

iCAHE JC Critical Appraisal Summary

Journal Club Details

Date of submission	17 th Dec 2012
Journal Club location	Western Therapy Service
JC Facilitator	Lorien Coff
JC Discipline	Occupational Therapy

Review Question/PICO/PACO

- P adult patients
- I any intervention to improve access to health care for chronic disease management/prevention
- C different interventions
- O clinical outcomes, hospitalisation rate, cost

Article/Paper

Comino E, Davies G, Krastev Y, Haas M, Christl B, Furler J, Raymont A & Harris M (2012) A systematic review of interventions to enhance access to best practice primary health care for chronic disease management, prevention and episodic care, *BMC Health Services Research*, 12; 415.

Please note: due to copyright regulations CAHE is unable to supply a copy of the critically appraised paper/article. If you are an employee of the South Australian government you can obtain a copy of articles from the [DOHSA librarian](#).

Article Methodology: Systematic Review

Returned JC on: 31st Jan 2013

Click [here](#) to access critical appraisal tool



University of
South Australia

International Centre for
Allied Health Evidence

iCAHE

A member of the Sansom Institute

The International Centre for Allied Health Evidence (iCAHE)

For more information on CAHE Journal Clubs email Lucylynn.Lizarondo@unisa.edu.au

To receive CAHE updates register online at www.unisa.edu.au/cahe

CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
 iCAHE@unisa.edu.au
 Telephone: +61 8 830 22099
 Fax: +61 8 830 22853

University of South Australia
 GPO Box 2471
 Adelaide SA 5001
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
 00121B



University of
 South Australia

International Centre for
 Allied Health Evidence

iCAHE

A member of the Sansom Institute

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
1	✓			<p>Did the review address a clearly focused question?</p> <p>Yes, the paper aimed to identify effective interventions to improve access to best practice primary health care (PHC).</p> <p><i>Intervention:</i> Intervention to improve access to one of our three domains of PHC (prevention, chronic disease domain and episodic care).</p> <p><i>Outcomes:</i> Access in terms of use of relevant recommended processes of care</p>
2	✓			<p>Did the authors look for the appropriate sort of papers?</p> <p>The aim of the review was to determine effective interventions and therefore experimental studies, specifically randomised controlled trials, are the most appropriate study designs to consider. In this review, however, all relevant papers and reports, irrespective of the study design, were sought to establish an evidence base for this area of interest.</p> <p>Is it worth continuing? YES</p>
3	✓			<p>Do you think the important, relevant studies were included?</p> <p>Yes, to identify relevant papers the search strategy included: searching a range of databases (Medline, Pubmed, Embase, APAIS Health, Cochrane, Epoch/DARE), searching the grey literature for government reports etc., contacting experts in the area/ key stakeholders and pearling the relevant articles reference lists.</p>
4	✓			<p>Did the review's authors do enough to assess the quality of the included studies?</p> <p>Yes, the reviewers evaluated the methodological quality of the included intervention studies, using the Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies, Effective Public Health Practice Project which classified studies as either low, medium or high.</p>
5			✓	<p>If the results of the review have been combined, was it reasonable to do so?</p> <p>Studies were combined into the three domains prevention, chronic disease domain and episodic care, however there was no meta-analysis performed. A meta-analysis would not have been possible for this study given the heterogeneity of studies included in the review; this should have been explicitly reported by the authors.</p>
6				<p>What are the overall results of the reviews?</p> <p>The results were presented using text, figures and tables with percentages reported for some values.</p> <p>Bottom line result</p> <p>Multiple, linked strategies targeted at different levels of the health care system appeared to improve access to best practice primary health care.</p>

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
7		✓		How precise are the results? Precision of results cannot be determined based on the analysis done in this systematic review.
8	Journal club to answer			Can the results be applied to the local population?
9				Were all important outcomes considered?
10				Are the benefits worth the harms and costs?

CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
iCAHE@unisa.edu.au
Telephone: +61 8 830 22099
Fax: +61 8 830 22853

University of South Australia
GPO Box 2471
Adelaide SA 5001
Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
00121B



University of
South Australia

International Centre for
Allied Health Evidence

iCAHE

A member of the Sansom Institute