

Appendix F: GRADE tables

Table 7: Clinical evidence profile: Presence of a case manager versus usual care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Presence of a case manager versus usual care	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Mortality (follow-up in-hospital)												
1	observational studies	very serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ²	none	3/152 (2%)	1.9%	RR 1.07 (0.28 to 4.08)	1 more per 1000 (from 14 fewer to 59 more)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL

¹ All non-randomised studies automatically downgraded due to selection bias. Studies may be further downgraded by 1 increment if other factors suggest additional high risk of bias, or 2 increments if other factors suggest additional very high risk of bias

² Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed 1 MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MIDs.

Table 8: Clinical evidence profile: Creation of surge capacity versus usual care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Creation of surge capacity versus usual care	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Mortality (follow-up in-hospital)												
1	observational studies	very serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ²	none	10/345 (2.9%)	3%	RR 0.97 (0.45 to 2.12)	1 fewer per 1000 (from 16 fewer to 34 more)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Length of stay (follow-up in-hospital; Better indicated by lower values)												

1	observational studies	very serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	345	537	-	MD 1 higher (0.7 lower to 2.7 higher)	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
---	-----------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	------	-----	-----	---	---------------------------------------	------------------	-----------

¹ All non-randomised studies automatically downgraded due to selection bias. Studies may be further downgraded by 1 increment if other factors suggest additional high risk of bias, or 2 increments if other factors suggest additional very high risk of bias

² Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed 1 MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MIDs.

Appendix G: Excluded clinical studies

Table 9: Studies excluded from the clinical review

Study	Exclusion reason
Anon2015J ¹	News article
Achour 2015 ²	Editorial
Ashcraft 2001 ³	Study design (descriptive)
Asplin 2006 ⁴	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Methodological study
Association of women's health 2012 ⁵	Study design (descriptive)
Atack 2012 ⁶	Incorrect interventions. Staff training outcomes
Aylwin 2006 ⁷	Study design (cross-sectional)
Bachman 2014 ⁸	Unable to locate a copy
Back 2010 ⁹	Focus on evacuation. Systematic review: literature search not sufficiently rigorous
Baker 2009 ¹⁰	Study design (descriptive)
Bar-el 2013 ¹¹	Study design (descriptive)
Barishansky 2009 ¹²	Study design (descriptive)
Belmont 2004 ¹³	Study design (descriptive)
Bissell 2004 ¹⁴	Incorrect interventions. No escalation measures - only comparison of mortality from several disasters
Bland 2007 ¹⁵	Incorrect interventions. Training document
Brady 2006 ¹⁶	News article
Branson 2008 ¹⁷	Literature review
Brazle 2001 ¹⁸	Study design (descriptive)
Brice 2007 ¹⁹	Study design (descriptive)
Buono 2007 ²⁰	Pre-hospital triage with no hospital outcomes
Burrington-brown 2002 ²¹	Study design (descriptive)
Challen 2006 ²²	Incorrect interventions. Theoretical escalation measure
Charney 2012 ²³	Not review population. Paediatrics
Chase 2012 ²⁴	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Forecasting surge events
Chenoweth 2006 ²⁵	News article
Cheung 2012 ²⁶	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Comparison of 2 influenza specific triage tools
Cheung 2012 ²⁷	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Comparison of 2 influenza specific triage tools
Christian 2012 ²⁸	Study design (case study)
Collins2016 ²⁹	Incorrect population - surgical
Cryer 2010 ³⁰	Incorrect interventions. Mass casualty Incident - all interventions and outcomes were pre-hospital
Culley 2014 ³¹	Systematic review: no papers of interest
Curcio 2010 ³²	No escalation measure
Davis 2005 ³³	Cross-sectional

Study	Exclusion reason
Dayton 2008 ³⁴	Study design (cross-sectional)
Disaster response 2007 ³⁵	Study design (descriptive)
Downey 2010 ³⁶	No protocol outcomes reported
Doyle 2006 ³⁷	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Vaccination strategies
Ecri institute 2008 ³⁹	Library service unable to obtain a copy
Epley 2006 ⁴¹	Evacuation co-ordination
Erich 2007 ⁴²	News article
Fagbuyi 2011 ⁴³	Not review population. Paediatric hospital (treats some adults but not stated how many, unlikely to be 75%)
Farrar 2010 ⁴⁴	Study design (descriptive)
Fawcett 2000 ⁴⁵	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Methodological study
Fineberg 2014 ⁴⁶	Study design (descriptive)
Franc 2015 ⁴⁷	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Methodological study
Gabler 2013 ⁴⁸	No escalation measure
Gebbie 2007 ⁴⁹	Study design (descriptive)
Glick 2007 ⁵⁰	Study design (descriptive)
Goddard 2006 ⁵¹	Study design (descriptive)
Gold 2005 ⁵²	Study design (descriptive). Incorrect interventions. Evacuation following disaster
Golob 2005 ⁵³	Study design (descriptive)
Goodacre 2013 ⁵⁵	Non-comparative pilot study
Goodacre 2015 ⁵⁴	Protocol and non-comparative pilot study
Gray 2007 ⁵⁶	Study design (descriptive)
Hall 2013 ⁵⁷	Study design (case study)
Hammad 2012 ⁵⁸	Literature review
Hammond 2005 ⁵⁹	Study design (descriptive)
Hampton 2007 ⁶⁰	News article
Hanley 2008 ⁶¹	Incorrect interventions. Staff training outcomes
Hick 2004 ⁶²	Literature review
Hirshberg 2005 ⁶⁴	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Incorrect population: assessing trauma workload
Hirshberg 2010 ⁶³	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Incorrect population: assessing trauma workload
Hoard 2005 ⁶⁵	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Methodological study
Hsu 2004 ⁶⁶	Systematic review: no papers of interest
Hsu 2004 ⁶⁷	Systematic review: no papers of interest
Hupert 2007 ⁶⁸	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Incorrect population: exclusively trauma care
Jenkins 2008 ⁷⁰	Literature review
Jha 2016 ⁷¹	Brief report; no protocol outcomes reported
Kako 2012 ⁷²	Systematic review: no papers of interest

Study	Exclusion reason
Kallman 2011 ⁷³	Study design (descriptive)
Kanno 2006 ⁷⁴	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. No escalation measure
Kanter 2015 ⁷⁵	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Assessing the effect of triage predictor performance on mortality.
Kelen 2009 ⁷⁶	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. No relevant outcome
Kleber 2013 ⁷⁸	Staff training outcomes
Koh 2006 ⁷⁹	Literature review
Kwok 2015 ⁸¹	No outcomes of interest
Lam 2006 ⁸²	Literature review
Lee 2000 ⁸³	No protocol outcomes
Lindsey 2005 ⁸⁴	Study design (descriptive)
Lynch 2009 ⁸⁵	Study design (descriptive)
Maloney 2007 ⁸⁶	Not review population. Paediatric
Mathias 2009 ⁸⁷	News article
Matteson 2006 ⁸⁸	Incorrect interventions. Vaccination clinic
Maunder 2010 ⁸⁹	Staff training outcomes
Mechem 2007 ⁹⁰	Library services unable to obtain a copy
Menon 2005 ⁹¹	Non-comparative study
Michaels 2013 ⁹²	Case series
Morton 2015a ⁹³	Systematic review: No eligible papers
Moseley 2010 ⁹⁴	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. No relevant outcomes
Myles 2012 ⁹⁵	Study design (diagnostic accuracy)
Nager 2009 ⁹⁶	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. No relevant outcomes
Nap 2007 ⁹⁸	Statistical model - antiviral intervention
Nap 2008 ⁹⁷	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. No relevant outcomes
Nishizawa 2016 ⁹⁹	Incorrect intervention
O'connor 2004 ¹⁰⁰	Study design (descriptive)
O'connor 2006 ¹⁰¹	Study design (news article)
O'keefe 2004 ¹⁰²	Study design (descriptive)
Olafson 2015 ¹⁰³	Non-comparative study
Patrick 2008 ¹⁰⁴	Incorrect intervention (scheduling of appointments)
Paul 2006 ¹⁰⁵	Incorrect population (surgical)
Peleg 2009 ¹⁰⁶	Study design (descriptive)
Perrin 2006 ¹⁰⁷	Study design (descriptive)
Perry 2006 ¹⁰⁸	Study design (descriptive)
Pershad 2012 ¹⁰⁹	Not review population. Paediatric
Peters 2013 ¹¹⁰	Incorrect interventions. No escalation measure
Posner 2003 ¹¹¹	No escalation measure
Powell 2012 ¹¹²	Study design (descriptive)
Powers 2007 ¹¹³	Library service unable to locate a copy

Study	Exclusion reason
Roccaforte 2007 ¹¹⁴	Literature review
Romano 2005 ¹¹⁵	Study design (escalation)
Roth 2009 ¹¹⁶	Study design (descriptive)
Rozovsky 2002 ¹¹⁸	Study design (descriptive)
Rubin 2010 ¹¹⁹	Literature review
Rutter 2014 ¹²⁰	Not review population. Measures surge at primary care facilities
Sanchez 2007 ¹²¹	Study design (descriptive)
Sanchez 2007 ¹²²	Study design (descriptive)
Satterthwaite 2012 ¹²³	No extractable data
Savoia 2009 ¹²⁵	Systematic review: no papers of interest
Savoia 2013 ¹²⁴	Systematic review: no papers of interest
Scarfone 2011 ¹²⁶	Not review population. Paediatric
Schull 2006 ¹²⁷	Study design (case study)
Scott 2011 ¹²⁸	No escalation measure
Shahpori 2011 ¹²⁹	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Incorrect comparison: influenza triage tool in regional population and influenza population
Sheeley 2007 ¹³⁰	Conference abstract
Shih 2012 ¹³¹	Non-comparative study
Sloan 2011 ¹³²	Study design (descriptive)
Smith 2010 ¹³³	Study design (descriptive)
Smith 2014 ¹³⁴	Study design (descriptive)
Sobieraj 2007 ¹³⁵	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Incorrect population: does not account for non-influenza patients competing for resources
Soremekun 2011 ¹³⁶	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. No relevant outcomes
Spaulding 2012 ¹³⁷	Non-comparative study
Stein 2008 ¹³⁸	Incorrect interventions. Training document
Stein 2012 ¹³⁹	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Methodological study
Steinhauer 2002 ¹⁴⁰	Study design (descriptive)
Stukel 2008 ¹⁴¹	No escalation measure
Tawfik 2014 ¹⁴²	No escalation measure
Taylor 2003 ¹⁴⁴	Study design (descriptive)
Taylor 2006 ¹⁴³	Case series
Tham 2004 ¹⁴⁵	Study design (cross-sectional)
Timbie 2012 ¹⁴⁶	Systematic review: all relevant papers ordered for assessment
Timbie 2012 ¹⁴⁶	Systematic review: no papers of interest
Tsai 2004 ¹⁴⁷	Study design (cross-sectional)
Upshur 2005 ¹⁴⁸	Study design (descriptive)
Utley 2011 ¹⁴⁹	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Model inputs no clearly defined
Van genugten 2003 ¹⁵⁰	Statistical model - antiviral and vaccination intervention
Verni 2012 ¹⁵¹	Study design (descriptive)

Study	Exclusion reason
Vidondo 2009 ¹⁵²	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Incorrect intervention: Influenza specific
Voelker 2006 ¹⁵³	News article
Watson 2013 ¹⁵⁴	Systematic review: methods are not adequate/unclear
Wilgis 2008 ¹⁵⁵	Study design (descriptive)
Williams 2008 ¹⁵⁷	Systematic review: no papers of interest
Williams 2015 ¹⁵⁶	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. Non-comparative study
Wingate 2007 ¹⁵⁸	Study design (descriptive)
Wu 2013 ¹⁵⁹	Systematic review: no papers of interest
Wyatt 2003 ¹⁶⁰	Study design (descriptive)
Wynn 2012 ¹⁶¹	Study design (descriptive)
Zane 2004 ¹⁶²	Study design (descriptive)
Zhou 2011 ¹⁶³	Modelling paper containing no relevant clinical data. No escalation measure

Appendix H: Excluded health economic studies

No relevant studies identified.