

Appendix 7 (as supplied by the authors)

Results for studies investigating health status and well-being outcomes (n =11)

Study (design)	Disease cluster	Type of intervention (intervention vs. comparator)	Intervention component combination	Specific outcome	Description of results	Effect measure (95% CI; between-group p-value)
Physical health of patient or caregiver: Functional status or physical health (n = 5)						
Lamers 2010 <i>RCT; 9-month FU</i>	DEP + DM or DEP + COPD	<u>Cognitive-behavioural:</u> <i>Nurse-led Minimal Psychological Intervention (MPI) vs. Usual care</i>	ED + SM	Physical health (PCS of the SF-36)	The groups did not differ for the physical health component of QOL	Mean difference from baseline: -0.79; CI -2.74 to 1.16; p = 0.43
Lin 2003 <i>RCT; 6- and 12-month FU</i>	DEP + AT	<u>Coordination of care:</u> <i>IMPACT-DP (Improving Mood-Promoting Access to Collaborative Treatment: Depression with Arthritis vs. Usual care)</i>	CM + DM + TEAM	Health-related functional impairment (SDS)	At 12-months follow-up, intervention patients reported less health related functional impairment compared with the control group	Between group difference for mean SDS score: -0.82; CI -1.17 to -0.47; p < 0.001*
				Interference with daily activities due to arthritis	Intervention group had less interference with daily activities due to arthritis than usual care (on a scale of 0 to 10)	Between group difference: -0.59; CI -1.00 to -0.19; p = 0.004*
Noel 2004 <i>RCT; 12-month FU</i>	DM + CHF + COPD	<u>Information and health technology</u> (Telemedicine) <i>Home telemedicine (telehealth) vs. Control</i>	CM + ED + TM	Functional status (OARS multidimensional functional scale)	There was no difference between groups for functional status at 12 months	p = 0.799
Unutzer 2008 <i>Mixed-methods; 6-month FU</i>	DEP + OA	<u>Coordination of care:</u> <i>Adapted IMPACT-DP intervention (nurse administered case management supporting primary care)</i>	CM + DM + ED + SM + TEAM	Pain-related functional impairment (BPI)	Intervention participants experienced significant improvement in pain-related functional impairment	Effect size: 0.81; CI 0.36 to 2.47; p = 0.013*
Williams 2004 <i>RCT; 12-month FU</i>	DM + DEP	<u>Coordination of care:</u> <i>IMPACT-DP (Improving Mood – Promoting Access to Collaborative Treatment: Diabetes and depression) vs. Usual care</i>	CP + DM + ED + TEAM	Overall functioning (scale of 0 to 10; 0 = none, 10 = unable to perform activities)	The intervention group had greater improvement in overall functioning than the usual care group	Between group difference: -0.89; CI -1.46 to -0.32
				Health-related functional status (physical component of the 12-item short form)	By 12 months, patients in the intervention group had significantly improved functioning compared with controls	Between-group difference: 3.21; CI 1.78 to 4.63
Physical health of patient or caregiver: Dyspnea or dyspnea-related disability (n = 3)						
Alexopoulos 2014 <i>RCT; 28-week FU</i>	DEP + COPD	<u>Coordination of care:</u> <i>Personalized care management intervention for depressed patients with COPD (PID-C) vs. Usual care</i>	CM + ED + FR	Reduction in dyspnea-related disability (PFSDQ-M)	Intervention patients had significant reduction in dyspnea-related disability over the 28-week period. Compared with usual care.	Effect size of the PFSDQ-M difference: 0.40; CI -0.01 to 0.87; p = 0.044*

				Dyspnea-related disability due to reduction in depression severity	Mixed effects model analysis showed that reduction in depression severity (Ham-D) contributed to the advantage of intervention group over usual care in reducing dyspnea-related disability at later assessments.	In the whole group, for every 1-point decrease in depression, there was an average 2.34-point reduction in the PFSDQ-M; $p = 0.013^*$
Bernocchi 2018 <i>RCT; 4-month FU</i>	HF + COPD	<u>Information and health technology</u> Telerehabilitation home-based program (Telereab-HBP) vs. Usual care	DM + ED (Pt) + TM	Dyspnea (MRC – Medical Research Council)	The treatment group significantly improved compared with conventional care for dyspnea (MRC)	Change in MRC was -0.17 ($-0.3, -0.02$) in IG and 0.07 ($-0.1, 0.3$) in CG, $p=0.0500^*$
				Dyspnea (Physical Activity Scale for the Elderly [PASE])	The treatment group significantly improved compared with conventional care for dyspnea on the Physical Activity Scale for the Elderly (PASE)	Change in PASE was 18.1 ($-0.6, 36.9$) in IG and -21.3 ($-35.7, -7.0$) in CG, $P = 0.0015^*$
				Dyspnea (BARTHEL)	The treatment group significantly improved compared with conventional care for dyspnea (BARTHEL)	Change in BARTHEL was 5.4 ($3.6, 7.2$) in the intervention group and 1.3 ($-0.2, 2.8$) in the control group, $P = 0.0006^*$
Williams 2004 <i>RCT; 12-month FU</i>	DM + DEP	<u>Coordination of care:</u> <i>IMPACT-DP (Improving Mood – Promoting Access to Collaborative Treatment: Diabetes and depression) vs. Usual care</i>	CP + DM + ED + TEAM	Dyspnea-related disability	Mixed effects model analysis showed that adequate exercising contributed to the advantage of intervention group over usual care in reducing dyspnea-related disability	In the whole group, patients who exercised longer than 2 hours per week had an average of 18 points greater reduction in PFSDQ-M scores than those who exercised less; $p = 0.022^*$
Psychological health of patient or caregiver: Mental health and cognitive functioning (n = 4)						
Lamers 2010 <i>RCT; 9-month FU</i>	DEP + DM or DEP + COPD	<u>Cognitive-behavioural:</u> <i>Nurse-led Minimal Psychological Intervention (MPI) vs. Usual care</i>	ED + SM	Mental health (MCS of the SF-36)	The groups did not differ for the mental health component of QOL	Mean difference from baseline: -1.87 ; CI -4.34 to 0.59 ; $p = 0.14$
Williams 2004 <i>RCT; 12-month FU</i>	DM + DEP	<u>Coordination of care:</u> <i>IMPACT-DP (Improving Mood – Promoting Access to Collaborative Treatment: Diabetes and depression) vs. Usual care</i>	CP + DM + ED + TEAM	Mental health (12-item short form)	By follow-up, patients with diabetes in the intervention group had significantly improved functioning on the mental component of the 12-item short form	Between-group difference: 2.44 ; CI 0.79 to 4.09^*
Naik 2012 <i>Uncontrolled trial; 6-month FU</i>	DM + DEP	<u>Self-management:</u> <i>Healthy outcomes through patient empowerment (HOPE): Telephone-delivered behavioural coaching</i>	CP + ED + FR + SM + TEAM	Diabetes-related emotional distress (PAID)	The intervention reduced diabetes-related emotional distress	Mean change from baseline: 20.4 (SD 20.7); Effect size (Cohen's d): 1.06 (large effect size!)*

Noel 2004 <i>RCT; 6-month FU</i>	DM + CHF + COPD	<u>Information and health technology</u> (Telemedicine): <i>Home telemedicine (telehealth) vs. Control</i>	CM + ED + TM	Cognitive status (OARS multidimensional functional scale)	Intervention patients showed a statistically significant improvement in cognitive status at 12 months	p = 0.006*
Psychosocial health of patient or caregiver: General health status and well-being, overall QOL (n = 6)						
Bernocchi 2018 <i>RCT; 4-month FU</i>	CHF + COPD	<u>Information and health technology</u> Telerehabilitation home-based program (Telereab-HBP) vs. Usual care	DM + ED (Pt) + TM	QOL: Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire (MLHFQ)	The treatment group significantly improved compared with usual care for MLHFQ	Change in MLHFQ was -10.5 (-14.2,-6.8) in the intervention and -0.44 (-4.9,4.0) in the control group; p=0.0007*
				COPD assessment test (CAT)	The treatment group significantly improved compared with usual care for CAT	Change in CAT was -5.3 (-6.9,-3.7) in the intervention group and 1.6 (-0.4,3.5) in the control group, P = 0.0000*
Doyle 2017 <i>RCT; 8-week FU</i>	COPD + depression or anxiety	<u>Cognitive-behavioural</u> : Telephone-based CBT vs. telephone-based befriending	DM + ED + TM	COPD assessment test (CAT)	There was a significant change in COPD symptoms (CAT) from T1 to T2 for the control group (befriending), but not for the intervention group (CBT); however, at T3, this change was no longer significant in the befriending group.	Effect size (95% CI) = 0.1 (-0.4, 0.3)
Bowles 2009 <i>RCT; 2- and 3-month FU</i>	CHF + DM	<u>Information and health technology</u> (Telemedicine): <i>Telephone (in-person visits + telephone) vs. TM (in-person visits + TM) vs. Control (in-person visits only)</i>	DM + ED + TM	General health status (one question on a 5-point scale; 1 = excellent, 5 = poor)	The groups did not differ for general health status at 60 or 90 days	p = 0.76
Lin 2003 <i>RCT; 6- and 12-month FU</i>	DEP + AT	<u>Coordination of care</u> : <i>IMPACT-DP (Improving Mood-Promoting Access to Collaborative Treatment: Depression with Arthritis vs. Usual care)</i>	CM + DM + TEAM	Overall QOL (on a scale from 0 to 10) compared with the control group)	At 12-months follow-up, the intervention group had significant improvement on overall QOL	Between group difference: 0.42; CI 0.13 to 0.71; p = 0.005*
				General health status (on a 5-point scale) compared with the control group)	At 12-months follow-up, the intervention group had significant improvement in general health status	Between group difference: -0.3; CI -0.42 to -0.17; p < 0.001*
Noel 2004 <i>RCT; 6-month FU</i>	DM + CHF + COPD	<u>Information and health technology</u> (Telemedicine): <i>Home telemedicine (telehealth) vs. Control</i>	CM + ED + TM	Patient satisfaction (OARS multidimensional functional scale)	The groups did not differ for patient satisfaction on the OARS scale	p = 0.125
				Health status (OARS multidimensional functional scale)	The groups did not differ for health status on the OARS scale	p = 0.506
Whitten P, 2007 <i>RCT; 10.7 week FU</i>	CHF + COPD	<u>Information and health technology</u> (Telemedicine): <i>Telemedicine: Home telehealth vs. Control</i>	DM + TM	Health and well-being (SF-36 subscales)	Overall, the addition of telehealth to COPD/CHF patient care was not a significant predictor of health and wellbeing, either positively or negatively; the	No data provided

						groups did not differ	
--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------	--

**QOL = quality of life; BDI = Beck Depression Inventory; PCS = physical component score of the SF-36; MCS = mental component score of the SF-36; PHQ-9 = patient health questionnaire; HSCL-20 = Hopkins symptom checklist; PAID = problem areas in diabetes scale; BPI = brief pain inventory; ALF = aggregate locomotor function; BP = blood pressure; DMSES = diabetes self-efficacy scale; SDSCA = summary of diabetes self-care activities; HAM-D = Hamilton depression rating scale; PFSDQ-M = pulmonary functional status and dyspnea questionnaire – modified; BDOC = bed days of care; OARS multidimensional functional assessment = objective tools that measure cognitive status and functional level and two subjective tools that measure patient satisfaction with care and self-rated health status; EBASD = even briefer assessment scale for depression; CSDD = Cornell Scale for Depression in Dementia; GDS = geriatric depression scale; RAID = rating anxiety in dementia; BEHAVE-AD = ; OSPRSO = Omaha System Problem Rating Scale for Outcomes; SDS = Sheehan Disability Scale; CHF = congestive heart failure; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; DEP = depression; DEM = dementia; AT = arthritis; OA = osteoarthritis; CKD = chronic kidney disease; DM = diabetes; CVD = cardiovascular disease

†Effect size measured using Cohen's d (0.8 = large effect; 0.5 = medium effect; 0.2 = small effect)