)
30. Co-ordinat* within 3 service*
31. Coordinat* within 3 service*
32. Seamless service*
33. Seamless care
34. Contin* within 3 service*
35. (contin* within 3 care) or (contin* within 3 healthcare) or (contin* within 3 health care)
36. (Progression within 3 care) or (Progression within 3 healthcare) or (Progression within 3 health care)
37. Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care
38. Uninterrupted service*
39. (Inter-organisation* or Inter-organization*) within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
40. Holistic within 3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
41. (Interorganisation* or Interorganization*) within 3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
42. Multidisciplinary within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
43. Multiprofessional within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
44. Multi-disciplinary within 3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
45. Multi-professional within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
46. Multi-agency within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
47. Inter-agency within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
48. Inter-professional within 3 (care healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
49. Interdisciplinary within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
50. Inter-disciplinary within 3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
51. Holistic within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
52. Collaborat* within 3 servic*
53. Multidisciplinary assessment*
54. single assessment*
55. Care trust*
56. Strategic collaboration*
57. Provider partnership*
58. Pool* within 3 budget*
59. Overlapping commissioning
60. Contiguous commissioning
61. Joint commissioning
62. Integrated commissioning
63. linkwork*
64. Co-located team*
65. co-location
66. One stop shop*
67. DE="Integrated management"
68. DE="Ambulatory health care"
69. ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare
70. ambulatory service* or ambulatory health service*
71. case management
72. care management
73. DE="Integrated care pathways"
74. Managed Care Program*
75. Patient Care Plan*
76. #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24 or #25 or #26 or #27 or #28 or #29 or #30 or #31 or #32 or #33 or #34 or #35 or #36 or #37 or #38 or #39 or #40 or #41 or #42 or #43 or #44 or #45 or #46 or #47 or #48 or #49 or #50 or #51 or #52 or #53 or #54 or #55 or #56 or #57 or #58 or #59 or #60 or #61 or #62 or #63 or #64 or #65 or #66 or #67 or #68 or #69 or #70 or #71 or #72 or #73 or #74 or #75
77. DE="Motor neurone disease" or “bell s palsy”
78. lou gehrig disease
79. lou gehrig's disease
80. motor neuron disease
81. motor neurone disease
82. MND
83. lateral sclerosis
84. ALS
85. anterior horn cell disease
86. Bulbar Palsy
87. Spinal Muscular Atrophy
88. DE="Parkinson's disease"
89. paralysis agitans
90. Parkinson disease
91. Parkinson syndrome
92. Parkinson s
93. parkinsonism
94. Ms
95. Multiple sclerosis
96. DE="Multiple sclerosis"
97. degenerative neurologic* disease*
98. degenerative neurologic* condition*
99. long term neurologic* disease*
100. long-term neurologic* disease*
101. long term neurologic* condition*
102. evolving neurologic\* disease\*
103. evolving neurologic\* condition\*
104. LTNC\*
105. #77 or #78 or #79 or #80 or #81 or #82 or #83 or #84 or #85 or
    #86 or #87 or #88 or #89 or #90 or #91 or #92 or #93 or #94 or
    #95 or #96 or #97 or #98 or #99 or #100 or #101 or #102 or #103 or
    #104
106. #76 and #105

Date range = 1985-2006
Search strategy:

#1. (integrate* near care) or (integrate* near healthcare) or (integrate* near health care)
#2. integrat* near working
#3. (integrate* near provision)
#4. (integrate* near (provider next organisation*))
#5. (integrate* near assessment*)
#6. (integrate* near team*)
#7. (integrate* near management)
#8. (horizontal next integration)
#9. (vertical next integration)
#10. (integrate* near primary near community)
#11. (integrate* near health near social)
#12. (cluster* near health near social)
#13. (integrate* near service*)
#14. ((structured next care) or (structured next healthcare) or (structured next health next care))
#15. (structured next service*)
#16. (joint* near working)
#17. (joined next up next partnership*)
#18. partnership* working
#19. joint near service* near development*
#20. (horizontal next communication*)
#21. (partnership next project*)
#22. (horizontal next partnership*)
#23. (flexible next partnership*)
#24. (joint* near service*)
#25. (joined next up next service*)
#26. joint* care or joint* healthcare or joint* health care
#27. ((joined next up next care) or (joined next up next health next care) or (joined next up next healthcare))
#28. (((co-ordinate* near care*) or (co-ordinate* near (health next care*))) or (co-coordinate* near healthcare*))
#29. (((co-ordinate* near care*) or (co-ordinate* near healthcare*) or (co-ordinate* near (health next care*)))
#30. (co-ordinate* near service*)
#31. (co-ordinate* near service*)
#32. (seamless next service*)
#33. (seamless next care)
#34. (contin* near service*)
#35. contin* care or contin* healthcare or contin* health care
#36. ((progression near care) or (progression near healthcare) or (progression near (health next care)))
#37. ((uninterrupted next care) or (uninterrupted next healthcare) or (uninterrupted next health next care))
#38. (uninterrupted next service*)
#39. (((inter next oragnisation*) or (inter next oragnization*)) and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or (co next ordinat*) or coordinat*))
#40. (holistic and (care or (health next care) or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#41. ((interoragnisation* or interoragnization*) and (care or (health next care) or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#42. (Multidisciplinary near care) or (Multidisciplinary near healthcare) or (Multidisciplinary near health care) or (Multidisciplinary near service*) or (Multidisciplinary near team*) or (Multidisciplinary near work*) or (Multidisciplinary near collaboration*) or (Multidisciplinary near co-ordinat*) or (Multidisciplinary near coordinat*)
#43. (multiprofessional and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#44. ((multi next disciplinary) and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#45. ((multi next professional) and (care or (health next care) or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#46. ((multi next agency) and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#47. ((inter next agency) and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#48. ((inter next professional) and ((care next health next care) or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#49. (interdisciplinary and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#50. (inter next disciplinary) and (care or (health next care) or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#51. (holistic and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#52. (collaborat* near servic*)
#53. (multidisciplinary next assessment*)
#54. (single next assessment*)
#55. care next trust*:ti
#56. (strategic next collaboration*)
#57. (provider next partnership*)
#58. (pool* near budget*)
#59. (overlapping next commissioning)
#60. (contiguous next commissioning)
#61. (joint next commissioning)
#62. (integrated next commissioning)
#63. linkwork*
#64. (co-located next team*)
#65. co-location
#66. (one next stop next shop*)
#67. DELIVERY OF HEALTH CARE INTEGRATED explode all trees (MeSH)
#68. AMBULATORY CARE explode all trees (MeSH)
#69. ((ambulatory next care) or (ambulatory next health next care) or (ambulatory next healthcare))
#70. ((ambulatory next service*) or (ambulatory next health next service*))
#71. (case next management)
#72. (care next management)
#73. CASE MANAGEMENT single term (MeSH)
#74. (managed next care next program*)
#75. (patient next care next plan*)
#76. (#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24 or #25 or #26 or #27 or #28 or #29 or #30 or #31 or #32 or #33 or #34 or #35 or #36 or #37 or #38 or #39 or #40 or #41 or #42 or #43 or #44 or #45 or #46 or #47 or #48 or #49 or #50 or #51 or #52 or #53 or #54 or #55 or #56 or #57 or #58 or #59 or #60 or #61 or #62 or #63 or #64 or #65 or #66 or #67 or #68 or #69 or #70 or #71 or #72 or #73 or #74 or #75)
#77. MOTOR NEURON DISEASE explode all trees (MeSH)
#78. (lou next gehrig next disease)
#79. (lou next gehrig next s next disease)
#80. (motor next neuron next disease)
#81. (motor next neurone next disease)
#82. mnd
#83. (lateral next sclerosis)
#84. als
#85. (anterior next horn next cell next disease)
#86. (bulbar next palsy)
#87. (spinal next muscular next atrophy)
#88. PARKINSON DISEASE single term (MeSH)
#89. (paralysis next agitans)
#90. (parkinson next disease)
#91. (parkinson next syndrome)
#92. (parkinson next s)
#93. parkinsonism
#94. ms:ti
#95. (multiple next sclerosis)
#96. MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS explode all trees (MeSH)
#97. (degenerative next neurologic* next disease*)
#98. (degenerative next neurologic* next condition*)
#99. (long next term next neurologic* next disease*)
#100. (long next term next neurologic* next disease*)
#101. (long next term next neurologic* next condition*)
#102. (evolving next neurologic* next disease*)
#103. (evolving next neurologic* next condition*)
#104. ltnc*
#105. (#77 or #78 or #79 or #80 or #81 or #82 or #83 or #84 or #85 or #86 or #87 or #88 or #89 or #90 or #91 or #92 or #93 or #94 or #95 or #96 or #97 or #98 or #99 or #100 or #101 or #102 or #103 or #104)
#106. (#76 and #105)

SOSIG (http://www.sosig.ac.uk/)
Searches on 10/4/2006
Retrieved 96 hits

Search strategy:

This is a very simple search interface and the following lines were run as separate searches on both the Social Welfare section and the Government Policy section.

“Integrated care”
“Integrated service” or “integrated services”
“Integrated work” or “integrated working”
“Integrated health” or “Integrated healthcare”
“Integrated team” or “Integrated teams”
“integrated management”
“structured care”
“managed care”
“Case management”
“care management”
“Ambulatory care”
“ambulatory service” or “ambulatory services”
collaborate and (care or service or services)
collaborate and (work or health or team or teams)
collaborate and (assessment or management)
collaboration and (care or service or services)
collaboration and (work or health or team)
collaboration and teams
 collaboration and (assessment or management)

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (The Cochrane Library – http://www.thecochranelibrary.com/)
Issue 2 2006
Search on 15/5/2006
Retrieved 6 hits

Search strategy:
#1. ((integrate* near/3 care) or (integrate* near/3 healthcare) or (integrate* near/3 health care)) in Record Title or ((integrate* near/3 care) or (integrate* near/3 healthcare) or (integrate* near/3 health care)) in Abstract in all products
#2. (integrat* near/3 working) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 working) in Abstract in all products
#3. (integrat* near/3 provision) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 provision) in Abstract in all products
#4. (integrat* near/3 provider organisation*) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 provider organisation*) in Abstract in all products
#5. (integrat* near/3 assessment*) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 assessment*) in Abstract in all products
#6. (integrat* near/3 team*) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 team*) in Abstract in all products
#7. (integrat* near/3 management) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 management) in Abstract in all products
#8. horizontal integration in Record Title or horizontal integration in Abstract in all products
#9. vertical integration in Record Title or vertical integration in Abstract in all products
#10. (integrat* near/3 primary near/3 community) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 primary near/3 community) in Abstract in all products
#11. (integrat* near/3 health near/3 social) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 health near/3 social) in Abstract in all products
#12. (cluster* near/3 health near/3 social) in Record Title or (cluster* near/3 health near/3 social) in Abstract in all products

#13. (integrat* near/3 service*) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 service*) in Abstract in all products

#14. (structured care or structured healthcare or structured health care) in Record Title or (structured care or structured healthcare or structured health care) in Abstract in all products

#15. structured service* in Record Title or structured service* in Abstract in all products

#16. (joint* near/3 working) in Record Title or (joint* near/3 working) in Abstract in all products

#17. joined up partnership* in Record Title or joined up partnership* in Abstract in all products

#18. (partnership* near/3 working) in Record Title or (partnership* near/3 working) in Abstract in all products

#19. (joint service* near/3 development*) in Record Title or (joint service* near/3 development*) in Abstract in all products

#20. horizontal communication* in Record Title or horizontal communication* in Abstract in all products

#21. partnership project* in Record Title or partnership project* in Abstract in all products

#22. horizontal partnership* in Record Title or horizontal partnership* in Abstract in all products

#23. flexible partnership* in Record Title or flexible partnership* in Abstract in all products

#24. (joint* near/3 service*) in Record Title or (joint* near/3 service*) in Abstract in all products

#25. joined up service* in Record Title or joined up service* in Abstract in all products

#26. ((joint* near/3 care) or (joint* near/3 healthcare) or (joint* near/3 health care)) in Record Title or ((joint* near/3 care) or (joint* near/3 healthcare) or (joint* near/3 health care)) in Abstract in all products

#27. (joined up care or joined up health care or joined up healthcare) in Record Title or (joined up care or joined up health care or joined up healthcare) in Abstract in all products

#28. ((co ordinat* near/3 care*) or (co ordinat* near/3 health care*) or (co ordinat* near/3 healthcare*)) in Record Title or ((co ordinat* near/3 care*) or (co ordinat* near/3 health care*) or (co ordinat* near/3 healthcare*)) in Abstract in all products

#29. ((coordinat* near/3 care*) or (coordinat* near/3 healthcare*) or (coordinat* near/3 health care*)) in Record Title or ((coordinat* near/3 care*) or (coordinat* near/3 healthcare*) or (coordinat* near/3 health care*)) in Abstract in all products
#30. (co ordinat* near/3 service*) in Record Title or (co ordinat* near/3 service*) in Abstract in all products

#31. (coordinat* near/3 service*) in Record Title or (coordinat* near/3 service*) in Abstract in all products

#32. seamless service* in Record Title or seamless service* in Abstract in all products

#33. seamless care in Record Title or seamless care in Abstract in all products

#34. (contin* near/3 service*) in Record Title or (contin* near/3 service*) in Abstract in all products

#35. ((contin* near/3 care) or (contin* near/3 healthcare) or (contin* near/3 health care)) in Record Title or ((contin* near/3 care) or (contin* near/3 healthcare) or (contin* near/3 health care)) in Abstract in all products

#36. ((progression near/3 care) or (progression near/3 healthcare) or (progression near/3 health care)) in Record Title or ((progression near/3 care) or (progression near/3 healthcare) or (progression near/3 health care)) in Abstract in all products

#37. (uninterrupted care or uninterrupted healthcare or uninterrupted health care) in Record Title or (uninterrupted care or uninterrupted healthcare or uninterrupted health care) in Abstract in all products

#38. uninterrupted service* in Record Title or uninterrupted service* in Abstract in all products

#39. ((inter oragnisation* or inter oragnization*) near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or ((inter oragnisation* or inter oragnization*) near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#40. (holistic near/3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (holistic near/3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#41. ((interoragnisation* or interoragnization*) near/3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or ((interoragnisation* or interoragnization*) near/3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#42. (multidisciplinary near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (multidisciplinary near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products
#43. (multiprofessional near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (multiprofessional near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#44. (multi disciplinary near/3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (multi disciplinary near/3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#45. (multi professional near/3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (multi professional near/3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#46. (multi agency near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (multi agency near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#47. (inter agency near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (inter agency near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#48. (inter professional near/3 (care health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (inter professional near/3 (care health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#49. (interdisciplinary near/3 (care healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (interdisciplinary near/3 (care healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#50. (inter disciplinary near/3 (care healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (inter disciplinary near/3 (care healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#51. (holistic near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title
or (holistic near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#52. (collaborat* near/3 servic*) in Record Title or (collaborat* near/3 servic*) in Abstract in all products

#53. multidisciplinary assessment* in Record Title or multidisciplinary assessment* in Abstract in all products

#54. single assessment* in Record Title or single assessment* in Abstract in all products

#55. care trust* in Record Title or care trust* in Abstract in all products

#56. strategic collaboration* in Record Title or strategic collaboration* in Abstract in all products

#57. provider partnership* in Record Title or provider partnership* in Abstract in all products

#58. (pool* near/3 budget*) in Record Title or (pool* near/3 budget*) in Abstract in all products

#59. overlapping commissioning in Record Title or overlapping commissioning in Abstract in all products

#60. contiguous commissioning in Record Title or contiguous commissioning in Abstract in all products

#61. joint commissioning in Record Title or joint commissioning in Abstract in all products

#62. integrated commissioning in Record Title or integrated commissioning in Abstract in all products

#63. linkwork* in Record Title or linkwork* in Abstract in all products

#64. co located team* in Record Title or co located team* in Abstract in all products

#65. co location in Record Title or co location in Abstract in all products

#66. one stop shop* in Record Title or one stop shop* in Abstract in all products

#67. MeSH descriptor Delivery of Health Care, Integrated explode all trees in MeSH products

#68. MeSH descriptor Ambulatory Care explode all trees in MeSH products

#69. (ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare) in Record Title or (ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare) in Abstract in all products

#70. (ambulatory service* or ambulatory health service*) in Record Title or (ambulatory service* or ambulatory health service*) in Abstract in all products

#71. case management in Record Title or case management in Abstract in all products
#72. care management in Record Title or care management in Abstract in all products

#73. MeSH descriptor Case Management, this term only in MeSH products

#74. managed care program* in Record Title or managed care program* in Abstract in all products

#75. patient care plan* in Record Title or patient care plan* in Abstract in all products

#76. (#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR #12 OR #13 OR #14 OR #15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #19 OR #20 OR #21 OR #22 OR #23 OR #24 OR #25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28 OR #29 OR #30 OR #31 OR #32 OR #33 OR #34 OR #35 OR #36 OR #37 OR #38 OR #39 OR #40 OR #41 OR #42 OR #43 OR #44 OR #45 OR #46 OR #47 OR #48 OR #49 OR #50 OR #51 OR #52 OR #53 OR #54 OR #55 OR #56 OR #57 OR #58 OR #59 OR #60 OR #61 OR #62 OR #63 OR #64 OR #65 OR #66 OR #67 OR #68 OR #69 OR #70 OR #71 OR #72 OR #73 OR #74 OR #75)

#77. MeSH descriptor Motor Neuron Disease explode all trees in MeSH products

#78. lou gehrig disease in Record Title or lou gehrig disease in Abstract in all products

#79. lou gehrig s disease in Record Title or lou gehrig s disease in Abstract in all products

#80. motor neuron disease in Record Title or motor neuron disease in Abstract in all products

#81. motor neurone disease in Record Title or motor neurone disease in Abstract in all products

#82. mnd in Record Title or mnd in Abstract in all products

#83. lateral sclerosis in Record Title or lateral sclerosis in Abstract in all products

#84. als in Record Title or als in Abstract in all products

#85. anterior horn cell disease in Record Title or anterior horn cell disease in Abstract in all products

#86. bulbar palsy in Record Title or bulbar palsy in Abstract in all products

#87. spinal muscular atrophy in Record Title or spinal muscular atrophy in Abstract in all products

#88. MeSH descriptor Parkinson Disease, this term only in MeSH products

#89. paralysis agitans in Record Title or paralysis agitans in Abstract in all products

#90. parkinson disease in Record Title or parkinson disease in Abstract in all products

#91. parkinson syndrome in Record Title or parkinson syndrome in Abstract in all products

#92. parkinson s in Record Title or parkinson s in Abstract in all products
#93. parkinsonism in Record Title or parkinsonism in Abstract in all products
#94. ms in Record Title or ms in Abstract in all products
#95. multiple sclerosis in Record Title or multiple sclerosis in Abstract in all products
#96. MeSH descriptor Multiple Sclerosis explode all trees in MeSH products
#97. degenerative neurologic* disease* in Record Title or degenerative neurologic* disease* in Abstract in all products
#98. degenerative neurologic* condition* in Record Title or degenerative neurologic* condition* in Abstract in all products
#99. long term neurologic* disease* in Record Title or long term neurologic* disease* in Abstract in all products
#100. long term neurologic* disease* in Record Title or long term neurologic* disease* in Abstract in all products
#101. long term neurologic* condition* in Record Title or long term neurologic* condition* in Abstract in all products
#102. evolving neurologic* disease* in Record Title or evolving neurologic* disease* in Abstract in all products
#103. evolving neurologic* condition* in Record Title or evolving neurologic* condition* in Abstract in all products
#104. ltnc* in Record Title or ltnc* in Abstract in all products
#105. (#77 OR #78 OR #79 OR #80 OR #81 OR #82 OR #83 OR #84 OR #85 OR #86 OR #87 OR #88 OR #89 OR #90 OR #91 OR #92 OR #93 OR #94 OR #95 OR #96 OR #97 OR #98 OR #99 OR #100 OR #101 OR #102 OR #103 OR #104)
#106. (#76 AND #105)
#107. (#76 AND #105)
Appendix 2  Search strategies for long-term neurological conditions – new search terms and update searching (December 2006)

The following databases were searched:
- MEDLINE
- CINAHL
- EMBASE
- HMIC
- DARE
- HTA
- NHSEED
- SIGLE
- Social Policy and Practice
- Social Science Citation Index
- ASSIA, Social Services Abstracts
- Sociological Abstracts
- NRR SOSIG
- The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.

Terminology

These searches included extra terms for multidisciplinary working which has been identified from the results of previous searches.

In an attempt to increase the amount of relevant literature retrieved, terms for epilepsy and cerebral palsy were also included.

Dates

The strategies were run to pick up any material from the new terms using the original date restrictions (1985 onwards).

Since it was 9 months since the original searches had been conducted, a top up search was also run on the original terms.

All results were deduplicated against the material retrieved from the main searches.
MEDLINE (Ovid Online – http://www.ovid.com/)
1966 to November Week 3 2006
Searched on 1/12/2006
Retrieved 749 hits

Search strategy:
1. ((Integrate$ adj3 care) or (Integrate$ adj3 healthcare) or (Integrate$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
2. (Integrate$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
3. (Integrate$ adj3 provision).ti,ab.
4. (Integrate$ adj3 provider organisation$).ti,ab.
5. (Integrate$ adj3 assessment$).ti,ab.
6. (Integrate$ adj3 team$).ti,ab.
7. (Integrate$ adj3 management).ti,ab.
8. Horizontal integration.ti,ab.
10. (Integrate$ adj3 primary adj3 community).ti,ab.
11. (Integrate$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
12. (Cluster$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
14. (Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care).ti,ab.
15. Structured service$.ti,ab.
16. (Joint$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
17. Joined-up partnership$.ti,ab.
18. (Partnership$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
19. (Joint service$ adj3 development$).ti,ab.
20. Horizontal communication$.ti,ab.
21. Partnership project$.ti,ab.
22. Horizontal partnership$.ti,ab.
23. Flexible partnership$.ti,ab.
24. (Joint$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
25. Joined-up service$.ti,ab.
26. ((Joint$ adj3 care) or (Joint$ adj3 healthcare) or (Joint$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
27. (Joined-up care or Joined-up health care or Joined-up healthcare).ti,ab.
28. ((Co-ordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 health care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 healthcare$)).ti,ab.
29. ((Coordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 healthcare$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 health care$)).ti,ab.
30. (Co-ordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
31. (Coordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
32. Seamless service$.ti,ab.
33. Seamless care.ti,ab.
34. (Contin$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
35. ((contin$ adj3 care) or (contin$ adj3 healthcare) or (contin$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
36. ((Progression adj3 care) or (Progression adj3 healthcare) or (Progression adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
37. (Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care).ti,ab.
38. Uninterrupted service$.ti,ab.
39. ((Inter-organisation$ or Inter-organization$) adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
40. (Holistic adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
41. ((Interorganisation$ or Interorganisation$) adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
42. (Multidisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
43. (Multiprofessional adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
44. (Multi-disciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
45. (Multi-professional adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
46. (Multi-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
47. (Inter-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
48. (Inter-professional adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
49. (Interdisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
50. (Holistic adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
51. (Collaborat$ adj 3 servic$).ti,ab.
52. Multidisciplinary assessment$.ti,ab.
53. single assessment$.ti,ab.
54. Care trust$.ti,ab.
55. Strategic collaboration$.ti,ab.
56. Provider partnership$.ti,ab.
57. (Pool$ adj3 budget$).ti,ab.
58. Overlapping commissioning.ti,ab.
59. Contiguous commissioning.ti,ab.
60. Joint commissioning.ti,ab.
61. Integrated commissioning.ti,ab.
62. linkwork$.ti,ab.
63. Co-located team$.ti,ab.
64. co-location.ti,ab.
65. One stop shop$.ti,ab.
66. exp "Delivery of Health Care, Integrated"/
67. exp ambulatory care/
68. (ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare).ti,ab.
(ambulatory service$ or ambulatory health service$).ti,ab.
case management.ti,ab.
care management.ti,ab.
Case Management/
Managed Care Program$.ti,ab.
Patient Care Plan$.ti,ab.
Patient Care Team/
care team$.ti,ab.
or/1-77
Motor Neuron Disease/
lou gehrig disease.ti,ab.
lou gehrig's disease.ti,ab.
motor neuron disease.ti,ab.
motor neurone disease.ti,ab.
MND.ti,ab.
lateral sclerosis.ti,ab.
ALS.ti,ab.
anterior horn cell disease.ti,ab.
Bulbar Palsy.ti,ab.
Spinal Muscular Atrophy.ti,ab.
PARKinson DISEASE/
paralysis agitans.ti,ab.
Parkinson disease.ti,ab.
Parkinson syndrome.ti,ab.
Parkinson s.ti,ab.
parkinsonism.ti,ab.
Ms.ti,ab.
Multiple sclerosis.ti,ab.
exp Multiple Sclerosis/
degenerative neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
degenerative neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
long term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
long-term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
long term neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
evolving neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
evolving neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
LTNC$.ti,ab.
Epilepsy/
epilepsy.ti,ab.
epileptic.ti,ab.
seizure disorder$.ti,ab.
landau kleffner syndrome.ti,ab.
cerebral palsy.ti,ab.
spastic diplegia.ti,ab.
little disease.ti,ab.
 cp.ti,ab.
diplegia spastic.ti,ab.
little's disease.ti,ab.
cerebral palsy/
or/79-118
Search strategy:
1. ((Integrate$ adj3 care) or (Integrate$ adj3 healthcare) or (Integrate$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
2. (Integrate$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
3. (Integrate$ adj3 provision).ti,ab.
4. (Integrate$ adj3 provider organisation$).ti,ab.
5. (Integrate$ adj3 assessment$).ti,ab.
6. (Integrate$ adj3 team$).ti,ab.
7. (Integrate$ adj3 management).ti,ab.
8. Horizontal integration.ti,ab.
10. (Integrate$ adj3 primary adj3 community).ti,ab.
11. (Integrate$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
12. (Cluster$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
14. (Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care).ti,ab.
15. Structured service$.ti,ab.
16. (Joint$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
17. Joined-up partnership$.ti,ab.
18. (Partnership$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
19. (Joint service$ adj3 development$).ti,ab.
20. Horizontal communication$.ti,ab.
21. Partnership project$.ti,ab.
22. Horizontal partnership$.ti,ab.
23. Flexible partnership$.ti,ab.
24. (Joint$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
25. Joined-up service$.ti,ab.
26. ((Joint$ adj3 care) or (Joint$ adj3 healthcare) or (Joint$ adj3 health care$)).ti,ab.
27. (Joined-up care or Joined-up health care or Joined-up healthcare).ti,ab.
28. ((Co-ordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 health care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 healthcare$)).ti,ab.
29. ((Coordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 healthcare$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 health care$)).ti,ab.
30. (Co-ordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
31. (Coordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
32. Seamless service$.ti,ab.
33. Seamless care.ti,ab.
34. (Conti$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
35. ((contin$ adj3 care) or (contin$ adj3 healthcare) or (contin$ adj3 health care$)).ti,ab.
36. ((Progression adj3 care) or (Progression adj3 healthcare) or (Progression adj3 health care$)).ti,ab.
37. (Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care).ti,ab.
38. Uninterrupted service$.ti,ab.
39. ((Inter-organisation$ or Inter-organization$) adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
40. (Holistic adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
41. ((Interorganisation$ or Interorganisation$) adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
42. (Multidisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
43. (Multiprofessional adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
44. (Multi-disciplinary adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
45. (Multi-professional adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
46. (Multi-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
47. (Inter-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
48. (Inter-professional adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
49. (Interdisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
50. (Inter-disciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
51. (Holistic adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service or team or work or collaboration or co-ordinat or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
52. (Collaborat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
53. Multidisciplinary assessment$.ti,ab.
54. single assessment$.ti,ab.
55. Care trust$.ti,ab.
56. Strategic collaboration$.ti,ab.
57. Provider partnership$.ti,ab.
58. (Pool$ adj3 budget$).ti,ab.
59. Overlapping commissioning.ti,ab.
60. Contiguous commissioning.ti,ab.
61. Joint commissioning.ti,ab.
62. Integrated commissioning.ti,ab.
63. linkwork$.ti,ab.
64. Co-located team$.ti,ab.
65. co-location.ti,ab.
66. One stop shop$.ti,ab.
67. Health Care Delivery, Integrated/
68. ambulatory care/
69. (ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare).ti,ab.
70. (ambulatory service$ or ambulatory health service$).ti,ab.
71. case management.ti,ab.
72. care management.ti,ab.
73. Case Management/
74. Managed Care Program$.ti,ab.
75. Patient Care Plan$.ti,ab.
76. care team$.ti,ab.
77. multidisciplinary care team/
78. or/1-77
79. exp Motor Neuron Diseases/
80. lou gehrig disease.ti,ab.
81. lou gehrig's disease.ti,ab.
82. motor neuron disease.ti,ab.
83. motor neurone disease.ti,ab.
84. MND.ti,ab.
85. lateral sclerosis.ti,ab.
86. ALS.ti,ab.
87. anterior horn cell disease.ti,ab.
88. Bulbar Palsy.ti,ab.
89. Spinal Muscular Atrophy.ti,ab.
90. PARKINSON DISEASE/
91. paralysis agitans.ti,ab.
92. Parkinson disease.ti,ab.
93. Parkinson syndrome.ti,ab.
94. Parkinson s.ti,ab.
95. parkinsonism.ti,ab.
96. Ms.ti,ab.
97. Multiple sclerosis.ti,ab.
98. Multiple Sclerosis/
99. degenerative neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
100. degenerative neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
101. long term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
102. long-term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
103. long term neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
104. evolving neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
105. evolving neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
106. LTNC$.ti,ab.
107. Epilepsy/
108. epilepsy.ti,ab.
109. epileptic.ti,ab.
110. seizure disorder$.ti,ab.
111. landau kleffner syndrome.ti,ab.
112. cerebral palsy.ti,ab.
113. spastic diplegia.ti,ab.
114. little disease.ti,ab.
115. little's disease.ti,ab.
116. cerebral palsy/
117. cp.ti,ab.
118. diplegia spastic.ti,ab.
119. or/79-118
120. 78 and 119
121. 120
122. 2006$.ew.
123. 121 and 122
124. or/79-106
125. or/107-118
126. 125 not 124
127. 126 and 78
128. 127
129. limit 128 to yr="1985 - 2006"
130. 129 or 123

EMBASE (Ovid Online – http://www.ovid.com/)
1980 to 2006 Week 48
Searched on 7/12/2006
Retrieved 357 hits

Search strategy:
1. ((Integrate$ adj3 care) or (Integrate$ adj3 healthcare) or (Integrate$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
2. (Integrat$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
3. (Integrat$ adj3 provision).ti,ab.
4. (Integrat$ adj3 provider organisation$).ti,ab.
5. (Integrat$ adj3 assessment$).ti,ab.
6. (Integrat$ adj3 team$).ti,ab.
7. (Integrat$ adj3 management).ti,ab.
8. Horizontal integration.ti,ab.
10. (Integrat$ adj3 primary ajd3 community).ti,ab.
11. (Integrat$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
12. (Cluster$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
14. (Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care).ti,ab.
15. Structured service$.ti,ab.
16. (Joint$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
17. Joined-up partnership$.ti,ab.
18. (Partnership$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
19. (Joint service$ adj3 development$).ti,ab.
20. Horizontal communication$.ti,ab.
21. Partnership project$.ti,ab.
22. Horizontal partnership$.ti,ab.
23. Flexible partnership$.ti,ab.
24. (Joint$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
25. Joined-up service$.ti,ab.
26. ((Joint$ adj3 care) or (Joint$ adj3 healthcare) or (Joint$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
27. (Joined-up care or Joined-up health care or Joined-up healthcare).ti,ab.
28. ((Co-ordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 health care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 healthcare$)).ti,ab.
29. ((Coordination$ adj3 care$) or (Coordination$ adj3 healthcare$) or (Coordination$ adj3 health care$)).ti,ab.
30. (Co-ordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
31. (Coordination$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
32. Seamless service$.ti,ab.
33. Seamless care.ti,ab.
34. (Contin$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
35. ((contin$ adj3 care) or (contin$ adj3 healthcare) or (contin$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
36. ((Progression adj3 care) or (Progression adj3 healthcare) or (Progression adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
37. (Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care).ti,ab.
38. Uninterrupted service$.ti,ab.
39. ((Inter-organisation$ or Inter-organization$) adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
40. (Holistic adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
41. ((Interorganisation$ or Interorganization$) adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
42. (Multidisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
43. (Multiprofessional adj3 (care or healthcare or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
44. (Multi-disciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
45. (Multi-professional adj3 (care or healthcare or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
46. (Multi-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
47. (Inter-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
48. (Inter-professional adj3 (care healthcare or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
49. (Interdisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
50. (Inter-disciplinary adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
51. (Holistic adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
52. (Collaborat$ adj3 servic$).ti,ab.
53. Multidisciplinary assessment$.ti,ab.
54. single assessment$.ti,ab.
55. Care trust$.ti,ab.
56. Strategic collaboration$.ti,ab.
57. Provider partnership$.ti,ab.
58. (Pool$ adj3 budget$).ti,ab.
59. Overlapping commissioning.ti,ab.
60. Contiguous commissioning.ti,ab.
61. Joint commissioning.ti,ab.
62. Integrated commissioning.ti,ab.
63. linkwork$.ti,ab.
64. Co-located team$.ti,ab.
65. co-location.ti,ab.
66. One stop shop$.ti,ab.
67. ambulatory care/
68. (ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare).ti,ab.
69. (ambulatory service$ or ambulatory health service$).ti,ab.
70. case management.ti,ab.
71. care management.ti,ab.
72. Managed Care Program$.ti,ab.
73. Patient Care Plan$.ti,ab.
74. care team$.ti,ab.
75. or/1-74
76. exp Motor Neuron Diseases/
77. lou gehrig disease.ti,ab.
78. lou gehrig's disease.ti,ab.
79. motor neuron disease.ti,ab.
80. motor neurone disease.ti,ab.
81. MND.ti,ab.
82. lateral sclerosis.ti,ab.
83. ALS.ti,ab.
84. anterior horn cell disease.ti,ab.
85. Bulbar Palsy.ti,ab.
86. Spinal Muscular Atrophy.ti,ab.
87. PARKINSON DISEASE/
88. paralysis agitans.ti,ab.
89. Parkinson disease.ti,ab.
90. Parkinson syndrome.ti,ab.
91. Parkinson s.ti,ab.
92. parkinsonism.ti,ab.
93. Ms.ti,ab.
94. Multiple sclerosis.ti,ab.
95. Multiple Sclerosis/
96. degenerative neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
97. degenerative neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
98. long term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
99. long-term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
100. long term neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
101. evolving neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
102. evolving neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
103. LTNC$.ti,ab.
104. epilepsy/ or generalized epilepsy/
105. epilepsy.ti,ab.
106. epileptic.ti,ab.
107. seizure disorder$.ti,ab.
108. landau kleffner syndrome.ti,ab.
109. cerebral palsy.ti,ab.
110. spastic diplegia.ti,ab.
111. little disease.ti,ab.
112. cp.ti,ab.
113. diplegia spastic.ti,ab.
114. little's disease.ti,ab.
115. Cerebral Palsy/
116. or/76-115
117. 116 and 75
118. 2006$.em.
119. 117 and 118
120. or/76-103
121. or/104-115
122. 121 not 120
123. 122 and 75
124. 123
125. limit 124 to yr="1985 - 2006"
126. 125 or 119

HMIC (Ovid Online – http://www.ovid.com/)
November 2006
Search on 7/12/2006
Retrieved 32 hits

Search strategy:
1. ((Integrate$ adj3 care) or (Integrate$ adj3 healthcare) or (Integrate$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
2. (Integrat$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
3. (Integrat$ adj3 provision).ti,ab.
4. (Integrat$ adj3 provider organisation$).ti,ab.
5. (Integrat$ adj3 assessment$).ti,ab.
6. (Integrat$ adj3 team$).ti,ab.
7. (Integrat$ adj3 management).ti,ab.
8. Horizontal integration.ti,ab.
10. (Integrat$ adj3 primary adj3 community).ti,ab.
11. (Integrat$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
12. (Cluster$ adj3 health adj3 social).ti,ab.
14. (Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care).ti,ab.
15. Structured service$.ti,ab.
16. (Joint$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
17. Joined-up partnership$.ti,ab.
18. (Partnership$ adj3 working).ti,ab.
19. (Joint service$ adj3 development$).ti,ab.
20. Horizontal communication$.ti,ab.
21. Partnership project$.ti,ab.
22. Horizontal partnership$.ti,ab.
23. Flexible partnership$.ti,ab.
24. (Joint$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
25. Joined-up service$.ti,ab.
26. ((Joint$ adj3 care) or (Joint$ adj3 healthcare) or (Joint$ adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
27. (Joined-up care or Joined-up health care or Joined-up healthcare).ti,ab.
28. (((Co-ordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 health care$) or (Co-ordinat$ adj3 health care$))).ti,ab.
29. (((Coordinat$ adj3 care$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 healthcare$) or (Coordinat$ adj3 health care$))).ti,ab.
30. (Co-ordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
31. (Co-ordinat$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
32. Seamless service$.ti,ab.
33. Seamless care.ti,ab.
34. (Contin$ adj3 service$).ti,ab.
35. (((contin$ adj3 care) or (contin$ adj3 healthcare) or (contin$ adj3 health care))).ti,ab.
36. ((Progression adj3 care) or (Progression adj3 healthcare) or (Progression adj3 health care)).ti,ab.
37. (Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care).ti,ab.
38. Uninterrupted service$.ti,ab.
39. (((Inter-organisation$ or Inter-organization$) adj3 care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
40. (Holistic adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
41. (((Interorganisation$ or Interorganization$) adj3 care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
42. (Multidisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
43. (Multiprofessional adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
44. (Multi-disciplinary adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
45. (Multi-professional adj3 (care or health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
46. (Multi-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
47. (Inter-agency adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
48. (Inter-professional adj3 (care health care or healthcare or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
49. (Interdisciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
50. (Inter-disciplinary adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
51. (Holistic adj3 (care or healthcare or health care or service$ or team$ or work$ or collaboration$ or co-ordinat$ or coordinat$)).ti,ab.
52. (Collaborat$ adj3 servic$).ti,ab.
53. Multidisciplinary assessment$.ti,ab.
54. single assessment$.ti,ab.
55. Care trust$.ti,ab.
56. Strategic collaboration$.ti,ab.
57. Provider partnership$.ti,ab.
58. (Pool$ adj3 budget$).ti,ab.
59. Overlapping commissioning.ti,ab.
60. Contiguous commissioning.ti,ab.
61. Joint commissioning.ti,ab.
62. Integrated commissioning.ti,ab.
63. linkwork$.ti,ab.
64. Co-located team$.ti,ab.
65. co-location.ti,ab.
66. One stop shop$.ti,ab.
67. exp AMBULATORY CARE/
68. AMBULATORY CARE SERVICES/
69. (ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare).ti,ab.
70. (ambulatory service$ or ambulatory health service$).ti,ab.
71. case management.ti,ab.
72. care management.ti,ab.
73. Case Management/ or care management/
74. Managed Care Program$.ti,ab.
75. Patient Care Plan$.ti,ab.
76. Health care teams/
77. care team$.ti,ab.
78. or/1-77
79. Motor Neuron Diseases/
80. lou gehrig disease.ti,ab.
81. lou gehrig's disease.ti,ab.
82. motor neuron disease.ti,ab.
83. motor neurone disease.ti,ab.
84. MND.ti,ab.
85. lateral sclerosis.ti,ab.
86. ALS.ti,ab.
87. anterior horn cell disease.ti,ab.
88. Bulbar Palsy.ti,ab.
89. Spinal Muscular Atrophy.ti,ab.
90. parkinsons disease/
91. paralysis agitans.ti,ab.
92. Parkinson disease.ti,ab.
93. Parkinson syndrome.ti,ab.
94. Parkinson s.ti,ab.
95. parkinsonism.ti,ab.
96. Ms.ti,ab.
97. Multiple sclerosis.ti,ab.
98. multiple sclerosis/
99. degenerative neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
100. degenerative neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
101. long term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
102. long-term neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
103. long term neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
104. evolving neurologic$ disease$.ti,ab.
105. evolving neurologic$ condition$.ti,ab.
106. LTNC$.ti,ab.
107. epilepsy/
108. epilepsy.ti,ab.
109. epileptic.ti,ab.
110. seizure disorder$.ti,ab.
111. landau kleffner syndrome.ti,ab.
112. cerebral palsy.ti,ab.
113. spastic diplegia.ti,ab.
114. little disease.ti,ab.
115. cp.ti,ab.
116. diplegia spastic.ti,ab.
117. little's disease.ti,ab.
118. cerebral palsy/
119. or/79-118
120. 78 and 119
121. 2006$.up.
122. 120 and 121
123. or/79-106
124. or/107-118
125. 124 not 123
126. 125 and 78
127. 126
128. limit 127 to yr="1985 - 2006"
129. 128 or 122
DARE – Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects, HTA (Health Technology Assessment Database and NHSEED (NHS Economic Evaluation Database) (CRD administration database))

Searched on 7/12/2006
Retrieved 5 hits from DARE, 4 hits from HTA and 22 hits from NHSEED

Search strategy:
1. s Integrate$(3w)care or Integrate$(3w)healthcare or Integrate$(3w)health(w)care
2. s Integrat$(3w)working
3. s Integrat$(3w)provision
4. s Integrat$(3w)provider(w)organisation$
5. s Integrat$(3w)assessment
6. s Integrat$(3w)team
7. s Integrat$(3w)management
8. s Horizontal(w)integration
9. s Vertical(w)integration
10. s Integrat$(3w)primary(3w)community
11. s Integrat$(3w)health(3w)social
12. s Cluster$(3w)health(3w)social
13. s Integrated(3w)service or Integrated(3w)services or Integration(3w)service or Integration(3w)services
14. s Structured(w)care or Structured(w)healthcare or Structured(w)health(w)care
15. s Structured(w)service or Structured(w)services
16. s Joint$(3w)working
17. s Joined(w)up(w)partnership$
18. s Partnership$(3w)working
19. s Joint(w)service(3w)development or Joint(w)services(3w)development
20. s Horizontal(w)communication$
21. s Partnership(w)project$
22. s Horizontal(w)partnership$
23. s Flexible(w)partnership$
24. s Joint(3w)service or Joint(3w)service or Jointly(3w)service or Jointly(3w)services
25. s Jointed(w)up(w)service or Joined(w)up(w)services
26. s Joint(3w)care or Joint(3w)healthcare or Joint(3w)health(w)care or Jointly(3w)care or Jointly(3w)healthcare or Jointly(3w)health(w)care
27. s Jointed(w)up(w)care or Joined(w)up(w)health(w)care or Joined(w)up(w)healthcare
28. s Co(w)ordinate(3w)care or Co(w)ordinate(3w)health(w)care or Co(w)ordinate(3w)healthcare or Co(w)ordination(3w)care or Co(w)ordination(3w)health(w)care or Co(w)ordination(3w)healthcare
29. s Coordinat$(3w)care or Coordinat$(3w)healthcare or Coordinat$(3w)health(w)care
30. s Co(w)ordinate(3w)service or s Co(w)ordinate(3w)services or Co(w)ordination(3w)service or s Co(w)ordination(3w)services
31. s Co ordinate(3w)service or Co ordinate(3w)services or Co ordination(3w)service or Co ordination(3w)services
32. s Seamless(w)service or Seamless(w)services
33. s Seamless(w)care
34. s Continuous(w)service or Continuous(w)services or Continuity(3w)service or Continuity(3w)services
35. s contin$(3w)care or contin$(3w)healthcare or contin$(3w)health(w)care
36. s Progression(3w)care or Progression(3w)healthcare or Progression(3w)health(w)care
37. s Uninterrupted(w)care or Uninterrupted(w)healthcare or Uninterrupted(w)health(w)care
38. s Uninterrupted(w)service or Uninterrupted(w)services
39. s Inter(w)organisation(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or working or workers or collaboration or collaborate or collaborations or co(W)ordinate or co(W)ordination or coordinate or coordination) or Inter(w)organisational(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or working or workers or collaboration or collaborate or collaborations or co(W)ordinate or co(W)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
40. s Holistic(3w)(care or healthcare or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
41. s ((Interoragnisation or Interoragnisational or Interoragnization or Interoragnizational)(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or working or workers or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination))
42. s Multidisciplinary(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
43. s Multiprofessional(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
44. s Multi(w)disciplinary(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
45. s Multi(w)professional(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
46. s Multi(w)agency(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
47. s Inter(w)agency(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
48.  s Inter(w)professional(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
49.  s Interdisciplinary(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
50.  s Inter(w)disciplinary(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
51.  s Holistic(3w)(care or healthcare or health(w)care or service or services or team or teams or work or workers or working or collaboration or collaborations or co(w)ordinate or co(w)ordination or coordinate or coordination)
52.  s (Collaborate or collaboration or collaborations)(3w)(service or services)
53.  s Multidisciplinary(w)assessment$
54.  s single(w)assessment$
55.  s Care(w)trust$
56.  s Strategic(w)collaboration$
57.  s Provider(w)partnership$
58.  s Pool$(3w)budget$
59.  s Overlapping(w)commissioning
60.  s Contiguous(w)commissioning
61.  s Joint(w)commissioning
62.  s Integrated(w)commissioning
63.  s linkwork$
64.  s Co(w)located(w)team$
65.  s co(w)location
66.  s One(w)stop(w)shop$
67.  s ambulatory(w)care or ambulatory(w)health(w)care or ambulatory(w)healthcare
68.  s ambulatory(w)service or ambulatory(w)services or ambulatory(w)health(w)service or ambulatory(w)health(w)services
69.  s case(w)management
70.  s care(w)management
71.  s Managed(w)Care(w)Program$
72.  s Patient(w)Care(w)Plan$
73.  s care(w)team$
74.  s s1 or s2 or s3 or s4 or s5 or s6 or s7 or s8 or s9 or s10 or s11 or s12 or s13 or s14 or s15 or s16 or s17 or s18 or s19 or s20 or s21 or s22 or s23 or s24 or s25 or s26 or s27 or s28 or s29 or s30 or s31 or s32 or s33 or s34 or s35 or s36 or s37 or s38 or s39 or s40 or s41 or s42 or s43 or s44 or s45 or s46 or s47 or s48 or s49 or s50 or s51 or s52 or s53 or s54 or s55 or s56 or s57 or s58 or s59 or s60 or s61 or s62 or s63 or s64 or s65 or s66 or s67 or s68 or s69 or s70 or s71 or s72 or s73
75.  s lou(w)gehrig(w)disease
76. s lou(w)gheirg(w)s(w)disease
77. s motor(w)neuron(w)disease
78. s motor(w)neurone(w)disease
79. s MND
80. s lateral(w)sclerosis
81. s ALS
82. s anterior(w)horn(w)cell(w)disease
83. s Bulbar(w)Palsy
84. s Spinal(w)Muscular(w)Atrophy
85. s paralysis(w)agitans
86. s Parkinson(w)disease
87. s Parkinson(w)syndrome
88. s Parkinson(w)s
89. s parkinsonism
90. s Ms
91. s Multiple(w)sclerosis
92. s degenerative(w)neurologic(w)disease or degenerative(w)neurological(w)disease or degenerative(w)neurologic(w)diseases or degenerative(w)neurological(w)diseases
93. s degenerative(w)neurologic(w)condition or degenerative(w)neurological(w)condition or degenerative(w)neurologic(w)conditions or degenerative(w)neurological(w)conditions
94. s long(w)term(w)neurologic(w)disease or long(w)term(w)neurological(w)disease or long(w)term(w)neurologic(w)diseases or long(w)term(w)neurological(w)diseases
95. s long(w)term(w)neurologic(w)condition or long(w)term(w)neurological(w)condition or long(w)term(w)neurologic(w)conditions or long(w)term(w)neurological(w)conditions
96. s evolving(w)neurologic(w)disease or evolving(w)neurological(w)disease or evolving(w)neurologic(w)diseases or evolving(w)neurological(w)diseases
97. s evolving(w)neurologic(w)condition or evolving(w)neurological(w)condition or evolving(w)neurologic(w)conditions or evolving(w)neurological(w)conditions
98. s LTNC$
99. s epilepsy
100. s epileptic
101. s seizure(w)disorder$
102. s landau(w)kleffner(w)syndrome
103. s cerebral(w)palsy
104. s spastic(w)diplegia
105. s little(w)disease
106. s cp
107. s diplegia(w)spastic
108. s little(w)s(w)disease
109. s s75 or s76 or s77 or s78 or s79 or s80 or s81 or s82 or s83 or s84 or s85 or s86 or s87 or s88 or s89 or s90 or s91 or s92 or s93 or s94 or s95 or s96 or s97 or s98 or s99 or s100 or s101 or s102 or s103 or s104 or s105 or s106 or s107 or s108
110. s s74 and s109
111. s @2006
112. s s110 and s111
113. s s75 or s76 or s77 or s78 or s79 or s80 or s81 or s82 or s83 or s84 or s85 or s86 or s87 or s88 or s89 or s90 or s91 or s92 or s93 or s94 or s95 or s96 or s97 or s98
114. s s99 or s100 or s101 or s102 or s103 or s104 or s105 or s106 or s107 or s108
115. s s114 andnot s113
116. s s115 and s74
117. s @1985:2006
118. s s116 and s117
119. s s118 or s112

SIGLE (Silverplatter ERL WebSPIRS – http://www.arc.uk.ovid.com/)
1980-2005/03
Searched on 8/12/2006
Retrieved 0 hits

and:

Social Policy and Practice (Silverplatter ERL WebSPIRS – http://www.arc.uk.ovid.com/)
1890-
Searched on 8/12/2006
Retrieved 19 hits

Search strategy:
#1 (Integrate* near3 care) or (Integrate* near3 healthcare) or (Integrate* near3 health care)
#2 Integrat* near3 working
#3 Integrat* near3 provision
#4 Integrat* near3 provider organisation*
#5 Integrat* near3 assessment*
#6 Integrat* near3 team*
#7 Integrat* near3 management
#8 Horizontal integration
#9 Vertical integration
#10 Integrat* near3 primary near3 community
#11 Integrat* near3 health near3 social
#12 Cluster* near3 health near3 social
#13 Integrat* near3 service*
#14 Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care
#15 Structured service*
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#16 Joint* near3 working
#17 Joined-up partnership*
#18 Partnership* near3 working
#19 Joint service* near3 development*
#20 Horizontal communication*
#21 Partnership project*
#22 Horizontal partnership*
#23 Flexible partnership*
#24 Joint* near3 service*
#25 Joined-up service*
#26 (Joint* near3 care) or (Joint* near3 healthcare) or (Joint* near3 health care)
#27 Joined-up care or Joined-up health care or Joined-up healthcare
#28 (Co-ordinat* near3 care*) or (Co-ordinat* near3 health care*) or (Co-ordinat* near3 healthcare*)
#29 (Coordinat* near3 care*) or (Coordinat* near3 healthcare*) or (Coordinat* near3 health care*)
#30 Co-ordinat* near3 service*
#31 Coordinat* near3 service*
#32 Seamless service*
#33 Seamless care
#34 Contin* near3 service*
#35 (contin* near3 care) or (contin* near3 healthcare) or (contin* near3 health care)
#36 (Progression near3 care) or (Progression near3 healthcare) or (Progression near3 health care)
#37 Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care
#38 Uninterrupted service*
#39 (Inter-oragnisation* or Inter-oragnization*) near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
#40 Holistic near3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
#41 (Interorganisation* or Interorganisation*) near3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
#42 Multidisciplinary near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
#43 Multiprofessional near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
#44 Multi-disciplinary near3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
#45 Multi-professional near3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
#46 Multi-agency near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
#47 Inter-agency near3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) (Web Of Knowledge – http://wos.mimas.ac.uk/)
(limited to)1985-2006
Search on 11/12/2006
Retrieved 95 hits

Search strategy:

All lines limited as follows:
DocType=All document types; Language=All languages; Database=SSCI;
Timespan=1985-2006 (except where otherwise stated)

#1 TS=(Integrate* same "health care")
#2 TS=(Integrat* same working)
#3 TS=(Integrat* same provision)
#4 TS=(Integrat* same "provider organisation"")
#5 TS=(Integrat* same assessment")
#6 TS=(Integrat* same team")
#7 TS=(Integrat* same management)
#8 TS="("Horizontal integration"")
#9 TS="("Vertical integration"")
#10 TS=(Integrat* same primary same community)
#11 TS=(Integrat* same health same social)
#12 TS=(Cluster* same health same social)
#13 TS=(Integrat* same service")
#14 TS="("Structured care" or "Structured healthcare" or "Structured health care")"
#15 TS="("Structured service"")"
#16 TS=(Joint* same working)
#17 TS="("Joined-up partnership"") or "Joined up partnership"")"
#18 TS=(Partnership* same working)
#19 TS="("Joint service"") same development"")
#20 TS="("Horizontal communication"")"
#21 TS="("Partnership project"")"
#22 TS="("Horizontal partnership"")"
#23 TS="("Flexible partnership"")"
#24 TS=(Joint* same service")
#25 TS="("Joined-up service"") or "Joined up service"")"
#26 TS=((Joint* same care) or (Joint* same healthcare) or (Joint* same "health care"))
#27 TS="("Joined-up care" or "Joined-up health care" or "Joined-up healthcare")"
#28 TS=((Co-ordinat* same care") or (Co-ordinat* same "health care") or (Co-ordinat* same healthcare*)
#29 TS=((Coordinat* same care") or (Coordinat* same healthcare") or (Coordinat* same "health care")
#30 TS=(Co-ordinat* same service")
#31 TS=(Coordinat* same service")
#32 TS="("Seamless service"")"
#33 TS="("Seamless care"")"
#34 TS=(Contin* same service")
#35 TS=((contin* same care) or (contin* same healthcare) or (contin* same "health care")
#36 TS=((Progression same care) or (Progression same healthcare) or (Progression same "health care")
#37 TS="("Uninterrupted care" or "Uninterrupted healthcare" or "Uninterrupted health care")"
#38 TS="("Uninterrupted service"")"
#39 TS=((Inter-oragnisation* or Inter-oragnization*) same (care or healthcare or "health care" or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#40 TS=(Holistic same (care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#41  TS=((Interorganisation* or Interorganisation*) same (care or "health care" or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#42  TS=(Multidisciplinary same (care or healthcare or "health care" or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#43  TS=(Multiprofessional same (care or healthcare or "health care" or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#44  TS=(Multi-disciplinary same (care or "health care" or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#45  TS=(Multi-professional same (care or "health care" or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#46  TS=(Multi-agency same (care or healthcare or "health care" or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#47  TS=(Inter-agency same (care or healthcare or "health care" or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#48  TS=(Inter-professional same (care or healthcare or "health care" or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#49  TS=(Inter-disciplinary same (care or healthcare or "health care" or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#50  TS=(Inter-disciplinary same (care or healthcare or "health care" or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#51  TS=(Holistic same (care or healthcare or "health care" or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#52  TS=(Collaborat* same servic*)
#53  TS="(Multidisciplinary assessment"")
#54  TS="(single assessment"")
#55  TS="(Care trust"")
#56  TS="(Strategic collaboration"")
#57  TS="(Provider partnership"")
#58  TS=(Pool same budget)
#59  TS="(Overlapping commissioning"")
#60  TS="(Contiguous commissioning"")
#61  TS="(Joint commissioning"")
#62  TS="(Integrated commissioning"")
#63  TS=(linkwork)
#64  TS="(Co-located team"")
#65  TS=(co-location)
#66  TS="(One stop shop"")
#67  TS="(ambulatory care" or "ambulatory health care" or "ambulatory healthcare"")
#68  TS="(ambulatory service"")
#69  TS="(case management"")
#70  TS="(care management"")
#71  TS="(Managed Care Program"")
#72  TS="(Patient Care Plan"")
#73  TS=(#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24)
#74 TS=(#25 or #26 or #27 or #28 or #29 or #30 or #31 or #32 or #33 or #34 or #35 or #36 or #37 or #38 or #39 or #40 or #41 or #42 or #43 or #44 or #45 or #46 or #47 or #48 or #49 or #50)
#75 TS=(#51 or #52 or #53 or #54 or #55 or #56 or #57 or #58 or #59 or #60 or #61 or #62 or #63 or #64 or #65 or #66 or #67 or #68 or #69 or #70 or #71 or #72)
#76 TS=(#73 or #74 or #75)
#77 TS=("lou gehrig disease")
#78 TS=("lou gehrig's disease")
#79 TS=("motor neuron disease")
#80 TS=("motor neurone disease")
#81 TS=(MND)
#82 TS=("lateral sclerosis")
#83 TS=(ALS)
#84 TS=("anterior horn cell disease")
#85 TS=("Bulbar Palsy")
#86 TS=("Spinal Muscular Atrophy")
#87 TS=("paralysis agitans")
#88 TS=("Parkinson disease")
#89 TS=("Parkinson syndrome")
#90 TS=("Parkinson s" or "Parkinson's")
#91 TS=(parkinsonism)
#92 TS=(Ms or LTNC*)
#93 TS=("Multiple sclerosis" or "Long term neurologic* disease**")
#94 TS=("degenerative neurologic* disease**" or "evolving neurologic* disease**" or "degenerative neurologic* condition**" or "evolving neurologic* condition**")
#95 TS=("long term neurologic* condition**")
#96 TS=(#77 or #78 or #79 or #80 or #81 or #82 or #83 or #84 or #85 or #86 or #87 or #88 or #89 or #90 or #91 or #92 or #93 or #94 or #95)
#97 TS=(epilepsy or epileptic or "seizure disorder**" or "landau kleffner syndrome" or "cerebral palsy" or "spastic diplegia" or "diplegia spastic or cp")
#98 TS=(#96 and #76)( Timespan=2006)
#99 TS=(#97 and #76)
#100 TS=(#98 or #99)

ASSIA (CSA Illumina – http://ca2.csa.com/)
1987 to 2006
Searched on 11/12/2006
Retrieved 43 hits

and

Social Services Abstracts (CSA Illumina – http://ca2.csa.com/)
1979 to 2006
Searched on 11/12/2006
Retrieved 12 hits
and

Sociological Abstracts (CSA Illumina – http://ca2.csa.com/)
1952 to 2006
Searched on 11/12/2006
Retrieved 18 hits

Search strategy:
1. Integrate* within 3 care
2. Integrate* within 3 healthcare
3. Integrate* within 3 health care
4. Integrat* within 3 working
5. Integrat* within 3 provision
6. Integrat* within 3 provider organisation*
7. Integrat* within 3 assessment*
8. Integrat* within 3 team*
9. Integrat* within 3 management
10. Horizontal integration
11. Vertical integration
12. Integrat* within 3 primary within 3 community
13. Integrat* within 3 health within 3 social
14. Cluster* within 3 health within 3 social
15. Cluster* within 3 health within 3 social
16. Structured care or Structured healthcare or Structured health care
17. Structured service*
18. Joint* within 3 working
19. Joined-up partnership*
20. Partnership* within 3 working
21. Joint service* within 3 development*
22. Horizontal communication*
23. Partnership project*
24. Horizontal partnership*
25. Flexible partnership*
26. Joint* within 3 service*
27. Joined-up service*
28. Joint* within 3 care
29. Joint* within 3 healthcare
30. Joint* within 3 health care
31. Joined-up care or Joined-up health care or Joined-up healthcare
32. Co-ordinat* within 3 care*
33. Co-ordinat* within 3 health care*
34. Co-ordinat* within 3 healthcare*
35. Coordinat* within 3 care*
36. Coordinat* within 3 healthcare*
37. Coordinat* within 3 health care*
38. Co-ordinat* within 3 service*
39. Coordinat* within 3 service*
40. Seamless service*
41. Seamless care
42. Contin* within 3 service*
contin* within 3 care
contin* within 3 healthcare
contin* within 3 health care
Progression within 3 care
Progression within 3 healthcare
(Progression within 3 health care)) or
Uninterrupted care or Uninterrupted healthcare or Uninterrupted health care
Uninterrupted service*
(Inter-oragnisation* or Inter-oragnization*) within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
(Holistic within 3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Interoragnisation* or Interoragnizati on*) within 3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*)
(Multidisciplinary within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Multiprofessional within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Multidisciplinary within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Multiprofessional within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Multi-disciplinary within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Multi-professional within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Multi-agency within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Inter-agency within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Inter-professional within 3 (care health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Interdisciplinary within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Inter-disciplinary within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Holistic within 3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
(Collaborat* within 3 servic*)
Multidisciplinary assessment*)
single assessment*)
Care trust*)
Strategic collaboration*)
Provider partnership*)
Pool* within 3 budget*)
Overlapping commissioning)
Contiguous commissioning)
Joint commissioning)
Integrated commissioning)
linkwork*)
Co-located team*)
77. co-location) 
78. care team*) 
79. One stop shop*) 
80. DE="integrated management") 
81. DE="ambulatory health care") 
82. ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare) 
83. ambulatory service* or ambulatory health service*) 
84. case management) 
85. care management) 
86. DE="integrated care pathways") 
87. Managed Care Program*) 
88. Patient Care Plan* 
89. #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24 or #25 or #26 or #27 or #28 or #29 or #30 or #31 or #32 or #33 or #34 or #35 or #36 or #37 or #38 or #39 or #40 or #41 or #42 or #43 or #44 or #45 or #46 or #47 or #48 or #49 or #50 or #51 or #52 or #53 or #54 or #55 or #56 or #57 or #58 or #59 or #60 or #61 or #62 or #63 or #64 or #65 or #66 or #67 or #68 or #69 or #70 or #71 or #72 or #73 or #74 or #75 or #76 or #77 or #78 or #79 or #80 or #81 or #82 or #83 or #84 or #85 or #86 or #87 or #88 
90. (DE=("motor neurone disease" or "bell s palsy")) 
91. lou gehrig disease) 
92. lou gehrig's disease) 
93. motor neuron disease) 
94. motor neurone disease) 
95. MND) 
96. lateral sclerosis) 
97. ALS) 
98. anterior horn cell disease) 
99. Bulbar Palsy) 
100. Spinal Muscular Atrophy) 
101. DE="parkinson s disease") 
102. paralysis agitans) 
103. Parkinson disease) 
104. Parkinson syndrome) 
105. Parkinson s or Parkinson's 
106. parkinsonism) 
107. Ms) 
108. Multiple sclerosis) 
109. DE="multiple sclerosis") 
110. degenerative neurologic* disease*) 
112. degenerative neurologic* condition*) 
113. long term neurologic* disease*) 
114. long-term neurologic* disease*) 
115. long term neurologic* condition*) 
116. evolving neurologic* disease*) 
117. evolving neurologic* condition*) 
118. LTNC*
119. #90 or #91 or #92 or #93 or #94 or #95 or #96 or #97 or #98 or #99 or #100 or #101 or #102 or #103 or #104 or #105 or #116 or #117 or #118
120. #89 and #119 (2006-2007)
121. DE= ("epilepsy" or "complex partial seizure disorder" or "landau kleffner syndrome" or "temporal lobe epilepsy" or "cerebral palsy")
122. epilepsy
123. epileptic
124. seizure disorder*
125. landau kleffner syndrome
126. cerebral palsy
127. spastic diplegia
128. little disease
129. cp
130. diplegia spastic
131. little's disease
132. #121 or #122 or #123 or #124 or #125 or #126 or #127 or #128 or #129 or #130 or #131
133. #89 and #132 (1985-2007)

Due to the restrictions on combining searches for different dates, sets #120 and #133 were downloaded separately and deduplicated in Endnote.

NRR (http://www.nrr.nhs.uk/)
2006: Issue 4
Searched on 12/12/2006
Retrieved 94 hits

Search strategy:
#1. (integrate* near care) or (integrate* near healthcare) or (integrate* near health care)
#2. (integrat* near working)
#3. (integrat* near provision)
#4. (integrat* near (provider next organisation*))
#5. (integrat* near assessment*)
#6. (integrat* near team*)
#7. (integrat* near management)
#8. (horizontal next integration)
#9. (vertical next integration)
#10. (integrat* near primary near community)
#11. (integrat* near health near social)
#12. (cluster* near health near social)
#13. (integrat* near service*)
#14. ((structured next care) or (structured next healthcare) or (structured next health next care))
#15. (structured next service*)
#16. (joint* near working)
#17. (joined next up next partnership*)
#18. partnership* working
#19. joint near service* near development*
#20. (horizontal next communication*)
#21. (partnership next project*)
#22. (horizontal next partnership*)
#23. (flexible next partnership*)
#24. (joint* near service*)
#25. (joined next up next service*)
#26. (joint* next care) or (joint* next healthcare) or (joint* next health next care)
#27. ((joined next up next care) or (joined next up next health next care) or (joined next up next healthcare))
#28. ((co-ordinat* near care*) or (co-ordinat* near (health next care*)) or (co-ordinat* near healthcare*))
#29. ((coordinat* near care*) or (coordinat* near healthcare*) or (coordinat* near (health next care*)))
#30. (co-ordinat* near service*)
#31. (coordinat* near service*)
#32. (seamless next service*)
#33. (seamless next care)
#34. (contin* near service*)
#35. (contin* next care) or (contin* next healthcare) or (contin* next health next care)
#36. ((progression near care) or (progression near healthcare) or (progression near (health next care*)))
#37. ((uninterrupted next care) or (uninterrupted next healthcare) or (uninterrupted next health next care))
#38. (uninterrupted next service*)
#39. (((inter next oragnisation*) or (inter next oragnization*)) and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or (co next ordinat*) or coordinat*))
#40. (holistic and (care or (health next care) or healthcare or service* or team* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#41. ((interoragnisation* or interoragniza tion*) and (care or (health next care) or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#42. (Multidisciplinary near care) or (Multidisciplinary near healthcare) or (Multidisciplinary near health care) or (Multidisciplinary near service*) or (Multidisciplinary near team*) or (Multidisciplinary near work*) or (Multidisciplinary near collaboration*) or (Multidisciplinary near co-ordinat*) or (Multidisciplinary near coordinat*)
#43. (multiprofessional and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#44. ((multi next disciplinary) and (care or (health next care) or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#45. ((multi next professional) and (care or (health next care) or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#46. ((multi next agency) and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#47. ((inter next agency) and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#48. ((inter next professional) and ((care next health next care) or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#49. (interdisciplinary and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#50. ((inter next disciplinary) and (care or (health next care) or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#51. (holistic and (care or healthcare or (health next care) or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co-ordinat* or coordinat*))
#52. (collaborat* near servic*)
#53. (multidisciplinary next assessment*)
#54. (single next assessment*)
#55. care next trust*:ti
#56. (strategic next collaboration*)
#57. (provider next partnership*)
#58. (pool* near budget*)
#59. (overlapping next commissioning)
#60. (contiguous next commissioning)
#61. (joint next commissioning)
#62. (integrated next commissioning)
#63. linkwork*
#64. (co-located next team*)
#65. co-location
#66. (one next stop next shop*)
#67. DELIVERY OF HEALTH CARE INTEGRATED explode all trees (MeSH)
#68. AMBULATORY CARE explode all trees (MeSH)
#69. ((ambulatory next care) or (ambulatory next health next care) or (ambulatory next healthcare))
#70. ((ambulatory next service*) or (ambulatory next health next service*))
#71. (case next management)
#72. (care next management)
#73. CASE MANAGEMENT single term (MeSH)
#74. (managed next care next program*)
#75. (patient next care next plan*)
#76. PATIENT CARE TEAM explode all trees (MeSH)
#77. care next team*
#78. (#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24 or #25 or #26 or #27 or #28 or #29 or #30 or #31 or #32 or #33 or #34 or #35 or #36 or #37 or #38 or #39 or #40 or #41 or #42 or #43 or #44 or #45 or #46 or #47 or #48 or #49 or #50 or #51 or #52 or #53 or #54 or #55 or #56 or #57 or #58 or #59 or #60 or #61 or #62 or #63 or #64 or #65 or #66 or #67 or #68 or #69 or #70 or #71 or #72 or #73 or #74 or #75 or #76 or #77)
#79. MOTOR NEURON DISEASE explode all trees (MeSH)
#80. (lou next gehrig next disease)
#81. (lou next gehrig next s next disease)
#82. (motor next neuron next disease)
#83. (motor next neurone next disease)
#84. mnd
#85. (lateral next sclerosis)
#86. als
#87. (anterior next horn next cell next disease)
#88. (bulbar next palsy)
#89. (spinal next muscular next atrophy)
#90. PARKINSON DISEASE single term (MeSH)
#91. (paralysis next agitans)
#92. (parkinson next disease)
#93. (parkinson next syndrome)
#94. (parkinson next s)
#95. parkinsonism
#96. ms:ti
#97. (multiple next sclerosis)
#98. MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS explode all trees (MeSH)
#99. (degenerative next neurologic* next disease*)
#100. (degenerative next neurologic* next condition*)
#101. (long next term next neurologic* next disease*)
#102. (long next term next neurologic* next disease*)
#103. (long next term next neurologic* next condition*)
#104. (evolving next neurologic* next disease*)
#105. (evolving next neurologic* next condition*)
#106. ltnc*
#107. EPILEPSY single term (MeSH)
#108. epilepsy
#109. epileptic
#110. seizure next disorder*
#111. landau next kleffner next syndrome
#112. cerebral next palsy
#113. spastic next diplegia
#114. little next disease
#115. cp
#116. diplegia next spastic
#117. little next s next disease
#118. CEREBRAL PALSY single term (MeSH)
#119. (# 79 or #80 or #81 or #82 or #83 or #84 or #85 or #86 or #87 or #88 or #89 or #90 or #91 or #92 or #93 or #94 or #95 or #96 or #97 or #98 or #99 or #100 or #101 or #102 or #103 or #104 or #105 or #106 or #107 or #108 or #109 or #110 or #112 or #113 or #114 or #115 or #116 or #117 or #118)
#120. (#78 and #119)
Search strategy:

This is a very simple search interface and the following lines were run as separate searches on both the Social Welfare section and the Government Policy section.

“Integrated care”
“Integrated service” or “integrated services”
“Integrated work” or “integrated working”
“Integrated health” or “Integrated healthcare”
“Integrated team” or “Integrated teams”
“integrated management”
“structured care”
“managed care”
“Case management”
“care management”
“Ambulatory care”
“ambulatory service” or “ambulatory services”
collaborate and (care or service or services)
collaborate and (work or health or team or teams)
collaborate and (assessment or management)
collaboration and (care or service or services)
collaboration and (work or health or team)
collaboration and teams
collaboration and (assessment or management)
“care teams” or “care team”

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (The Cochrane Library – http://www.thecochranelibrary.com/)
Issue 4 2006
Searched on 12/12/2006
Retrieved 11 hits

Search strategy:
#1 ((integrate* near/3 care) or (integrate* near/3 healthcare) or (integrate* near/3 health care)) in Record Title or ((integrate* near/3 care) or (integrate* near/3 healthcare) or (integrate* near/3 health care)) in Abstract in all products
#2 (integrate* near/3 working) in Record Title or (integrate* near/3 working) in Abstract in all products
#3 (integrate* near/3 provision) in Record Title or (integrate* near/3 provision) in Abstract in all products
#4 (integrate* near/3 provider organisation*) in Record Title or (integrate* near/3 provider organisation*) in Abstract in all products
#5 (integrate* near/3 assessment*) in Record Title or (integrate* near/3 assessment*) in Abstract in all products
#6 (integrat* near/3 team*) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 team*) in Abstract in all products
#7 (integrat* near/3 management) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 management) in Abstract in all products
#8 horizontal integration in Record Title or horizontal integration in Abstract in all products
#9 vertical integration in Record Title or vertical integration in Abstract in all products
#10 (integrat* near/3 primary near/3 community) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 primary near/3 community) in Abstract in all products
#11 (integrat* near/3 health near/3 social) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 health near/3 social) in Abstract in all products
#12 (cluster* near/3 health near/3 social) in Record Title or (cluster* near/3 health near/3 social) in Abstract in all products
#13 (integrat* near/3 service*) in Record Title or (integrat* near/3 service*) in Abstract in all products
#14 (structured care or structured healthcare or structured health care) in Record Title or (structured care or structured healthcare or structured health care) in Abstract in all products
#15 structured service* in Record Title or structured service* in Abstract in all products
#16 (joint* near/3 working) in Record Title or (joint* near/3 working) in Abstract in all products
#17 joined up partnership* in Record Title or joined up partnership* in Abstract in all products
#18 (partnership* near/3 working) in Record Title or (partnership* near/3 working) in Abstract in all products
#19 (joint service* near/3 development*) in Record Title or (joint service* near/3 development*) in Abstract in all products
#20 horizontal communication* in Record Title or horizontal communication* in Abstract in all products
#21 partnership project* in Record Title or partnership project* in Abstract in all products
#22 horizontal partnership* in Record Title or horizontal partnership* in Abstract in all products
#23 flexible partnership* in Record Title or flexible partnership* in Abstract in all products
#24 (joint* near/3 service*) in Record Title or (joint* near/3 service*) in Abstract in all products
#25 joined up service* in Record Title or joined up service* in Abstract in all products
#26 ((joint* near/3 care) or (joint* near/3 healthcare) or (joint* near/3 health care)) in Record Title or ((joint* near/3 care) or (joint* near/3 healthcare) or (joint* near/3 health care)) in Abstract in all products
#27 (joined up care or joined up health care or joined up healthcare) in Record Title or (joined up care or joined up health care or joined up healthcare) in Abstract in all products
#28 ((co ordinat* near/3 care*) or (co ordinat* near/3 health care*) or (co ordinat* near/3 healthcare*)) in Record Title or ((co ordinat* near/3 care*) or (co ordinat* near/3 health care*) or (co ordinat* near/3 healthcare*)) in Record Title
care*) or (co ordinat* near/3 health care*) or (co ordinat* near/3 healthcare*)) in Abstract in all products

#29 ((coordinat* near/3 care*) or (coordinat* near/3 healthcare*) or (coordinat* near/3 health care*)) in Record Title or ((coordinat* near/3 care*) or (coordinat* near/3 healthcare*) or (coordinat* near/3 health care*)) in Abstract in all products

#30 (co ordinat* near/3 service*) in Record Title or (co ordinat* near/3 service*) in Abstract in all products

#31 (coordinat* near/3 service*) in Record Title or (coordinat* near/3 service*) in Abstract in all products

#32 seamless service* in Record Title or seamless service* in Abstract in all products

#33 seamless care in Record Title or seamless care in Abstract in all products

#34 (contin* near/3 service*) in Record Title or (contin* near/3 service*) in Abstract in all products

#35 ((contin* near/3 care) or (contin* near/3 healthcare) or (contin* near/3 health care)) in Record Title or ((contin* near/3 care) or (contin* near/3 healthcare) or (contin* near/3 health care)) in Abstract in all products

#36 ((progression near/3 care) or (progression near/3 healthcare) or (progression near/3 health care)) in Record Title or ((progression near/3 care) or (progression near/3 healthcare) or (progression near/3 health care)) in Abstract in all products

#37 (uninterrupted care or uninterrupted healthcare or uninterrupted health care) in Record Title or (uninterrupted care or uninterrupted healthcare or uninterrupted health care) in Abstract in all products

#38 uninterrupted service* in Record Title or uninterrupted service* in Abstract in all products

#39 ((interorganisation* or interorganisation*) near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or ((interorganisation* or interorganisation*) near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#40 (holistic near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (holistic near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#41 ((interorganisation* or interorganisation*) near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or ((interorganisation* or interorganisation*) near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#42 (multidisciplinary near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (multidisciplinary near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products
#43 (multiprofessional near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service*
or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (multiprofessional near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#44 (multi disciplinary near/3 (care or health care or healthcare or service*
or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (multi disciplinary near/3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#45 (multi professional near/3 (care or health care or healthcare or service*
or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (multi professional near/3 (care or health care or healthcare or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#46 (multi agency near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service*
or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (multi agency near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#47 (inter agency near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service*
or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (inter agency near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#48 (inter professional near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service*
or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (inter professional near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#49 (interdisciplinary near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service*
or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (interdisciplinary near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#50 (inter disciplinary near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service*
or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (inter disciplinary near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#51 (holistic near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team*
or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Record Title or (holistic near/3 (care or healthcare or health care or service* or team* or work* or collaboration* or co ordinat* or coordinat*)) in Abstract in all products

#52 (collaborat* near/3 servic*) in Record Title or (collaborat* near/3 servic*) in Abstract in all products

#53 multidisciplinary assessment* in Record Title or multidisciplinary assessment* in Abstract in all products
#54 single assessment* in Record Title or single assessment* in Abstract in all products
#55 care trust* in Record Title or care trust* in Abstract in all products
#56 strategic collaboration* in Record Title or strategic collaboration* in Abstract in all products
#57 provider partnership* in Record Title or provider partnership* in Abstract in all products
#58 (pool* near/3 budget*) in Record Title or (pool* near/3 budget*) in Abstract in all products
#59 overlapping commissioning in Record Title or overlapping commissioning in Abstract in all products
#60 contiguous commissioning in Record Title or contiguous commissioning in Abstract in all products
#61 joint commissioning in Record Title or joint commissioning in Abstract in all products
#62 integrated commissioning in Record Title or integrated commissioning in Abstract in all products
#63 linkwork* in Record Title or linkwork* in Abstract in all products
#64 co located team* in Record Title or co located team* in Abstract in all products
#65 co location in Record Title or co location in Abstract in all products
#66 one stop shop* in Record Title or one stop shop* in Abstract in all products
#67 MeSH descriptor Delivery of Health Care, Integrated explode all trees in MeSH products
#68 MeSH descriptor Ambulatory Care explode all trees in MeSH products
#69 (ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare) in Record Title or (ambulatory care or ambulatory health care or ambulatory healthcare) in Abstract in all products
#70 (ambulatory service* or ambulatory health service*) in Record Title or (ambulatory service* or ambulatory health service*) in Abstract in all products
#71 case management in Record Title or case management in Abstract in all products
#72 care management in Record Title or care management in Abstract in all products
#73 MeSH descriptor Case Management, this term only in MeSH products
#74 managed care program* in Record Title or managed care program* in Abstract in all products
#75 patient care plan* in Record Title or patient care plan* in Abstract in all products
#76 (#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR #12 OR #13 OR #14 OR #15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #19 OR #20 OR #21 OR #22 OR #23 OR #24 OR #25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28 OR #29 OR #30 OR #31 OR #32 OR #33 OR #34 OR #35 OR #36 OR #37 OR #38 OR #39 OR #40 OR #41 OR #42 OR #43 OR #44 OR #45 OR #46 OR #47 OR #48 OR #49 OR #50 OR #51 OR #52 OR #53 OR #54 OR #55 OR #56 OR #57 OR #58 OR #59 OR #60 OR #61 OR #62 OR #63 OR #64 OR #65 OR #66 OR #67 OR #68 OR #69 OR #70 OR #71 OR #72 OR #73 OR #74 OR #75)
OR #94 OR #95 OR #96 OR #97 OR #98 OR #99 OR #100 OR #101
OR #102 OR #103 OR #104)
#106 (#76 AND #105)
#107 MeSH descriptor Patient Care Team, this term only
#108 (care team*):ti or (care team*):ab
#109 (#76 OR #107 OR #108)
#110 MeSH descriptor Epilepsy, this term only
#111 (epilepsy):ti or (epilepsy):ab
#112 (epileptic):ti or (epileptic):ab
#113 (seizure disorder*):ti or (seizure disorder*):ab
#114 (landau kleffner syndrome):ti or (landau kleffner syndrome):ab
#115 (cerebral palsy):ti or (cerebral palsy):ab
#116 (spastic diplegia):ti or (spastic diplegia):ab
#117 ("little disease"):ti or ("little disease"):ab
#118 (cp):ti or (cp):ab
#119 (diplegia spastic):ti or (diplegia spastic):ab
#120 (little s disease):ti or (little s disease):ab
#121 MeSH descriptor Cerebral Palsy, this term only
#122 (#110 OR #111 OR #112 OR #113 OR #114 OR #115 OR #116 OR
#117 OR #118 OR #119 OR #120 OR #121)
#123 (#122 AND #109)
#124 (#123 AND NOT #106)
Appendix 3 Definitions for selection for review/data extraction

Method to ensure or improve continuity of care

(based on Freeman et al. (2001, 2002) with carers added as a group who might also experience continuity of care).

Any service, any aspect of service organisation or delivery, or any model of care intended to ensure or improve any of the following:

- Co-ordinated and smooth progression of care from service user’s or informal carer’s point of view (experienced continuity).

- Care that sustains a person’s preferred social and personal relationships in the community and enhances their quality of life (continuity of social context).

- Provision of one or more named, individual professionals with whom the service user or informal carer can establish and maintain a consistent therapeutic relationship (relational, personal and therapeutic continuity).

- Care provided by as few professionals [over time] as possible, consistent with need (longitudinal continuity).

- Flexibility and adjustment to the needs of the individual over time (flexible continuity).

- Provision of care for as long as the service user needs it (long-term continuity).

- Excellent transfer of information that follows the service user and informal carer (continuity of information).

- Excellent transfer of information between professionals working in statutory and non-statutory agencies, working in primary and secondary [and tertiary] care and with service users and their informal care networks (cross-boundary continuity; team continuity).

Evaluation

Any form of research (qualitative or quantitative) or other form of structured enquiry (such as audit or inspection) that reports the effect or outcomes of a method of ensuring or improving continuity of care.
Description

Any material that describes any organisational or delivery features (e.g. provider, staffing, skill mix, location) of a method of ensuring or improving continuity of care.

Systematic review/meta-analysis

Any paper that describes itself as a systematic review and/or a meta-analysis. The team will make judgements subsequently about whether it is accurately described.
Appendix 4  Data extraction headings for the descriptive review

What is the model of care?

Self-care intervention
Screening/prescription/access to care
Assessment and management
Register
Prof led care pathway
User-led care pathway
Specialist nurse
GP with special interest
Nurse-led clinic
MD rehab
Palliative care
Prof training re: continuity of care
other(specify)

Where is it delivered?

In-patient setting
Out-patient setting
Home
Community
Other (specify)

What condition(s) does it cover?

Cerebral Palsy
Epilepsy
Generic neurology
Head injury
Huntington's Disease
Migraine
MND/ALS
Multiple Sclerosis
Muscular Dystrophy
Parkinson's Disease
Spinal injury
Stroke
Other (specify)
Who delivers the model?

**Specialist doctors:**
Neurology
Rehabilitation
Other (specify)
Speciality not mentioned

**Nurses:**
Neurology community based
Neurology acute based
Other specialist community based (specify)
Other specialist acute based (specify)
Specialty not mentioned
General community based
General acute based
Nurse not otherwise specified

**Therapists:**
Physiotherapist
Occupational therapist
Speech and language therapist
Dietician/nutritionist
Other (specify)
Therapist not otherwise specified

**Other:**
Psychologist
Counsellor
Social worker
Social services
Voluntary organisation
Co-ordinator/care manager
GP

Any other (specify)

What elements are included in this model of care?

Diagnosis
Assessment of:
  condition
  disability/impairment
  service need
  nursing need
  other
Care file - patient held
Care file - professional held
Care plan - patient held
Care plan - professional held
Care/service co-ordination
Data management system
Drug/medication review
Equipment/aids supply
Goal setting
Information/education/training - carer
Information/education/training - patient
Information/education/training - professional
Monitoring/review
Multi-disciplinary meeting/consultation
Other clinical input (specify)
Palliative care
Phone helpline/advice line/contact line
Rehabilitation input
Specialist clinics
Support group - carer
Support group - patient
Telemedicine/video link
Other (specify)

Aspects of service delivery and organisation

Who can refer:
  acute health care professional
  community health care professional
  patient
  voluntary organisation
  other (specify)

Type of access
Size of caseload
Other case load characteristics
Age of patients
Time-limited or ongoing service?
Funded by
Which agency provides?

Exclusion criteria for service:
  age
  mental capacity
  physical capacity/condition
  language
  co-morbidity
  other (specify)
  none reported

Type of continuity of care
Personal agency
Experienced
Social context
Relational, personal, therapeutic
Longitudinal
Flexible
Long-term
Information continuity
Cross-boundary/team
Appendix 5  Evaluation papers


Edmonds, D.P. (2006 - April) *Proposal to Create a Flagship Neurology and Specialist Palliative Care Service for Patients with Severe Multiple Sclerosis in South London: Service Design Study.*


Health Profile, *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 12, 389-394.


Appendix 6  Description papers


Appendix 7  Reported measures of disability and/or impairment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author and year</th>
<th>Model of care</th>
<th>How measured</th>
<th>When measured</th>
<th>Results for controls/before</th>
<th>Results for subjects/after</th>
<th>Statistical significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2004</td>
<td>Supported implementation of national care guidelines</td>
<td>Mean (95% CI) ESI-55 cognitive function test</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>21.0 (19.9 to 22.0)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 21.3 (20.6 to 22.0) Intensive: 20.7 (19.9 to 21.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12m</td>
<td>21.1 (20.2 to 22.0)</td>
<td>Intermediate: 20.9 (20.1 to 21.7) Intensive: 20.3 (19.6 to 21.1)</td>
<td>Paired t-tests value not reported. Said to be ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple sclerosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossiter 1998 and 1999</td>
<td>Integrated care pathway</td>
<td>Mean Barthel Index score</td>
<td>Admission and discharge</td>
<td>Cohort 1: 12 Cohort 2: 12 Cohort 3: 12</td>
<td>Cohort 1: 15 Cohort 2: 15 Cohort 3: 14</td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be no sig, diff between each cohort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Handicap Assessment Scale (^1) score</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Cohort 1: 16 Cohort 2: 17 Cohort 3: 15</td>
<td>Cohort 1: 17 Cohort 2: 15 Cohort 3: 13</td>
<td>As above. Said to be ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean FIM – motor score</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Cohort 1: 60 Cohort 2: 61 Cohort 3: 60</td>
<td>Cohort 1: 69 Cohort 2: 69 Cohort 3: 67</td>
<td>As above. Said to be ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean FIM – cognitive score</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Cohort 1: 29 Cohort 2: 30 Cohort 3: 29</td>
<td>Cohort 1: 29 Cohort 2: 30 Cohort 3: 29</td>
<td>As above. Said to be ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 2001</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary community team</td>
<td>Means Kurtzke Expanded Disability Status Scale score</td>
<td>Baseline and 6m</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>Wicoxon test. Not reported directly, p&lt;.05 (^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean FIM motor score</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>As above, p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean FIM cognitive score</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>T-test. Not reported directly. p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Newcastle Independence Assessment Form</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>Wicoxon test. Not reported directly, said to be ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig 2003</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team management of relapse, combined with IV steroid treatment</td>
<td>Mean (SD) GNDS score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>21.5 (7.2)</td>
<td>21.1 (7.1)</td>
<td>Univariate ANOVA on change from baseline to 3m. Result not reported, said to be significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3m</td>
<td>19.7 (10.6)</td>
<td>13.2 (8.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) AMCA</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.0 (13.8)</td>
<td>56.1 (15.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.3 (18.0)</td>
<td>69.1 (6.9)</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney U on change from baseline to 3m. Said to be significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) Barthel Index</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.7 (2.2)</td>
<td>14.8 (2.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2 (4.1)</td>
<td>17.4 (2.3)</td>
<td>As above. Said to be significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) Human Activity Profile (Maximum Score)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.3 (16.2)</td>
<td>54.4 (20.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.5 (25.1)</td>
<td>69.9 (14.2)</td>
<td>As above. Said to be significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzilli 2002</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary home care</td>
<td>EdSS</td>
<td>Baseline and 12m</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Results not reported. Said to be no sig. diff in change between subjects and controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chataway 2006</td>
<td>Home-based IV steroid administration</td>
<td>Mean (SD) MSWS-12 walking score</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>73.7 (23.4)</td>
<td>67.7 (31.1)</td>
<td>Repeated measures ANOVA of difference (95%CI) in mean score change. 2.6 (-5.8 to 11.1), p=.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeseburg 2004</td>
<td>Transmural care (same as Jansen?)</td>
<td>Mean (range) EDSS score</td>
<td>Baseline and 15m</td>
<td>4.7 (0 to 8.5)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported. Said to be no sig. change over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Hara 2002</td>
<td>Consumer focussed,</td>
<td>Median (range) Barthel</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>17 (0-20)</td>
<td>17 (0-20)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional advice about self-care</td>
<td>Index score</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>17 (0-20)</td>
<td>17 (0-20)</td>
<td>Wilcoxon test of difference from baseline to follow-up. Subjects z=0.49, p=.62. Subjects z = -3.41, p=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) score on De Souza MS mobility scale</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>5.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>5.8 (3.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) score on SDDR: SDDRO subscale</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>5.6 (3.3)</td>
<td>5.8 (3.6)</td>
<td>ANOVA, F=0.01, p=.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDDRE subscale</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>7.4 (7.4)</td>
<td>6.0 (6.6)</td>
<td>ANOVA F= 0.26, p=.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 (4.2)</td>
<td>5.0 (4.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8 (4.3)</td>
<td>4.8 (3.8)</td>
<td>ANOVA F=4.17, p=.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parkinson’s disease**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trend 2002 and associated papers</th>
<th>Multi-disciplinary rehabilitation with group educational support</th>
<th>Mean (SD) PD Disability Questionnaire</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>50.3 (18.0)</th>
<th>48.9 (14.4)</th>
<th>GLIM analysis of difference in change scores controlling for baseline differences. Not reported directly. p=.558</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 weeks</td>
<td>55.3 (19.5)</td>
<td>53.4 (17.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) stand-walk-sit time (seconds)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>21.5 (8.0)</td>
<td>20.1 (8.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) nine-hole peg test (seconds)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>23.1 (10.3)</td>
<td>19.4 (6.9)</td>
<td>As above, p=.093.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) UPDRS score, speech</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>20.2 (8.1)</td>
<td>23.9 (31.2)</td>
<td>As above, p=.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) UPDRS score, salivation</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>20.0 (8.1)</td>
<td>20.4 (14.8)</td>
<td>As above, p=.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) UPDRS score, swallowing</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>20.0 (8.1)</td>
<td>20.4 (14.8)</td>
<td>As above, p=.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) UPDRS score, writing</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>20.0 (8.1)</td>
<td>20.4 (14.8)</td>
<td>As above, p=.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carne 2005</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary assessment and management</td>
<td>Mean (SD) UPDRS Part III Motor Examination Score</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up (around 12m)</td>
<td>28.72 (13.16)</td>
<td>30/43 said to have improved with mean improvement of -11.28. 11/43 said to have deteriorated with mean deterioration of +9.72 Mean improvement of -5.38</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery 1994</td>
<td>Patient education and health promotion programme</td>
<td>Mean (SE) UPDRS summary score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>29.2 (1.1)</td>
<td>28.8 (1.3)</td>
<td>Paired difference t-test on mean change score. Not reported directly, p said to be =.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahanshahi 1994</td>
<td>Nurse practitioner</td>
<td>Mean (SD) Functional Disability Questionnaire score.</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>49.7 (14.2)</td>
<td>53.1 (19.7)</td>
<td>Not reported. Appears to be within group analysis. Reported as ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) Functional Disability Questionnaire score.</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>54.2 (19.4)</td>
<td>54.2 (19.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>56.8 (10.3)</td>
<td>55.7 (21.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) Functional Disability Questionnaire score.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>56.4 (18.5)</td>
<td>56.6 (19.2)</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds 2000</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Functional Disability Scale. Social disability</td>
<td>Baseline and possibly 12m</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis test on change in score. H=3.91, df=3, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H=3.18, df=3, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H=7.12, df=3, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H=2.67, df=3, ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz 2004</td>
<td>Nurse specialist</td>
<td>Mean (SD) Dot-in-square test score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>45.0 (21.8) N=808</td>
<td>45.6 (21.7) N=1028</td>
<td>OR (95% CI) -0.70 (-3.25 to 1.84), p=.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% able to rise from sitting position</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>42.6% no problems 19.2% without holding on 37% unable or had to hold on N=798</td>
<td>46% no problems 18.2% without holding on 34.3% unable or had to hold on N=993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>46.0 (21.1) N=558</td>
<td>45.3 (21.2) N=696</td>
<td>Single OR (95% CI) is reported (not clear for which part of results this was calculated) 1.15 (0.93 to 1.42, p=.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author and year</td>
<td>Model of care</td>
<td>How measured</td>
<td>When measured</td>
<td>Results for controls/before</td>
<td>Results for subjects/after</td>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed neurological</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haig 1994</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team assessment</td>
<td>Reported change of overall function from telephone follow-up questionnaire</td>
<td>12m after evaluation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16/40 rated no change 13/40 rated better 8/40 rated worse 3 nk</td>
<td>Chi-squared test of goodness of fit. $\chi^2 = 2.89$, ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitzia 1998</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary rehab with post-discharge follow-up</td>
<td>Median NHP (part 1) – physical mobility. PD patients</td>
<td>Baseline and one month after discharge</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Wilcoxon Z=2.1, p&lt;.05 $^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above, MS patients</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>Wilcoxon Z=2.1, p&lt;.05 $^5$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2004</td>
<td>Individualised patient education</td>
<td>Mean (SD) NEADL score</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>6.15 (5.58)</td>
<td>7.83 (6.33)</td>
<td>Paired difference t-test (within group) not reported directly. Controls ns, subjects p=.002. Mean difference for subjects (95% CI) 1.62 (0.69 to 2.55), p=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12m</td>
<td>6.65 (6.07)</td>
<td>9.45 (7.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- AMCA: Amended Motor Club Assessment
- EDSS: Kurtzke’s Expanded Disability Status Scale
- FIM: Functional Independence Measure
- GNDS: Guys Neurological Disability Scale
- IMPACT: measure of impact of epilepsy on individuals’ lives
- ISS: Incapacity Status Scale
- MMSE: Mini-Mental State Examination
- MSIS: MSIS
- MSWS: MSWS
- NEADL: Nottingham Extended Activities of Daily Living Scale
- NHP: Nottingham Health Profile

© Queen’s Printer and Controller of HMSO 2010
SDDR: Standard Day Dependency Record
   SDDRO: subscale of SDDR – measure of number of times people have been helped on range of ‘life domains’ in past 24 hours
   SDDRE: subscale of SDDR – indication of how essential help given is in each life domain.

UPDRS Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale

1. Decrease in score indicates improvement
2. Performance declined over time.
3. Calculated by us.
4. The mean change for the control group is reported to be 29.7. This is very different from the apparent mean change reported in other tables in the paper – i.e. from 29.9 to 31.9 is a mean change of 2.0. It is not clear on which of these figures the apparently statistically significant change is based.
5. Reported values were identical for both groups. This is not explained in the paper.
This document is an output from a research project that was commissioned by the Department of Health Policy Research Programme based at the National Institute for Health Research Central Commissioning Facility (NIHR CCF) and funded by the NIHR Service Delivery and Organisation (SDO) programme based at the National Institute for Health Research Evaluations, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre (NETSCC) at the University of Southampton.

The management of the project and subsequent editorial review of the final report was undertaken by the Policy Research Programme (PRP) programme as part of its Long-Term Neurological Conditions Research Initiative (LTNCRI). As the SDO programme had no involvement in the commissioning, management or editorial review of the project we may not be able to comment on the background of this document. Should you have any queries please contact sdo@southampton.ac.uk or maggie.winchcome@btinternet.com (for the PRP LTNCRI).