

# BMJ Open

## Protocol: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness of community-based health services by nurse practitioners

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2014-006670
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Sep-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Kanda, Mikiko; The University of Tokyo, Department of Global Health Policy Ota, Erika; National Center for Child Health and Development, Department of Health Policy Fukuda, Hiromi; Oita University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Department of Nursing Miyachi, Shinji; Oita University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Department of Nursing Gilmour, Stuart; The University of Tokyo, Department of Global Health Policy Kono, Yuko; Oita University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Department of Nursing Nakagama, Erika; Oita University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Department of Nursing Murashima, Sachiyo; Oita University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Department of Nursing; The University of Tokyo, Shibuya, Kenji; The University of Tokyo, Department of Global Health Policy
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Nursing, Health policy
Keywords:	Human resource management < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Title**

Protocol: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness of community-based health services by nurse practitioners

**Authors**

Mikiko Kanda<sup>1</sup>, MHS

Erika Ota<sup>2</sup>, PhD

Hiromi Fukuda<sup>3</sup>, PhD

Shinji Miyauchi<sup>3</sup>, MA

Stuart Gilmour<sup>1</sup>, MPH

Yuko Kono<sup>3</sup>, BSN

Erika Nakagama<sup>3</sup>, BSN

Sachiyo Murashima<sup>3,4</sup>, PhD

Kenji Shibuya<sup>1</sup>, MD, DrPH

**Affiliations**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Global Health Policy, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

<sup>2</sup>Division of Clinical Practice Policy, Department of Health Policy, National Center for Child Health and Development, Tokyo 157-8535, Japan

1  
2  
3<sup>3</sup>Department of Nursing, Oita University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Oita 870-1201,  
4  
5 Japan

6  
7<sup>4</sup>The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 **Corresponding author**  
14

15  
16 Mikiko Kanda, Department of Global Health Policy, Graduate School of Medicine, The  
17  
18 University of Tokyo  
19

20  
21  
22 7-3-1, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku Tokyo, 113-0033, Japan  
23

24  
25 Tel: +81-3-5841-3688  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

**Introduction:** In order to realize universal health coverage in an ageing society, adequate provision of appropriately trained human resources is essential. The nurse practitioner (NP) is a type of advanced practice nurse who is capable of providing treatment and care including assessment, inspection, prescription and consultation. Previous systematic reviews that examined NPs effectiveness in all settings identified higher levels of patient satisfaction with services provided by NPs than by medical doctors (MDs). As non-communicable diseases become a major health burden requiring long-term health care in community settings, this systematic review aims to assess the effectiveness of NP services and to determine whether their practice is an effective alternative to that of MDs in community settings.

**Methods and analysis:** Relevant randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and cluster RCTs will be searched in the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL and the British Nursing Index. We will assess interventions comparing treatment and care provided by NPs in community settings with that provided by MDs. Outcomes will include hospitalization, mortality, and biological data including blood pressure and blood sugar level. Two authors will independently screen studies for inclusion and will resolve differences by discussion and if required through consultation with a third author. The risk of bias of included studies will be assessed using the Cochrane Collaboration *risk of bias* tool. Meta-analysis of included studies will be conducted using a fixed-effect model or a

1  
2  
3  
4 random-effects model depending on the degree of between-study heterogeneity. Results will  
5  
6  
7 be presented using risk ratios with 95% confidence interval for dichotomous outcomes and  
8  
9  
10 standardized mean differences with 95% confidence interval for continuous outcomes.

11  
12 **Ethics and dissemination:** This systematic review and meta-analysis protocol does not  
13  
14 require ethical approval. We will disseminate the findings of this systematic review and  
15  
16  
17 meta-analysis via publications in peer-reviewed journals.  
18  
19

20  
21 **Review registration:** PROSPERO CRD42014009627.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

The percentage of the world's population over 60 years of age is estimated to double from approximately 11% to 20% by 2050.[1] In order to realize and sustain universal health coverage (UHC) in an ageing society, adequate provision of well-prepared human resources for health (HRH) is essential.[2] Nurses constitute the largest profession in the world,[3] and are the front-line – often the only – healthcare personnel available to the population, especially in a community setting. It is therefore important to secure a practical environment that enables nurses to optimize their expertise to provide high quality of services.

A nurse practitioner (NP) is a type of advanced practice nurse (APN) defined by the International Council of Nurses as “a registered nurse who has acquired an expert knowledge base, complex decision-making skills and clinical competencies. A master's degree is recommended for entry-level positions”. [4] Although many countries have introduced an NP system, the status of education, regulations, code of practice and competencies vary substantially across countries and regions.[5] Many countries with limited HRH are seeking ways to improve the efficiency of healthcare delivery, and utilizing NP is one solution that may enable the provision of primary health care with advanced scope of practice. For instance, in a community setting where NPs are the first point of contact, such as at a nursing home, geriatric health care facility, home-visit nursing agency, in the home or at the clinic,

1  
2  
3  
4 the NP provides treatment and care including assessment, inspection, prescription and  
5  
6  
7 consultation.[6]  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 With non-communicable diseases (NCDs) becoming a major burden on population health  
13  
14 globally,[7] the credentials and competencies of NPs may be beneficial in the management of  
15  
16 NCDs, which requires long-term care in primary-care settings, especially in countries with an  
17  
18 increasing ageing population. Moreover, NPs are in charge of managing community health in  
19  
20 countries with few medical doctors (MD).[8] It is essential to assure that NP practice is  
21  
22 sufficiently effective to make up the shortage of MDs, and/or can be equivalent to care  
23  
24 provided by MDs in a community setting.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Two comprehensive systematic reviews have previously assessed NP practice.[9, 10] One  
37  
38 review conducted in 2002 examined the equivalence of services provided by NPs and by  
39  
40 MDs in primary care.[9] This systematic review and meta-analysis of 11 trials and 23  
41  
42 observational studies identified higher levels of patient satisfaction with services provided by  
43  
44 NPs than by MDs, and no significant difference in patient health status, prescriptions and  
45  
46 return consultations. The other review quantified APN outcomes, including NPs, from articles  
47  
48 published in the US between 1990 and 2008.[10] This study identified 14 trials including 12  
49  
50 high quality scaled studies and 23 observational studies. From these trials, NP practice  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 outcomes were summarized in dimensions of patient satisfaction, self-rated health, physical  
5  
6 function, and biological data such as blood sugar control, lipid control and blood pressure.  
7  
8

9  
10 These outcomes were compared with the same outcomes in patients whose care was managed  
11  
12 exclusively by MDs. However, no systematic review and meta-analysis has focused on NP  
13  
14 practice specifically in a community setting. As services provided by NPs vary depending on  
15  
16 the setting, we will conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis focusing on NP practice in  
17  
18 the community settings.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

## 27 **Objectives**

28  
29 To investigate whether monitoring, assessment, counseling, education and prescription  
30  
31 provided by NPs results in statistically significantly different patient outcomes from those  
32  
33 provided by MDs in a community setting.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

## 42 **Methods**

### 43 **Type of Studies**

44  
45 Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and cluster RCTs of interventions comparing NPs and  
46  
47 MDs will be included. We will not include quasi-RCTs and cross-over trials.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 This review protocol has been registered with the International Prospective Register of  
54  
55 Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) at the National Institute for Health Research and Center  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) at the University of York (registration number:  
5  
6  
7 CRD42014009627).  
8  
9

### 10 11 12 13 **Type of participants**

14  
15 The participants will be adults receiving treatment and care from NPs in a community setting.  
16  
17  
18 Community settings include nursing homes, geriatric health care facilities, home-visit nursing  
19  
20  
21 agencies, patient homes, and clinics that cover all areas except hospital inpatients.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 28 **Type of intervention**

29  
30 The types of interventions included will be as follows: first contact and assessment of patient  
31  
32  
33 at clinics, follow-up and monitoring of patient health and medical plan adherence,  
34  
35  
36 counselling and education for preventing non-communicable disease (NCDs), continuity of  
37  
38  
39 care and hospital re-admission, disease symptom management, and medication prescription  
40  
41  
42 for management of NCDs and disease symptoms. All interventions are provided by NPs in a  
43  
44  
45 community setting.  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 51 **Type of outcome measures**

#### 52 53 **Primary outcomes**

- 54  
55  
56 1. Hospitalization [times/year]  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 2. Patient mortality
- 5
- 6 3. Biological data: cholesterol level [g], blood pressure [mmHg], blood sugar [mg/dl], and
- 7
- 8 Hemoglobin A1c [%]
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16

### 17 **Secondary outcomes**

- 18 1. Cost [International Dollars or US dollars]
- 19
- 20
- 21 2. Patient satisfaction
- 22
- 23
- 24 3. Self-reported perceived health
- 25
- 26
- 27 4. Pressure ulcers
- 28
- 29
- 30 5. Functional status (ADL/IADL)
- 31
- 32
- 33 6. Emergency department visits [times/year]
- 34
- 35
- 36 7. Length of hospital stay [days]
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41

### 42 **Search strategy and sources**

43

44 We will report data following the PRISMA statement.[11] A comprehensive literature review

45

46 using the databases MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, British Nursing Index, and Cochrane

47

48 Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) will be performed. Search strategies will

49

50 be tailored to each database so as to employ the correct MeSH terms. Where possible both

51

52

53 MeSH and free text terms with synonyms will be used so as to increase identification of

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

1  
2  
3  
4 potentially relevant studies. Where MeSH terms are not used, free text only will be used. A  
5  
6  
7 separate search of Web of Science will be undertaken in order to capture any grey literature.  
8  
9  
10 Reference list reviews of included papers will be carried out. No language restrictions will be  
11  
12  
13 applied to the searches.  
14

## 15 16 17 18 **Data collection and analysis**

### 19 20 **Inclusion criteria**

- 21  
22  
23  
24 1. Participants: Adult patients who received treatment and care by NPs or by MDs in the  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000
1. Participants: Adult patients who received treatment and care by NPs or by MDs in the  
community setting.
2. Study design: RCTs including cluster RCTs
3. Intervention site: Community setting including nursing homes, geriatric medical care  
facilities, geriatric health care facilities, home-visit nursing agencies, patient homes, and  
clinics.
4. Intervention: monitoring, assessment, counseling, education and medication prescription  
to elderly people, patients with chronic diseases, and patients discharged from hospitals.  
All interventions are provided by NPs in a community setting.
5. High-income countries based on World Bank criteria in 2013 or countries that require NP  
to hold a master's degree.
6. Published original articles (full-text available including theses) published from 1990 to

1  
2  
3  
4 2014. The time period was chosen because the scientific and organizational basis of  
5  
6  
7 clinical practice and intervention changed in 1990.[10]  
8  
9  
10

### 11 12 13 **Exclusion criteria**

- 14  
15 1. Excluded studies: Observational studies, quasi-randomized and cross-over trials.  
16  
17
- 18 2. Excluded intervention sites: Inpatient care at hospitals  
19
- 20 3. Excluded participants: Children  
21  
22
- 23 4. Excluded publications: Non-academic articles and articles published before 1990  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 **Data extraction and management**

31  
32  
33 The study title and abstract will be screened by two authors in the review group  
34  
35 independently to identify eligible studies. Two authors in the study group will manually enter  
36  
37 data into a standard data extraction form based on the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic  
38  
39 Reviews of Interventions,[12] to determine the eligibility of each study. Any disagreements  
40  
41 will be solved by discussion. If there is any discrepancy between the two authors, we will  
42  
43 consult with other authors (EO, SaM and KS) for expert opinion. When there is unclear  
44  
45 information in the process of data extraction, we will contact authors of the original studies to  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 provide further information.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

The risk of bias in included studies will be assessed using the *Risk of Bias* tool according to the Handbook.[12] We will use the following criteria to assess the risk of bias: random sequence generation, allocation sequence concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective outcome reporting and other bias.[12] Evaluation of whether or not included studies are eligible for meta-analysis will be conducted by four authors (MK, EO, HF and SG), and in the event of disagreement, we will consult with other authors (EO, SaM and KS) for expert opinion.

### Measurement of treatment effect

Statistical analysis will be carried out using RevMan 2014.[13] For dichotomous outcomes including hospitalization, patient mortality and emergency department use, risk ratios with 95% confidence intervals will be used to assess differences in the outcomes of treatment and care provided by NPs compared to MDs. For continuous outcomes including biological data, cost, patient satisfaction, self-reported perceived health, and functional status (ADL/IADL), standardized mean differences with 95% confidence interval will be calculated.

### Missing data

1  
2  
3  
4 We will assess levels of attrition for included studies, and conduct sensitivity analysis of the  
5  
6  
7 impact of including studies with 20% or more of missing data. For all outcomes, we will  
8  
9  
10 conduct intention-to-treat analysis wherever possible.

### 11 12 13 14 15 **Assessment of publication bias**

16  
17  
18 If a sufficient number (10 or more) of studies are eligible for meta-analysis, funnel plots will  
19  
20  
21 be used to in order to assess reporting bias by checking funnel plot asymmetry.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 **Strategy for data synthesis, assessment/investigation of heterogeneity**

28  
29  
30 We will use a fixed-effect model for combining data if the interventions examined in the  
31  
32  
33 studies are judged to be the same based on the heterogeneity between studies, and methods  
34  
35  
36 are fairly similar. We will use a random-effects model when the interventions in the studies  
37  
38  
39 are considered to have clinical heterogeneity or there is substantial heterogeneity between  
40  
41  
42 studies. The results of the random-effects model will be used as the average range of possible  
43  
44  
45 intervention effects with 95% confidence intervals, and the estimates of Tau-squared and  
46  
47  
48 I-squared and difference of clinical implication between interventions will be discussed.  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 **Analysis of subgroups or subsets**

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 If any substantial heterogeneity is identified through analysis of Tau-squared and I-squared  
5  
6  
7 statistics, subgroup analysis will be conducted for primary outcomes in the following  
8  
9  
10 characteristic groups.

- 11  
12 1. Type of facility: Geriatric health care facilities, home-visit nursing agencies, clinics and  
13  
14 hospitals
- 15  
16 2. Gender: Males versus females
- 17  
18 3. Age group: Less than 40 years versus 40 years and over
- 19  
20  
21 4. Type of intervention: Prevention, inspection, treatment including prescription, follow-up  
22  
23  
24 of patients and training of other health care providers
- 25  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 Subgroup differences will be assessed by interaction tests. The results of subgroup analyses  
31  
32 will be reported quoting the I-squared statistic and p-value, and the interaction test I-squared  
33  
34 value.  
35  
36

## 37 38 39 40 41 **Discussion**

42  
43  
44 This review and meta-analysis will play an important role in consolidating evidence on the  
45  
46 effectiveness of health services provided by NPs, especially where they play a role in  
47  
48 managing non-communicable disease, supporting continuity of care between hospital and  
49  
50 community, and monitoring and supporting the health of elderly people. Information on  
51  
52 which NP activities are effective in improving health outcomes will further drive efforts to  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 develop an effective NP utilization strategy to support and sustain UHC through provision of  
5  
6  
7 high quality care at low cost in community settings.  
8  
9  
10

### 11 12 **Acknowledgements**

13  
14  
15 We would like to thank Ms. Miwako Segawa for devising a search strategy for this review.  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 21 **Contributorship statement**

22  
23  
24 MK conceived and designed the review, completed PROSPERO registration and wrote  
25  
26  
27 primary draft. EO and HF conceived and designed the review, provided content expertise and  
28  
29  
30 revised the manuscript. SG provided content expertise in the part of statistical analysis and  
31  
32  
33 revised the manuscript. ShM, YK and EN were involved in the design of the review setting  
34  
35  
36 the outcomes of review, inclusion and exclusion criteria. SaM and KS contributed to content  
37  
38  
39 expertise and feedback and to provide important intellectual contents. All authors read and  
40  
41  
42 approved the final version of the protocol for submission.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 **Competing interests:** None  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 **Funding:** None  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## References

1. World Health Organization. *Global health and ageing*. 2011; Available from:  
[http://www.who.int/ageing/publications/global\\_health.pdf?ua=1](http://www.who.int/ageing/publications/global_health.pdf?ua=1).
2. Sheikh, M., et al., *Human resources for universal health coverage: a call for papers*.  
Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 2013. **91**(2): p. 84-84a.
3. Hughes, F., *Nurses at the forefront of innovation*. International Nursing Review, 2006.  
**53**(2): p. 94-101.
4. International Council of Nurses. *Nurse Practitioner/Advanced Practice Nurse:  
Definition and Characteristics*. Nursing Matters 2004; Available from:  
[http://www.icn.ch/images/stories/documents/publications/fact\\_sheets/1b\\_FS-NP\\_AP  
N.pdf](http://www.icn.ch/images/stories/documents/publications/fact_sheets/1b_FS-NP_AP<br/>N.pdf)
5. Delamaire, M.-L. and G. Lafortune, *Nurses in advanced roles*. OCDE, ed. OECD  
Health Working Papers, 2010(54).
6. Sherwood, G.D., et al., *Defining nurse practitioner scope of practice: expanding  
primary care services*. The internet journal of advanced nursing practice, 1997. **1**(2): p.  
1-12.
7. Lozano, R., et al., *Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age  
groups in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease  
Study 2010*. The Lancet, 2013. **380**(9859): p. 2095-2128.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 8. Naylor, M.D. and E.T. Kurtzman, *The role of nurse practitioners in reinventing*  
5  
6  
7 *primary care*. Health Affairs, 2010. **29**(5): p. 893-899.
- 8  
9  
10 9. Horrocks, S., E. Anderson, and C. Salisbury, *Systematic review of whether nurse*  
11  
12 *practitioners working in primary care can provide equivalent care to doctors*. Bmj,  
13  
14 2002. **324**(7341): p. 819-823.
- 15  
16  
17 10. Newhouse, R.P., et al., *Advanced practice nurse outcomes 1990-2008: a systematic*  
18  
19 *review*. Nursing Economics, 2011. **29**(5): p. 1-21.
- 20  
21  
22 11. Moher, D., et al., *Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses:*  
23  
24 *the PRISMA statement*. Annals of internal medicine, 2009. **151**(4): p. 264-269.
- 25  
26  
27 12. Higgins, J.P. and S. Green, *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of*  
28  
29 *interventions*. Vol. 5. 2008: Wiley Online Library.
- 30  
31  
32 13. The Cochrane Collaboration. *Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program]*.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*Version 5.3*. 2014.

# BMJ Open

## Protocol: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness of community-based health services by nurse practitioners

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2014-006670.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Mar-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Kanda, Mikiko; The University of Tokyo, Department of Global Health Policy Ota, Erika; National Center for Child Health and Development, Department of Health Policy Fukuda, Hiromi; Oita University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Department of Nursing Miyachi, Shinji; Oita University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Department of Nursing Gilmour, Stuart; The University of Tokyo, Department of Global Health Policy Kono, Yuko; Oita University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Department of Nursing Nakagama, Erika; Oita University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Department of Nursing Murashima, Sachiyo; Oita University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Department of Nursing; The University of Tokyo, Shibuya, Kenji; The University of Tokyo, Department of Global Health Policy
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Nursing, Health policy
Keywords:	Human resource management < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Title**

Protocol: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness of community-based health services by nurse practitioners

**Authors**

Mikiko Kanda<sup>1</sup>, MHS

Erika Ota<sup>2</sup>, PhD

Hiromi Fukuda<sup>3</sup>, PhD

Shinji Miyauchi<sup>3</sup>, MA

Stuart Gilmour<sup>1</sup>, MPH

Yuko Kono<sup>3</sup>, BSN

Erika Nakagama<sup>3</sup>, BSN

Sachiyo Murashima<sup>3,4</sup>, PhD

Kenji Shibuya<sup>1</sup>, MD, DrPH

**Affiliations**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Global Health Policy, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

<sup>2</sup>Division of Clinical Practice Policy, Department of Health Policy, National Center for Child Health and Development, Tokyo 157-8535, Japan

1  
2  
3<sup>3</sup>Department of Nursing, Oita University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Oita 870-1201,  
4  
5 Japan

6  
7<sup>4</sup>The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 **Corresponding author**  
14

15  
16 Mikiko Kanda, Department of Global Health Policy, Graduate School of Medicine, The  
17  
18 University of Tokyo  
19

20  
21  
22 7-3-1, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku Tokyo, 113-0033, Japan  
23

24  
25 Tel: +81-3-5841-3688 e-mail: [mkanda@m.u-tokyo.ac.jp](mailto:mkanda@m.u-tokyo.ac.jp)  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

**Introduction:** To realize universal health coverage in an ageing society, adequate provision of appropriately trained human resources is essential. The nurse practitioner (NP) is an autonomous and independent, advanced practice nurse capable of providing treatment and care that can be substituted for some aspects of a medical doctor's (MD) role, especially in a community setting. Previous systematic reviews found higher levels of patient satisfaction with services provided by NPs than MDs. As non-communicable diseases become a major health burden requiring long-term health care in community settings, this systematic review aims to assess the equivalence of NP services to standard care provided by MDs and to determine whether their practice is an effective alternative to that of MDs in community settings.

**Methods and analysis:** Relevant randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and cluster RCTs will be searched in the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL and the British Nursing Index. We will assess patient and health system utilization outcomes of interventions comparing treatment and care provided by NPs in community settings with that provided by MDs. Two authors will independently screen studies for inclusion, consulting with a third author where necessary to resolve discrepancies. The risk of bias of included studies will be assessed using the Cochrane Collaboration *risk of bias* tool, and quality of evidence using the GRADE approach. Meta-analysis of included studies will

1  
2  
3  
4 be conducted using fixed-effect or random-effects models depending on the degree of  
5  
6  
7 between-study heterogeneity. Results will be presented using risk ratios with 95% confidence  
8  
9  
10 interval for dichotomous outcomes and standardized mean differences with 95% confidence  
11  
12  
13 interval for continuous outcomes.

14  
15 **Ethics and dissemination:** This systematic review and meta-analysis protocol does not  
16  
17  
18 require ethical approval. We will disseminate the findings of this systematic review and  
19  
20  
21 meta-analysis via publications in peer-reviewed journals.  
22  
23

24 **Review registration:** PROSPERO CRD42014009627.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

The percentage of the world's population over 60 years of age is estimated to double from approximately 11% to 20% by 2050.[1] In order to realize and sustain universal health coverage (UHC) in an ageing society, adequate provision of well-prepared human resources for health (HRH) is essential.[2] Nurses constitute the largest profession in the world,[3] and are the front-line – often the only – healthcare personnel available to the population, especially in a community setting. It is therefore important to secure a practical environment that enables nurses to optimize their expertise to provide high quality of services.

A nurse practitioner (NP) is a type of advanced practice nurse (APN) defined by the International Council of Nurses as “a registered nurse who has acquired an expert knowledge base, complex decision-making skills and clinical competencies. A master's degree is recommended for entry-level positions”. [4] Although many countries have introduced an NP system, the status of education, regulations, code of practice and competencies vary substantially across countries and regions.[5] Many countries with limited HRH are seeking ways to improve the efficiency of healthcare delivery, and utilizing NP is one solution that may enable the provision of primary health care with advanced scope of practice. For instance, in a community setting where NPs are the first point of contact, such as at a nursing home, geriatric health care facility, home-visit nursing agency, in the home or at the clinic,



1  
2  
3  
4 the NP performs assessments and diagnoses, orders diagnostic and laboratory tests, prescribes  
5  
6 medication and offers treatments with a high level of autonomy and independence. Also  
7  
8  
9  
10 taking responsibility for case management, the NP monitors patient health and medical plan  
11  
12 adherence, offers counselling and education for non-communicable disease (NCD)  
13  
14 prevention, ensures continuity of care and manages hospital re-admission, The NP is also  
15  
16 responsible for disease symptom management and is expected to show advanced consultation,  
17  
18  
19  
20 collaboration, education, research and leadership skills.[4, 6]  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 With non-communicable diseases (NCDs) becoming a major burden on population health  
28  
29 globally,[7] the credentials and competencies of NPs may be beneficial in the management of  
30  
31  
32 NCDs, which requires long-term care in primary-care settings, especially in countries with an  
33  
34 increasing ageing population. Moreover, NPs are in charge of managing individual health in  
35  
36 communities with few medical doctors (MD).[8] It is essential to assure that NP practice is  
37  
38 sufficiently effective to make up the shortage of MDs, and/or can be equivalent to care  
39  
40  
41 provided by MDs in a community setting.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Two comprehensive systematic reviews have previously assessed NP practice.[9, 10] One  
51  
52 review conducted in 2002 examined the equivalence of services provided by NPs and by  
53  
54  
55 MDs in primary care.[9] This systematic review and meta-analysis of 11 trials and 23  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 observational studies identified higher levels of patient satisfaction with services provided by  
5  
6 NPs than by MDs, and no significant difference in patient health status, prescriptions and  
7  
8 return consultations. The other review quantified APN outcomes, including NPs, from articles  
9  
10 published in the US between 1990 and 2008.[10] This study identified 14 trials including 12  
11  
12 high quality scaled studies and 23 observational studies. From these trials, NP practice  
13  
14 outcomes were summarized in dimensions of patient satisfaction, self-rated health, physical  
15  
16 function, and biological data such as blood sugar control, lipid control and blood pressure.  
17  
18 These outcomes were compared with the same outcomes in patients whose care was managed  
19  
20 exclusively by MDs. However, no systematic review and meta-analysis has focused on NP  
21  
22 practice specifically in a community setting. As services provided by NPs vary depending on  
23  
24 the setting, we will conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis focusing on NP practice in  
25  
26 the community settings.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

## 42 **Objectives**

43  
44 To investigate whether services delivered by NPs substitution for MDs result in statistically  
45  
46 equivalent patient and health system utilization outcomes to standard care provided by MDs  
47  
48 in a community setting.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

## 55 **Methods**

## Type of Studies

Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and cluster RCTs of interventions comparing NPs and MDs will be included. We will not include quasi-RCTs and cross-over trials.

This review protocol has been registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) at the National Institute for Health Research and Center for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) at the University of York (registration number: CRD42014009627).

## Type of participants

The participants will be adults receiving treatment and care from NPs in a community setting. Community settings include nursing homes, geriatric health care facilities, home-visit nursing agencies, patient homes, and clinics that cover all areas except hospital inpatients.

## Type of intervention

The types of interventions included will be as follows:

- As a first point of contact for patients or clients, perform assessments, order diagnostic and laboratory tests
- Offer diagnoses, prescribe medications and treatments
- Implement procedures

- Take responsibility for case management
- Follow-up and monitoring of patient health and medical plan adherence
- Counselling and education for preventing non-communicable disease (NCDs)
- Ensuring continuity of care and hospital re-admission
- Disease symptom management

All interventions are provided by NPs in a community setting.

#### **Type of outcome measures**

##### **Primary outcomes**

1. Hospitalization [times/year]
2. Patient mortality
3. Biological data: cholesterol level [g], blood pressure [mmHg], blood sugar [mg/dl], and Hemoglobin A1c [%]

##### **Secondary outcomes**

1. Cost [International Dollars or US dollars]
2. Patient satisfaction
3. Self-reported perceived health
4. Pressure ulcers

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 5. Functional status (ADL/IADL)
- 5
- 6
- 7 6. Emergency department visits [times/year]
- 8
- 9
- 10 7. Length of hospital stay [days]
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14

### 15 **Search strategy and sources**

16 We will report data following the PRISMA statement.[11] A comprehensive literature review  
17  
18 using the databases MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, British Nursing Index, and Cochrane  
19  
20 Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) will be performed and an example of  
21  
22 search strategy in MEDLINE is shown in Supplementary File 1. Search strategies will be  
23  
24 tailored to each database so as to employ the correct MeSH terms. Where possible both  
25  
26 MeSH and free text terms with synonyms will be used so as to increase identification of  
27  
28 potentially relevant studies. Where MeSH terms are not used, free text only will be used. A  
29  
30 separate search of Web of Science will be undertaken in order to capture any grey literature.  
31  
32 Reference list reviews of included papers will be carried out. No language restrictions will be  
33  
34 applied to the searches.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 **Data collection and analysis**

### 51 **Inclusion criteria**

52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 1. Participants: Adult patients who received treatment and care by NPs or standard care by  
5  
6  
7 MDs in the community setting.  
8
- 9  
10 2. Study design: RCTs including cluster RCTs
- 11  
12  
13 3. Intervention site: Community setting including nursing homes, geriatric medical care  
14  
15 facilities, geriatric health care facilities, home-visit nursing agencies, patient homes, and  
16  
17  
18 clinics.  
19
- 20  
21 4. Intervention: All types of treatment and care provided by NPs in community settings.
- 22  
23  
24 5. High-income countries based on World Bank criteria in 2013
- 25  
26  
27 6. Countries that require NP to hold a master's degree at the time of the study period. If  
28  
29  
30 education qualifications are not clearly mentioned, detailed information will be obtained  
31  
32  
33 by contacting authors of the article or by reference to established qualification standards  
34  
35  
36 for the country in question where the study clearly specifies that NPs are defined with  
37  
38  
39 reference to national accreditation boards.  
40
- 41  
42 7. Published original articles (full-text available including theses) published from 1990 to  
43  
44  
45 2014. The time period was chosen because the scientific and organizational basis of  
46  
47  
48 clinical practice and intervention changed in 1990.[10]

### 52 53 **Exclusion criteria**

- 54  
55  
56 1. Excluded studies: Observational studies, quasi-randomized and cross-over trials.  
57  
58  
59  
60

2. Excluded intervention sites: Inpatient care at hospitals
3. Excluded participants: Children
4. Excluded publications: Non-academic articles and articles published before 1990

### **Data extraction and management**

The study title and abstract will be screened by two authors in the review group independently to identify eligible studies. Two authors in the study group will manually enter data into a standard data extraction form based on the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions,[12] to determine the eligibility of each study. Any disagreement will be solved by discussion. If there is any discrepancy between the two authors, we will consult with other authors (EO, SaM and KS) for expert opinion. When there is unclear information in the process of data extraction, we will contact authors of the original studies to provide further information.

### **Assessment of risk of bias in included studies**

The risk of bias in included studies will be assessed using the *Risk of Bias* tool according to the Handbook.[12] We will use the following criteria to assess the risk of bias: random sequence generation, allocation sequence concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective outcome reporting and

1  
2  
3  
4 other bias.[12] Studies will be included in meta-analysis if they are of the same type of such  
5  
6 as RCTs or cluster RCTs and have the same population, intervention, comparison and  
7  
8 outcomes. Evaluation of whether or not included studies are eligible for meta-analysis will be  
9  
10 conducted by four authors (MK, EO, HF and SG), and in the event of disagreement, we will  
11  
12 consult with other authors (EO, SaM and KS) for expert opinion.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

### 21 **Measurement of treatment effect**

22  
23  
24 Statistical analysis will be carried out using RevMan 2014.[13] For dichotomous outcomes  
25  
26 including hospitalization, patient mortality and emergency department use, risk ratios with  
27  
28 95% confidence intervals will be used to assess differences in the outcomes of treatment and  
29  
30 care provided by NPs compared to MDs. For continuous outcomes including biological data,  
31  
32 cost, patient satisfaction, self-reported perceived health, and functional status (ADL/IADL),  
33  
34 standardized mean differences with 95% confidence interval will be calculated.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **Missing data**

46  
47 We will assess levels of attrition for included studies, and conduct sensitivity analysis of the  
48  
49 impact of including studies with 20% or more of missing data. For all outcomes, we will  
50  
51 conduct intention-to-treat analysis wherever possible.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### Assessment of publication bias

If a sufficient number (10 or more) of studies are eligible for meta-analysis, funnel plots will be used in order to assess reporting bias by checking funnel plot asymmetry.

### Strategy for data synthesis, assessment/investigation of heterogeneity

We will use a fixed-effect model for combining data if the interventions examined in the studies are judged to be the same based on the heterogeneity between studies, and methods are fairly similar. We will use a random-effects model when the interventions in the studies are considered to have clinical heterogeneity or there is substantial heterogeneity between studies. The results of the random-effects model will be used as the average range of possible intervention effects with 95% confidence intervals, and the estimates of Tau-squared and I-squared and difference of clinical implication between interventions will be discussed. Finally we will assess the quality of the following individual outcomes and produce summaries using the GRADE approach

1. Hospitalization
2. Patient mortality
3. Biological data
4. Cost
5. Patient satisfaction

## 6. Self-reported perceived health

Data will be imported from RevMan 2014 [13] to the GRADE profiler [14] to produce “summary of findings” tables. These tables will include a summary of the intervention effect and a quality of individual outcomes using the GRADE approach. The quality of the body of evidence for each outcome will be assessed based on five factors: study limitations, consistency of effect, imprecision, indirectness and publication bias.

### **Analysis of subgroups or subsets**

If any substantial heterogeneity is identified through analysis of Tau-squared and I-squared statistics, subgroup analysis will be conducted for primary outcomes in the following characteristic groups.

1. Type of facility: Geriatric health care facilities, home-visit nursing agencies, clinics and hospitals
2. Gender: Males versus females
3. Age group: Less than 40 years versus 40 years and over
4. Type of intervention
5. The number of NPs delivering the intervention: less than 10 versus 10 and over
6. The years of NP experience: less than 10 years and 10 and over

1  
2  
3  
4 Subgroup differences will be assessed by interaction tests. The results of subgroup analyses  
5  
6 will be reported quoting the I-squared statistic and p-value, and the interaction test I-squared  
7  
8 value.  
9  
10

## 11 12 13 14 15 **Discussion**

16  
17  
18 This review and meta-analysis will play an important role in consolidating evidence on the  
19  
20 effectiveness of health services provided by NPs, especially where they play a role in  
21  
22 managing non-communicable disease, supporting continuity of care between hospital and  
23  
24 community, and monitoring and supporting the health of elderly people. Information on  
25  
26 which NP activities are effective as a substitute for standard care provided by MDs in terms  
27  
28 of patient and health system utilization outcomes will further drive efforts to develop an  
29  
30 effective NP utilization strategies. These strategies in turn will strengthen support to and  
31  
32 sustain UHC through provision of high quality care at low cost in community settings.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

## 44 45 **Acknowledgements**

46  
47 We would like to thank Ms. Miwako Segawa for devising a search strategy for this review.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

## 53 54 **Contributorship statement**

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 MK conceived and designed the review, completed PROSPERO registration and wrote  
5  
6 primary draft. EO and HF conceived and designed the review, provided content expertise and  
7  
8 revised the manuscript. SG provided content expertise in the part of statistical analysis and  
9  
10 revised the manuscript. SG provided content expertise in the part of statistical analysis and  
11  
12 revised the manuscript. ShM, YK and EN were involved in the design of the review setting  
13  
14 the outcomes of review, inclusion and exclusion criteria. SaM and KS contributed to content  
15  
16 expertise and feedback and to provide important intellectual contents. All authors read and  
17  
18 approved the final version of the protocol for submission.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 **Competing interests:** None  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 **Funding:** This project is funded by the Japanese Society for Promotion of Science Grant in  
34  
35 Aid for Scientific Research (B) 26293480 and National Center for Child health and  
36  
37 Development grant 26A-5.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 **References**

- 46  
47 1. World Health Organization. *Global health and ageing*. 2011; Available from:  
48  
49 [http://www.who.int/ageing/publications/global\\_health.pdf?ua=1](http://www.who.int/ageing/publications/global_health.pdf?ua=1).  
50  
51  
52  
53 2. Sheikh, M., et al., *Human resources for universal health coverage: a call for papers*.  
54  
55 Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 2013. **91**(2): p. 84-84a.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 3. Hughes, F., *Nurses at the forefront of innovation*. International Nursing Review, 2006.  
5  
6  
7 53(2): p. 94-101.  
8
- 9  
10 4. International Council of Nurses. *Nurse Practitioner/Advanced Practice Nurse:*  
11  
12 *Definition and Characteristics*. Nursing Matters 2004; Available from:  
13  
14 [http://www.icn.ch/images/stories/documents/publications/fact\\_sheets/1b\\_FS-NP\\_AP](http://www.icn.ch/images/stories/documents/publications/fact_sheets/1b_FS-NP_AP)  
15  
16 [N.pdf](#)  
17
- 18  
19  
20 5. Delamaire, M.-L. and G. Lafortune, *Nurses in advanced roles*. OCDE, ed. OECD  
21  
22 Health Working Papers, 2010(54).  
23
- 24  
25  
26 6. Sherwood, G.D., et al., *Defining nurse practitioner scope of practice: expanding*  
27  
28 *primary care services*. The internet journal of advanced nursing practice, 1997. 1(2): p.  
29  
30 1-12.  
31
- 32  
33  
34 7. Lozano, R., et al., *Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age*  
35  
36 *groups in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease*  
37  
38 *Study 2010*. The Lancet, 2013. 380(9859): p. 2095-2128.  
39  
40
- 41  
42  
43 8. Naylor, M.D. and E.T. Kurtzman, *The role of nurse practitioners in reinventing*  
44  
45 *primary care*. Health Affairs, 2010. 29(5): p. 893-899.  
46  
47
- 48  
49  
50 9. Horrocks, S., E. Anderson, and C. Salisbury, *Systematic review of whether nurse*  
51  
52 *practitioners working in primary care can provide equivalent care to doctors*. Bmj,  
53  
54 2002. 324(7341): p. 819-823.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

10. Newhouse, R.P., et al., *Advanced practice nurse outcomes 1990-2008: a systematic review*. Nursing Economics, 2011. **29**(5): p. 1-21.
11. Moher, D., et al., *Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement*. Annals of internal medicine, 2009. **151**(4): p. 264-269.
12. Higgins, J.P. and S. Green, *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. Vol. 5. 2008: Wiley Online Library.
13. The Cochrane Collaboration. *Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program]. Version 5.3*. 2014.
14. The Cochrane Collaboration. *GRADEpro [Computer program] Version 3.6*. 2008.

## Supplementary file 1 – Search strategy for MEDLINE (OVID)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6 #1 exp Nurse Practitioners/
- 7 #2 nurse practitioner\*.tw.
- 8 #3 Advanced Practice Nursing/
- 9 #4 (advanced practice adj3 nurs\*).tw.
- 10 #5 Nurse Clinicians/
- 11 #6 nurse clinician\*.tw.
- 12 #7 nurse specialist\*.tw.
- 13 #8 specialist nurse\*.tw.
- 14 #9 Home Health Nursing/
- 15 #10 Nurses, Community Health/
- 16 #11 community health nurs\*.tw.
- 17 #12 community nurse\*.tw.
- 18 #13 community matron\*.tw.
- 19 #14 district nurse\*.tw.
- 20 #15 Nurses, Public Health/
- 21 #16 Public Health Nursing/
- 22 #17 public health nurs\*.tw.
- 23 #18 or/1-17
- 24 #19 communit\*.tw.
- 25 #20 Nursing Homes/
- 26 #21 nursing home\*.tw.
- 27 #22 assisted living.tw.
- 28 #23 residential care.tw.
- 29 #24 Homes for the Aged/
- 30 #25 (geriatric adj7 care).tw.
- 31 #26 (care adj7 facilit\*).tw.
- 32 #27 ((long-term or longterm) adj7 facilit\*).tw.
- 33 #28 ((long-term or longterm) adj7 care).tw.
- 34 #29 (nursing adj7 facilit\*).tw.
- 35 #30 home.tw.
- 36 #31 House Calls/
- 37 #32 exp Home Care Services/
- 38 #33 Outpatients/
- 39 #34 (outpatient\* or out-patient\*).tw.
- 40 #35 (clinic or clinics).tw.
- 41 #36 or/19-35
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1  
2  
3 #37 18 and 36  
4 #38 randomized controlled trial.pt. (378560)  
5 #39 controlled clinical trial.pt. (88833)  
6 #40 randomized.ab. (298871)  
7 #41 randomised.ab. (59924)  
8 #42 placebo.ab. (155925)  
9 #43 randomly.ab. (215923)  
10 #44 trial.ab. (310452)  
11 #45 groups.ab. (1372175)  
12 #46 or/38-45 (2009609)  
13 #47 37 and 46 (1691)  
14 #48 exp animals/ not humans.sh. (3966435)  
15 #49 47 not 48 (1691)  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Supplementary file 2: PRISMA-P checklist of items for a systematic review or meta-analysis protocol

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page #
<b>Administrative information</b>			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Title: page 1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	N/A
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	Abstract: page 4 Methods: page 8
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Authors, affiliations, and corresponding author: page 1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Contributorship statement: page 15
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	N/A
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Funding: page 17
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	Funding: page 17
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	Funding: page 17
<b>Introduction</b>			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Introduction: page 6

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Objectives: page 7
<b>Methods</b>			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	Methods: page 7
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	Methods: page 10
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	Supplementary file 1
Study records:			
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Methods: page 11
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	Methods: page 11
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	Methods: page 11
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	Methods: page 10
Outcomes and	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization	Methods: page 10

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page #
prioritization		of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	Methods: page 12
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	Methods: page 13
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as $I^2$ , Kendall's $\tau$ )	Methods: page 13
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	Methods: page 14
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Methods: page
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Methods: page 13
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Methods: page 14