Appendix B: Sample Data Abstraction Forms

Level One (Screening Title and Abstract) Form

PLEASE NOTE: If you feel an article should be excluded, please answer the question on the basis of which you are excluding it. You do not need to answer the remaining questions.

1. Does this article report a systematic review? Yes No Can't tell Did not check
2. Does this article report on some component of care coordination?
(Care coordination for the purposes of this triage can be defined as those activities in which two or more people are involved in coordination of care for a patient. Components to consider include disease management, case management, discharge planning, coordination between health care providers and/or organization units).
NOTE: Please document why you consider this care coordination. If you exclude as not being care coordination, please specify why.
 Yes, specify: No, specify: Exclude for review but keep as background, specify: Can't tell Did not check
3. Does this article report results from studies that are conducted exclusively in an in-patient setting? Yes No Can't tell Did not check

Level Two (Full Text) Abstraction Form

1. Does this article merit full text review? (check ANY that apply)
Yes
No - not a systematic review
No - does not address care coordination:
(Coordination of care can be broadly defined as the deliberate assembly, exchange, and
integration of information by two or more participants involved in a patient's care to
facilitate appropriate delivery of health care services. For the purpose of the review, we
restrict our definition of coordination of care to the deliberate assembly, exchange, and
integration of information by two or more clinicians involved in a patient's care to
facilitate appropriate delivery of health care services.)
No - cost effectiveness study only
No - study conducted in an in-patient setting only
No - foreign language
No - other (specify):
No - other (specify): Not sure - need to discuss:
Trot bare free to disease.
2. Does this article meet inclusion criteria? (check ALL that apply)
Yes - multiple providers
Yes - complex patient
Yes - multiple settings
No - no intervention evaluated
No - self management only
No - other (not sure)
3. Does the entire review focus on care coordination or does only a part of the review focus on
care coordination?
Entire review is on care coordination
Only a part of the review is on care coordination (please remember to only abstract results
for the care coordination part of the article)
for the care coordination part of the article)
Quality Assessment of Review
Quality 1-2000000000 02 210 (10)
4. Does the study report a review/research question? (This might be stated under the purpose of
the review)
☐ Yes ´
□ No
5. Are the inclusion/exclusion criteria used to select articles stated? (Determine if the criteria
address study design, patient populations, interventions and outcomes of interest that determine
inclusion/exclusion)
☐ Yes
Not stated
I Not stated

6. Were the studies examined independently to determine inclusion/exclusion of the study for the review (i.e., dual level 1 review)?
☐ Yes
□ No
☐ Not stated
7. Was the data abstraction done by at least 2 independent reviewers?
Yes
□ No
☐ Not stated
8. Does the review report on how disagreements between reviewers were handled?
Yes
□ No □ Not applicable to applicable reviewers
Not applicable - no multiple reviewers
9. Did the research team include the following team members? (check ALL that apply). [To answer this question, look at the author affiliations, acknowledgements section and methods
section]
Research librarian
Statistician
Methods expert
Topic expert
☐ Not stated
10. What study designs does the review include? (check ALL that apply)
Randomized controlled trials (RCT)
Quasi-RCT
Controlled before-after
Interrupted time series
Prospective studies
Cross-sectional studies
Other (specify):
Not stated
11. Which databases were searched by the review? (check ALL that apply)
Medline
□ EMBASE
Cochrane
PsychInfo Social Sciences Register (or other social sciences detehase):
Social Sciences Register (or other social sciences database): Other (specify):
Article does not specify the databases searched

12. Does the review provide details of the search strategy used? Yes No
13. Does the review indicate the time frame covered by the search? Yes (specify): No
14. Does the review provide sufficient detail on the search for articles to indicate that a substantial effort was made to obtain all relevant articles? Yes, substantial effort made No, substantial effort not made
15. Does the review adequately address the validity of the included studies? (e.g., provides an explanation of the criteria used to assess the studies) Yes No No Not stated Not applicable - no included studies
16. Does the review provide sufficient details of the individual studies presented? (e.g., paper h a table listing the included studies, details on the study design, sample sizes, patient characteristics etc.) Yes No Not applicable - no included studies
17. Does the review summarize the primary studies included appropriately? (e.g., includes a narrative summary of results; may or may not include a quantitative analysis) Yes No Unclear: Not applicable - no included studies
Systematic Review Details 18. What topic does the review focus on? Asthma Cancer screening Children with special health care needs Congestive heart failure Diabetes Discharge planning End of life associated with advanced organ system failure Frailty associated with old age Hypertension Immunization

Ischemic heart disease
Major depression
Medication management
Other (specify):
☐ No specific clinical focus
19. How many studies were included in the final analysis?
20. What populations does the review include?
General population
Children
☐ Elderly
Other (specify):
☐ Not stated
☐ Not applicable - no included studes
21. Does the review provide information on the setting of the included studies? (check ALL that apply)
Outpatient clinic
Specialist facility
Managed care setting (specify):
Home
Community setting (specify):
Other setting (specify):
Not stated
Not applicable - no included studies
22. Does the review provide a description of a conceptual framework used to inform the search strategy or data abstraction?
(May include: operational definition of coordination; theories used to inform framework - e.g.,
behavioral change theories, organizational design theories; hypothesized mechanisms through
which specific QI strategies act; categorization of QI approaches) (check ALL that apply)
Yes, operational definition of care coordination
Yes, theories explicitly applied (e.g., organization theory, behavior change, structure-
process outcomes)
Yes, hypothesized mechanisms through which specific QI strategies act (e.g., improve
information exchange patient-provider, improve information exchange provider-provider,
improve information continuity)
Yes, categorization of QI approaches
☐ No conceptual framework provided

☐ Narrative result ☐ Quantitative and	esults of the review pre lts nalysis (meta-analysis) of narrative results and)	ysis	
found in the search smultidisciplinary tea State intervent	lination interventions wastrategy or inclusion/ex	xclusion criteria.	ooking for? (this will probably be e.g.: disease management,	;
☐ Unclear ☐ Not stated				
intervention grouping		tion or term used	uded in the review into the to classify the studies, list the terrach intervention/term.	m
Term Use		Definition	# of included studies	;
Intervention/Term 1 Intervention/Term 2				
Intervention/Term 3				
Intervention/Term 4				
Intervention/Term 5				
Intervention/Term 6	I			
Intervention/Term 7				
Intervention/Term 8				
Intervention/Term 9				
Intervention/Term 1	0			
		-	review (i.e., did systematic review	
		entation, where c	oordination is an implied or expli	icit
component of interv	ention)? , no discussion of impl	ementation		
			n activities and barriers discussed	
Yes, process n	neasures (e.g., frequence of provider-patient co	-	isits/referrals, rate of contacts amo	ong
Yes, participar action, and sta	nt self-report re: potent ge of change construct ent of questionnaires ap	tial predictors of best (NOTE: evaluate	behavioral change (e.g., motivation of behavior change constructed development, so if present in students	ets
Yes, participar collaboration,	nt self-report re: coordicontinuity of care) [NO	OTE: the table be	ncepts (e.g., interprofessional low includes some of the survey ost measures listed below were	

developed for the inpatient setting, it is unlikely that reviews will mention these unless modifications were made)

The table below lists some survey instruments that include an explicit "coordination" domain and have undergone at least initial psychometric assessment (i.e., separate study of validity/reliability):

Survey Instruments	Reference
Collaborative Practice Scales (CPS)	Weiss 1985
Collaboration and Satisfaction about Care Decisions (CSACD)	Baggs 1994
ICU Nurse-Physician Questionnaire	Shortell 1991
Jefferson Scale of Attitudes Toward Physician-Nurse Collaboration	Hojat 1999
Long-term-care interdisciplinary team performance questionnaire (adapted from ICU-Nurse Physician Questionnaire)	Temkin-Greener 2004
Physician - Pharmacist Collaboration Instrument (PPCI)	Zillich 2005
Care Transitions Measure (CTM)	Coleman
Systematic Review Results 28. What outcomes were measured by the review that relate to care cod Clinical outcomes (specify):	
Other (specify):	
Not stated:	

29. Please report the main findings of the review.
(the goal here is to highlight the results that readers are likely to find interesting. Feel free to use text as used in the article, but if using it verbatim, please indicate this when abstracting the information). Listed below are some other things to include in this section, if provided in the article.
Please provide 1-2 sentences of the overall findings of the review. Include here any information on negative or ineffective interventions as well.
If the authors provide any kind of synthesis on lessons learned or any specific elements/components that contributed to the success or failure of the intervention, include that information.
If any of the findings focus on more severe/complex patients, please note that as well.
 30. Is there material in this article that could be abstracted using the evaluation framework? Yes No (TO MAKE THIS DECISION, CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING: If the authors provide enough information and detail in the review on any of the following items, then this article should be included in the evaluation framework: details on the original studies that offer insight about the mechanisms of coordination, e.g., how patient monitoring or population surveillance links with planning for care, which activities or processes were integrated better by the coordination intervention; synthesis of the lessons learned or which components of the intervention were effective vineffective in terms of any outcomes; barriers to the success of the intervention(s); structural contexts that influenced care coordination, e.g., physical infrastructure (availability of decision support systems, proximity of those involved in coordinating care, etc), reinforcing characteristics (financial incentives, integration of funding); details about characteristics of tasks or activities that were coordinated, e.g., task complexity, task uncertainty, level of interdependence among tasks, number of participants involved in coordinating activities)
31. Please specify any other comments or concerns.