

LONDON  
SCHOOL of  
HYGIENE  
& TROPICAL  
MEDICINE



LSHTM Research Online

Pettigrew, LM; Kumpunen, S; Mays, N; Rosen, R; Posaner, R; (2018) The impact of new forms of large-scale general practice provider collaborations on England's NHS: a systematic review. The British journal of general practice. ISSN 0960-1643 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp18X694997>

Downloaded from: <http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/4646702/>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp18X694997>

**Usage Guidelines:**

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact [researchonline@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:researchonline@lshtm.ac.uk).

Available under license: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>

<https://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk>

1 **Title**

2 A systematic review of the impact of new forms of large-scale general practice provider collaborations in  
3 England's NHS

4

5 **Authors**

6 Luisa M Pettigrew <sup>1</sup>, Stephanie Kumpunen <sup>2</sup>, Nicholas Mays <sup>1</sup>, Rebecca Rosen <sup>2</sup>, Rachel Posaner <sup>3</sup>

7

8 **Corresponding Author:**

9 Luisa M Pettigrew

10 [luisa.pettigrew@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:luisa.pettigrew@lshtm.ac.uk)

11 07825564644

12

13 **Affiliations:**

14 1. Department of Health Services Research and Policy

15 London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

16 15-17 Tavistock Place

17 London

18 WC1H 9SH

19

20 2. Nuffield Trust

21 59 New Cavendish Street

22 London

23 W1G 7LP

24

25 3. Library & Information Service

26 Health Services Management Centre

27 University of Birmingham

28 Park House

29 40 Edgbaston Park Road

30 Birmingham

31 B15 2RT

32

33

34 **Abstract**

35 **Background:** Over the past decade, collaboration between general practices in England to form new  
36 provider networks and large-scale organisations has been driven largely by grassroots action among general  
37 practitioners (GPs). However it is now increasingly being advocated for by national policymakers, and  
38 expectations of what 'scaling-up' general practice in England will achieve are significant. They include  
39 strengthening the workforce, improving quality, extending services, and generating efficiencies.

40 **Aim:** To review the evidence of the impact of new forms of large-scale general practice provider  
41 collaborations in England.

42 **Design:** Systematic review

43 **Method:** Embase, HMIC, MEDLINE and SSCI were searched for primary research studies reporting the impact  
44 on clinical processes, clinical outcomes, patient experience, workforce satisfaction or costs of new forms of  
45 provider collaborations between three or more general practices in England.

46 **Results:** Five studies met the inclusion criteria, from 1,782 publications which were screened. Four of the  
47 studies examined the same general practice networks, limiting generalisability. Substantial financial  
48 investment was required to establish the networks and the associated interventions targeted at four clinical  
49 areas. Quality improvements were achieved in the targeted clinical areas through the use of standardised  
50 processes, incentives at network level, IT-enabled performance dashboards and local network management.  
51 The fifth study of a large-scale multi-site general practice organisation showed that it may be better placed  
52 to implement safety and quality processes than conventional practices. However, unintended consequences  
53 may arise as a result such as perceptions of disenfranchisement among staff and reductions in continuity of  
54 care.

55 **Conclusion:** Good quality evidence of the impacts of ‘scaling-up’ general practice provider organisations in  
56 England is very scarce. As more general practice collaborations emerge, evaluation of their impacts will be  
57 important to understand which work, in which settings, how and why.

58 Keywords

59 **MESH terms:** General practice, Primary health care, Health services, Organisation and administration,  
60 Quality Improvement

61 **How this fits in**

- 62 • National policy increasingly advocates the development of large-scale provider collaborations between  
63 general practices, with expectations that they will be better placed than individual practices to  
64 strengthen the workforce, improve quality of care, extend services, and generate economies of scale.
- 65 • We undertook a systematic review of the evidence on the impact of new forms of provider  
66 collaborations in England to understand what evidence existed to support these expectations.
- 67 • Limited evidence was found which met the inclusion criteria. Five studies point to potential  
68 improvements in quality of care through ‘scaling-up’. Four of these were from the same general  
69 practice network.
- 70 • There is a need for realistic expectations of what ‘scaling-up’ may achieve in England and cautious  
71 implementation alongside evaluation to understand better what is likely to work, for whom, and in  
72 which contexts.

## 73 **Introduction**

74 New organisational forms of collaboration between general practices for the provision of care have emerged  
75 across England over the past decade (1,2). These include general practice networks, federations, super-  
76 partnerships and multi-site practice organisations. It has been argued they are better placed than the  
77 traditional, smaller, independent business partnership between a small number of general practitioners (GPs)  
78 to strengthen the workforce, improve quality of care, extend services and generate efficiencies (2–7). Whilst  
79 many of the earliest collaborations emerged through grass-roots initiatives, building on existing local  
80 relationships, national policies are increasingly driving collaborations with a view to creating ‘accountable care’-  
81 type organisations in England through their integration with other health and social care providers (6–8). Many  
82 of the expectations of what ‘scaling-up’ general practices may achieve appear logical, however, it is unclear  
83 what research evidence exists to support them.

84 This paper presents a systematic review of the evidence on the impact of new organisational forms of  
85 collaboration between general practices for the provision of care in England.

## 86 **Methods**

87 This review contributed to a larger project led by the Nuffield Trust on 'Large-scale General Practice' (9). The  
88 search strategy was developed with a health services research librarian (RP) to identify literature on the impact  
89 of collaboration between three or more general practices on clinical processes, clinical outcomes, patient  
90 experience, workforce satisfaction and costs. Embase, Medline, HMIC, and SSCI were searched for literature in  
91 English, initially between January 1996 and March 2016. The database search was re-run in January 2017 to  
92 capture any subsequent academic literature. Additional academic and grey texts were identified by screening  
93 the references of relevant publications, seeking recommendations from experts in the fields of primary care  
94 and health services research, and by examining relevant websites, GP media reports, and policy documents.  
95 These are methods known to increase yields of relevant results in systematic reviews (10). The protocol was  
96 not registered.

97 The search strategy had initially aimed to systematically capture evidence from international and UK contexts.  
98 However due to heterogeneity in the terminology used, as well as in the process and context of  
99 implementation of 'scaling-up' general practice, it became evident that despite using several search strategies  
100 such a wide systematic review was neither feasible nor likely to provide clearly transferable evidence.  
101 Therefore, the inclusion and exclusion criteria applied aimed to identify studies with greatest relevance to  
102 current developments in England and robust research methods. These criteria are outlined in Box 1.

### 103 **Box 1 – Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria**

104 All titles and abstracts identified were screened, with full publications being read by LP if they appeared  
105 relevant. Publications were assessed using the inclusion/exclusion criteria. If there was uncertainty over  
106 whether a study met inclusion/exclusion criteria, it was discussed with other authors until consensus was  
107 reached (SK, NM). CASP checklists were used to evaluate the quality of included studies (11). Data were  
108 extracted on templates, presented in Tables 1 and 2, by two authors (LP, SK), with discussion to reach  
109 consensus. Narrative synthesis was used to present the findings (12).

## 110 **Results**

111 After the exclusion of duplicates, 1,782 texts were screened. Literature that did not meet the inclusion  
112 criteria often described the development, rather than impact, of large-scale general practice collaborations  
113 (3–5,12); was of poor methodological quality (13–17); or it was not possible to disentangle the impact of the  
114 new collaboration from wider initiatives (18–21). Evidence from initiatives with similarities to the process of  
115 formation and/or objectives of scaled-up general practice provider collaborations in England including  
116 specialist clinical networks, integrated care initiatives, GP-led commissioning and out-of-hours cooperatives,  
117 as well as evidence from other countries did not meet the inclusion criteria. However it helped inform the  
118 interpretation of the findings, assessment of the implications for policy, and contributed to a wider review of  
119 the literature presented elsewhere (23).

120

121 **Figure 1: Flow diagram of review process**

122 Only five studies met the inclusion criteria (Figure 1). Four studies examined networks of general practices in  
123 the same London Borough of Tower Hamlets. These evaluations focused on quantitative assessments of the  
124 impact of intervention packages delivered by new networks of practices on quality of care processes and  
125 clinical outcomes. These were tracked over the period of implementation, and between one and three years  
126 afterwards. Performance was compared to averages in London and England. The studies provided some cost

127 data, but no cost-effectiveness analysis (Table 1). All four studies had a moderate risk of bias based on CASP  
128 checklists (24–27). One qualitative study examined a multi-site general practice organisation with central  
129 ownership of 50 nationally dispersed GP practices. It used interviews and ethnographic observations to  
130 examine quality and safety processes, and to provide staff’s views on job satisfaction and their views on patient  
131 experience (Table 2). It had a low risk of bias based on the CASP checklist (28).

### 132 **Quantitative studies**

133 In 2008/09, Tower Hamlets Primary Care Trust (PCT) (the local NHS service commissioning organisation at that  
134 time, now a Clinical Commissioning Group), established eight geographically defined, managed general practice  
135 networks with a total of 36 GP practices. Each network had 4-5 practices and a registered population between  
136 30,000 and 50,000. The aims of the networks at the time were to improve four clinical areas: childhood  
137 immunisations; type 2 diabetes; chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD); and cardiovascular disease  
138 (CVD).

139 Previous Local Enhanced Services’ funding was channeled into the development of the networks and incentives  
140 for the provision of care packages rolled out between 2008 and 2010. The PCT distributed financial incentives  
141 at network level, rather than to individual practices, to encourage peer scrutiny and the collective management  
142 of funds to achieve the PCT’s key performance indicators (KPIs). Approximately £10 million per annum was  
143 spent across all networks for this initiative (27). Funding enabled staff education, IT-enhanced recall systems,  
144 standardised data collection, the analysis of comparative feedback on performance, as well management and  
145 shared clinical support teams across the networks. The interventions were developed by local GP clinical  
146 leaders, public health specialists and PCT managers, with input from McKinsey management consultancy. The  
147 Clinical Effectiveness Group (CEG), based at the local university and led by local GPs, developed the  
148 performance monitoring dashboards and measurable KPIs. They also undertook the evaluations.

### 149 **TABLE 1**

150 Results of observational time-series studies in the four targeted clinical areas appeared promising (Table 1).  
151 They demonstrated an improvement on most KPIs - with the average of the networks often doing better than  
152 other PCT, average London or national trends. This included achieving targets on childhood and flu  
153 immunisation (24,26), annual review and care planning (25–27), screening (25) and, for people with COPD or  
154 CVD, increasing the number of individuals on registers and numbers referred into community rehabilitation  
155 clinics (26,27). There were also improvements in measures of health outcomes, such as achieving targets for  
156 blood pressure, cholesterol and average HbA1c levels for patients with type 2 diabetes (25).

157 One study compared performance in two local PCTs, which had a similar intervention package as the networks  
158 in Tower Hamlets, including the dissemination of clinical guidelines to all staff that were reinforced at central  
159 educational meetings and by standard data entry templates. However, the other two PCTs did not have clinical  
160 case discussions within networks or administrative target reviews, and incentives were at practice level rather  
161 than at network level. Practices in other PCTs also did not have IT-enabled performance dashboards with  
162 ‘traffic light’ ratings, and did not have network managers. Results showed that practices in the comparator  
163 PCTs did better than the national average on all measures, but not as well as Tower Hamlets (27).

### 164 **Qualitative findings**

165 The multi-site GP practice organisation studied was founded and owned by a small number of GPs (28). At the  
166 time of the study (2011-2012), it operated over 50 GP practices across England with a salaried workforce. It had  
167 a hierarchical form of governance with a small executive made up of the owners (Table 2).

### 168 **TABLE 2**

169 The owners of the organisation interviewed reported commercial, reputational and moral factors that drove  
170 them to aim to deliver high-quality care and ensure patient satisfaction. Multiple mechanisms to ensure the  
171 safety and quality of care were reportedly used, including: standardising processes, such as for incident

172 reporting; enhancing training and inter-staff support; reducing administrative burden on frontline clinicians;  
173 optimising learning between practices; and comparing practice performance (for example, practices that  
174 under-reported adverse incidents were investigated, as this was considered a marker of possible lack of  
175 engagement with quality and safety issues). The organisation used surveys of patients and ‘mystery shoppers’  
176 to monitor performance. Feedback and benchmarking of performance were reported among member  
177 practices to create competition between practices. Authors presented a mixed picture of the ability to share  
178 learning between practices. For example, they described rapid dissemination of changes following an adverse  
179 events being common, but not all sites were maximising opportunities to improve care processes. GPs and  
180 other staff were performance-managed, and if they did not meet requirements were ‘performance-managed  
181 out of the organisation’, according to one GP director interviewed.

182 A central call centre was set up to take telephone requests for appointments. This was intended to allow more  
183 face-to-face time between receptionists and patients in practices, and to improve efficiency in the allocation of  
184 appointments. However, interviewees provided mixed views on its effectiveness, with receptionists stating  
185 they still often had to deal with calls from the call centre, and that some patients did not like the call centre.

186 Patient participation groups were reported to have been involved with varying success across practices, with  
187 challenges encountered in maintaining engagement. Some staff attributed challenges in recruiting patients to  
188 antipathy towards what patients perceived as a commercial organisation providing NHS healthcare. An  
189 interviewee perceived that staff felt undervalued in a large company where no one local owned the practice  
190 where they worked. The recruitment and retention of staff, in particular of GPs, was problematic in some  
191 practices. This was more notable in under-performing practices which had recently been taken over by the  
192 organisation. The authors attributed some of the GP turnover to the flexibility offered by salaried or locum  
193 work compared to the ‘buy-in’ required by the traditional GP partnership business model. Turnover of staff  
194 affected the relational continuity of care, and resulted in reports of patient dissatisfaction. It also posed a risk to  
195 the consistent implementation of the quality and safety procedures of the organisation, and increased the  
196 amount of time spent on staff induction procedures.

## 197 **Discussion**

### 198 **Summary**

199 The very small number of studies available provided limited evidence on the impact on quality of care, costs  
200 and workforce satisfaction of ‘scaling-up’ general practice in England. There was no robust direct evidence of  
201 impacts on patient experience, and no evidence identified on the cost-effectiveness of ‘scaling-up’ general  
202 practice.

203 The evidence from a group of networks covering 36 general practices in Tower Hamlets indicated that such  
204 networks can enable quality improvement by clearly targeting areas for improvement, guidelines reinforced at  
205 central educational meetings, standard data entry templates, clinical case discussions within networks,  
206 administrative target reviews, incentives at network levels, and IT-enabled performance dashboards, alongside  
207 additional clinical and management support. This is likely to require substantial financial investment, and time.  
208 In the case of Tower Hamlets, it was approximately £10 million per year. Evidence from one multi-site general  
209 practice organisation with over 50 GP practices in England suggested that increasing scale under a single  
210 organisation could improve safety and quality processes, but might increase staff turnover, reduce continuity of  
211 care and reduce perceived quality of patient experience.

### 212 **Strengths and limitations**

213 The literature search was comprehensive, with an expert librarian (RP) advising on multiple versions of  
214 keyword searches, and authors identifying further literature through snowball searching and seeking guidance  
215 from experts. The search methods and strict inclusion criteria improved the rigour and relevance of the  
216 reviewed literature, but the small number of studies, mostly from a single geographic area, limits the

217 generalisability of the findings.

218 The review was undertaken when ‘scaling-up’ general practice is starting to be advocated by national  
219 policymakers (6,7). It highlights the limited good quality evidence to support this approach. Further research is  
220 now underway, which may help fill some of the gaps identified (9,29–33).

221 This review is complemented by a less systematic review of the wider academic and grey literature examining  
222 the development and impact of national and international initiatives with similarities to large-scale general  
223 practice organisations in England such as specialist clinical networks, GP-led commissioning, out-of-hours  
224 cooperatives and integrated care initiatives (23).

### 225 **Comparison with existing literature**

226 Despite the recent focus by national policymakers in England on increasing organisational size to improve  
227 quality of care and generate efficiencies in general practice, there is no consistent association between scale,  
228 quality of care or the generation of efficiency savings in the health care literature (23). A wide range of  
229 factors other than size alone influence performance, including the availability of resources, the quality of  
230 clinical leadership, and pre-existing relationships within the local health economy (34–40). The time and  
231 resources involved in health service re-organisations such as scaling up organisations have often been  
232 underestimated, and anticipated benefits have not always been delivered (20,41–43). While patients may  
233 value increased routes of access through scaling-up, new access routes may not be well received by all  
234 patients (20,22,39). For example, the importance of providing continuity of care for those who most need it  
235 has frequently been identified as desirable but may be harmed by providing general practice care through  
236 larger organisations (44).

237 Experience from similar initiatives both in the UK and internationally highlights important trade-offs which  
238 exist in ‘scaling-up’, such as between being small enough to maintain flexibility and inclusive decision-making  
239 processes, and being of sufficient size to bear financial risks as well as exert power to influence the local  
240 health economy (45,46). It also highlights that giving GPs autonomy and engaging them in decision making  
241 may well increase the likelihood of large-scale general practice collaborations successfully forming, however,  
242 this may also result in duplicated efforts, inequity in participation and complexity of organisational forms  
243 (46–49).

### 244 **Implications for research and practice**

245 The pressures GP practices are facing at present in England are significant. Whilst these circumstances make  
246 finding better ways to deliver care pressing, using clinicians’ time to address organisational issues represents  
247 an opportunity-cost to patient care.

248 There is currently little robust research to indicate with confidence that the expectations placed upon larger-  
249 scale general practice provider collaborations in England will be met, or to identify robustly the potential  
250 unintended consequences. As more GP collaborations form and mature in England, evaluation of their impacts  
251 will be fundamental to better understand which types work best, in which circumstances, for whom, how and  
252 why. This ideally should happen before ‘large-scale general practice’ is pursued as national policy across  
253 England.

254

## 255 **Funding and Acknowledgements**

256 LP was funded by a National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) In-Practice Fellowship in the Department of  
257 Health Services Research and Policy at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. The views  
258 expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or Department of Health.  
259 This study formed part of a larger piece of work in collaboration with the Nuffield Trust, for which we thank

260 Judith Smith (Professor of Health Policy and Management, and Director of Health Services Management  
261 Centre, University of Birmingham) who led on the early research project development; Natasha Curry (Senior  
262 Health Policy Fellow) who provided guidance on this literature review in its initial stages; Rod Sheaff  
263 (Professor of Health and Social Services Research, Plymouth University) who provided comments on the  
264 literature review in the final stages; Sally Hull and John Robson (Clinical Leads in the Clinical Effectiveness  
265 Group, Centre for Primary Care and Public Health, Queen Mary University of London) who reviewed an early  
266 draft of the section on Managed General Practice Networks in Tower Hamlets and provided additional  
267 information; and, Michael Kidd, Ruth Wilson and Job Metsemakers (World Organization of Family Doctors)  
268 for insights into large-scale general practice collaborations internationally.

## 269 **References**

- 270 1. Sheaff R. Plural provision of primary medical care in England, 2002–2012. *J Health Serv Res Policy*.  
271 2013;18(2 suppl):20–28.
- 272 4. Smith J, Holder H, Edwards N, Maybin J, Parker H, Rosen R, et al. Securing the future of general  
273 practice: new models of primary care. Nuffield Trust, London. 2013
- 274 3. RCGP. Primary Care Federations—putting patients first. Royal College of General Practitioners; 2008.
- 275 4. Imison C, Williams S, Smith J, Dingwall C. Toolkit to support the development of primary care  
276 federations. RCGP King’s Fund Nuffield Trust Hempsons [Internet]. 2010; Available from:  
277 [http://www.rcgp.org.uk/clinical-and-research/a-to-z-clinical-](http://www.rcgp.org.uk/clinical-and-research/a-to-z-clinical-resources/~/_media/19A1F84B41A04DFE8AAAF2F65FD3D757.ashx)  
278 [resources/~/\\_media/19A1F84B41A04DFE8AAAF2F65FD3D757.ashx](http://www.rcgp.org.uk/clinical-and-research/a-to-z-clinical-resources/~/_media/19A1F84B41A04DFE8AAAF2F65FD3D757.ashx)
- 279 5. Addicott R, Ham C. Commissioning and funding general practice: making the case for family care  
280 networks. *Lond King’s Fund Help Patients*. 2014;153:2811–2.
- 281 6. NHS England. Five year forward view - Chapter three – What will the future look like? New models of  
282 care [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2016 Mar 10]. Available from:  
283 <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ourwork/futurenhs/nhs-five-year-forward-view-web-version/5yfv-ch3/>
- 284 7. NHS England. The multispecialty community provider (MCP) emerging care model and contract  
285 framework [Internet]. NHS England; 2016. Available from: [https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/mcp-care-model-frmrwrk.pdf)  
286 [content/uploads/2016/07/mcp-care-model-frmrwrk.pdf](https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/mcp-care-model-frmrwrk.pdf)
- 287 8. NHS England. Integrating care: contracting for accountable models NHS England. Accountable Care  
288 Organisation (ACO) Contract package - supporting document [Internet]. NHS; 2017 Aug [cited 2017 Aug  
289 24]. (New Care Models). Available from: [https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/1693_DraftMCP-1a_A.pdf)  
290 [content/uploads/2016/12/1693\\_DraftMCP-1a\\_A.pdf](https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/1693_DraftMCP-1a_A.pdf)
- 291 9. Rosen R, Kumpunen S, Curry N, Davies A, Pettigrew L, Kossarova L. Is bigger better? Lessons for large-  
292 scale general practice [Internet]. Nuffield Trust; 2016 [cited 2017 Feb 28]. Available from:  
293 <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2017-01/large-scale-general-practice-web-final.pdf>
- 294 10. Greenhalgh T, Peacock R. Effectiveness and efficiency of search methods in systematic reviews of  
295 complex evidence: audit of primary sources. *Bmj*. 2005;331(7524):1064–1065.



- 296 11. CASP. CASP Tools & Checklists [Internet]. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) - Making sense of  
 297 evidence. 2016 [cited 2016 Jul 18]. Available from: <http://www.casp-uk.net/#!casp-tools->  
 298 [checklists/c18f8](http://www.casp-uk.net/#!casp-tools-checklists/c18f8)
- 299 12. Mays N, Pope C, Popay J. Systematically reviewing qualitative and quantitative evidence to inform  
 300 management and policy-making in the health field. *J Health Serv Res Policy*. 2005;10(1\_suppl):6–20.
- 301 13. Rosen R, Parker H. New Models of Primary Care: practical lessons from early implementers. Nuffield  
 302 Trust [Internet]. 2013; Available from:  
 303 [http://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/sites/files/nuffield/publication/131212\\_new\\_models\\_of\\_general\\_practice.pdf](http://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/sites/files/nuffield/publication/131212_new_models_of_general_practice.pdf)  
 304
- 305 14. Barr F. How providing general practice at scale can benefit patients [Internet]. *Medeconomics, the*  
 306 *Business of General Practice*. 2016 [cited 2016 Jul 18]. Available from:  
 307 <http://www.medeconomics.co.uk/article/1382460>
- 308 15. Evans R. Case study: The benefits of being a larger practice [Internet]. *Medeconomics, the business of*  
 309 *general practice*. 2016 [cited 2016 Jul 18]. Available from:  
 310 <http://www.medeconomics.co.uk/article/1400910>
- 311 16. RCGP. July Clinical News Articles - The Working at Scale Edition [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2016 Aug 1].  
 312 Available from: <http://www.rcgp.org.uk/clinical-and-research/clinical-news.aspx>
- 313 17. GPFrontline. Can working at scale deliver for patients? GPFrontline, Magazine of RCGP. Issue 4. 2016  
 314 Jul;12–3.
- 315 18. Smith M. How a GP federation is cutting A&E workload [Internet]. *Medeconomics, the business of*  
 316 *general practice*. 2015 [cited 2016 Jul 18]. Available from:  
 317 <http://www.medeconomics.co.uk/article/1366707>
- 318 19. Erens B, Wistow G, Mounier-Jack S, Douglas N, Jones L, Manacorda T, et al. Early evaluation of the  
 319 Integrated Care and Support Pioneers Programme. Final Rep Lond Policy Innov Res Unit [Internet].  
 320 2015 [cited 2016 May 27]; Available from:  
 321 <http://www.piru.ac.uk/assets/files/Early%20evaluation%20of%20IC%20Pioneers,%20interim%20report.pdf>  
 322
- 323 20. RAND Europe, Ernst & Young LLP. National Evaluation of the Department of Health’s Integrated Care  
 324 Pilots - Prepared for the Department of Health. Cambridge; 2012.
- 325 21. Sheaff R, Halliday J, Øvretveit J. Integration and continuity of primary care: polyclinics and  
 326 alternatives: a patient-centred analysis of how organisation constrains care co-ordination. *Health Serv*  
 327 *Deliv Res*. 2015;3(35):(August 2015).
- 328 22. MacDonald M, SQW. Prime Minister’s Challenge Fund: improving access to general practice [Internet].  
 329 2015. Report No.: NHS England Publication Gateway Reference Number 04123. Available from:  
 330 <https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/pmcf-wv-one-eval-report.pdf>
- 331 23. Pettigrew L, Mays N, Kumpunen S, Rosen R, Posaner R. Large-scale general practice in England: What  
 332 can we learn from the literature? Lond Nuffield Trust [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2017 Feb 28]; Available  
 333 from: <http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/3450732/1/Large-scale%20general%20practice.pdf>
- 334 24. Cockman P, Dawson L, Mathur R, Hull S. Improving MMR vaccination rates: herd immunity is a realistic  
 335 goal. *BMJ*. 2011;343(7826).

- 336 25. Hull S, Chowdhury TA, Mathur R, Robson J. Improving outcomes for patients with type 2 diabetes using  
337 general practice networks: a quality improvement project in east London. *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2013;bmjqs-  
338 2013.
- 339 26. Hull S, Mathur R, Lloyd-Owen S, Round T, Robson J. Improving outcomes for people with COPD by  
340 developing networks of general practices: evaluation of a quality improvement project in east London.  
341 *NPJ Prim Care Respir Med.* 2014;24:14082.
- 342 27. Robson J, Hull S, Mathur R, Boomla K. Improving cardiovascular disease using managed networks in  
343 general practice: an observational study in inner London. *Br J Gen Pr.* 2014;64(622):e268–e274.
- 344 28. Baker R, Willars J, McNicol S, Dixon-Woods M, McKee L. Primary care quality and safety systems in the  
345 English National Health Service: a case study of a new type of primary care provider. *J Health Serv Res*  
346 *Policy.* 2013;1355819613500664.
- 347 29. McDonald R. Learning about and learning from GP Federations in the English NHS a qualitative  
348 investigation. [Internet]. National Institute for Health Research, NHS. 2016. Available from:  
349 <https://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hsdr/1419604/#/>
- 350 30. Turner A, Mulla A, Booth A, Aldridge S, Stevens S, Battye F, et al. An evidence synthesis of the  
351 international knowledge base for new care models to inform and mobilise knowledge for  
352 multispecialty community providers (MCPs). *Syst Rev.* 2016 Oct 1;5:167.
- 353 31. Sheaff R. From Programme Theory to Logic Models for Multi-specialty Community Providers: A Realist  
354 Evidence Synthesis [Internet]. National Institute for Health Research, NHS. 2016. Available from:  
355 <https://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hsdr/157734/#/>
- 356 32. PA Consulting Group, NAPC. Does the Primary Care Home Make a Difference? Understanding its impact  
357 [Internet]. National Association of Primary Care; 2017 Mar. Available from:  
358 [http://www.napc.co.uk/control/uploads/files/1490953667~NAPC\\_Does\\_the\\_primary\\_care\\_home\\_ma](http://www.napc.co.uk/control/uploads/files/1490953667~NAPC_Does_the_primary_care_home_make_a_difference_March_2017.pdf)  
359 [ke\\_a\\_difference\\_March\\_2017.pdf](http://www.napc.co.uk/control/uploads/files/1490953667~NAPC_Does_the_primary_care_home_make_a_difference_March_2017.pdf)
- 360 33. Kumpunen S, Rosen R, Kossarova L, Sherlaw-Johnson C. Primary Care Home: Evaluating a new model of  
361 primary care [Internet]. London: Nuffield Trust; 2017 Aug. Available from:  
362 <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2017-08/pch-report-final.pdf>
- 363 34. Brown BB, Patel C, McInnes E, Mays N, Young J, Haines M. The effectiveness of clinical networks in  
364 improving quality of care and patient outcomes: A systematic review of quantitative and qualitative  
365 studies. *BMC Health Serv Res* [Internet]. 2016 Aug; Available from:  
366 <https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12913-016-1615-z>
- 367 35. Ng CWL, Ng KP. Does practice size matter? Review of effects on quality of care in primary care. *Br J Gen*  
368 *Pr.* 2013;63(614):e604–e610.
- 369 36. McDonald R, Cheraghi-Sohi S, Tickle M, Roland M, Doran T, Campbell S, et al. The impact of incentives  
370 on the behaviour and performance of primary care professionals. *Queens Print Controll HMSO*  
371 [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2016 May 17]; Available from:  
372 [http://www.netscc.ac.uk/netscc/hsdr/files/project/SDO\\_FR\\_08-1618-158\\_V06.pdf](http://www.netscc.ac.uk/netscc/hsdr/files/project/SDO_FR_08-1618-158_V06.pdf)
- 373 37. Baeza JI, Fitzgerald L, McGivern G. Change capacity: the route to service improvement in primary care.  
374 *Qual Prim Care.* 2008;16(6):401–7.

- 375 38. Goodwin N, Peck E, Freeman T, Posaner R. Managing across diverse networks of care: lessons from  
376 other sectors. Rep NHS SDO RD Programme Birm Health Serv Manag Cent Univ Birm [Internet]. 2004;  
377 Available from:  
378 [http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20091005103011/http://www.sdo.nihr.ac.uk/files/adhoc/3](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20091005103011/http://www.sdo.nihr.ac.uk/files/adhoc/39-policy-report.pdf)  
379 [9-policy-report.pdf](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20091005103011/http://www.sdo.nihr.ac.uk/files/adhoc/39-policy-report.pdf)
- 380 39. Leibowitz R, Day S, Dunt D. A systematic review of the effect of different models of after-hours primary  
381 medical care services on clinical outcome, medical workload, and patient and GP satisfaction. *Fam*  
382 *Pract.* 2003;20(3):311–317.
- 383 40. Bojke C, Gravelle H, Wilkin D. Is bigger better for primary care groups and trusts? *Bmj.* 2001;599–602.
- 384 41. Miller R, Peckham S, Coleman A, McDermott I, Harrison S, Checkland K. What happens when GPs  
385 engage in commissioning? Two decades of experience in the English NHS. *J Health Serv Res Policy.*  
386 2016;21(2):126–133.
- 387 42. Nolte E, Pitchforth E. What is the evidence on the economic impacts of integrated care. *Cph Eur Obs*  
388 *Health Syst Policies* [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2016 Mar 3]; Available from:  
389 [http://observgo.quebec.ca/observgo/fichiers/12008\\_GSS-1.pdf](http://observgo.quebec.ca/observgo/fichiers/12008_GSS-1.pdf)
- 390 43. Fulop N, Protopsaltis G, Hutchings A, King A, Allen P, Normand C, et al. Process and impact of mergers  
391 of NHS trusts: multicentre case study and management cost analysis. *BMJ.* 2002;325(7358):246.
- 392 44. Freeman G, Hughes J. Continuity of care and the patient experience. *Lond Kings Fund* [Internet]. 2010  
393 [cited 2016 May 26]; Available from: <http://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/files/kf/Continuity.pdf>
- 394 45. Ham CJ. GP budget holding: lessons from across the pond and from the NHS. 2010 [cited 2016 Jun 7];  
395 Available from: <http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/758/1/HSMC-policy-paper7.pdf>
- 396 46. Horvath J. Review of Medicare Locals: Report to the Minister for Health and Minister for Sport  
397 [Internet]. Australian Government Department of Health; 2014. Available from:  
398 <http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/review-medicare-locals-final-report>
- 399 47. Hutchinson B. Primary health care in Canada: systems in motion. *Milbank Q* Vol 89 No 2 Jun 2011 P  
400 256-288 [Internet]. 2011; Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC21676023/>
- 401 48. Checkland K, McDermott I, Coleman A, Perkins N. Complexity in the new NHS: longitudinal case studies  
402 of CCGs in England. *BMJ Open.* 2016;6(1):e010199.
- 403 49. Guthrie B, Davies H, Greig G, Rushmer R, Walter I, Duguid A, et al. Delivering health care through  
404 managed clinical networks (MCNs): lessons from the North. Rep Natl Inst Health Res Serv Deliv Organ  
405 Programme [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2016 Mar 3]; Available from:  
406 [http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0020/64514/FR-08-1518-103.pdf](http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/64514/FR-08-1518-103.pdf)
- 407
- 408



## Box:

### Inclusion criteria:

- Study evaluates the impact of new forms of collaboration between three or more GP practices working collectively to provide routine clinical care in England e.g. general practice networks, federations, super-partnerships or multi-site practice organisations (1).
- Study reports on the impact of one or more of the following as a result of the collaboration: quality of care processes indicators, clinical outcomes, patient experience, workforce satisfaction, or costs.

### Exclusion criteria:

- Descriptive case studies without primary data, clear methodology and/or with only self-reported impacts.
- Studies including new forms of collaboration, but the evaluation of the collaboration's impact is not a focus of the study and therefore cannot be identified from the rest of the initiative.
- Studies of organisations only providing out-of-hours care.

Box 1: Inclusion and exclusion criteria for systematic review

## Figure:




Figure 1: Flow diagram of review process

**Tables:**

**Table 1: The impacts of a large-scale general practice collaboration from quantitative studies (Tower Hamlets Managed General Practice Network)**

Authors and journal	Title of paper	Study methods	Care package facilitated by Tower Hamlets Managed General Practice Network	Key performance indicators	Reported impact on processes and indicators of quality of care	Reported impact on costs
Cockman and others (2011), <i>BMJ</i> (22)	Improving MMR vaccination rates: herd immunity is a realistic goal	Observational study. Time-series analysis. Comparison with trends in London and England  Intervention phased in Sept 2009 – Jan 2010  Period of data analysis presented quarterly between Q1 2006 and Q3 2010 (MMR1 vaccination)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Financial incentives</li> <li>– Standardised recording of data</li> <li>– Systematic call and recall with IT</li> <li>– Monthly dashboard feedback on performance</li> <li>– Training and education for clinicians</li> <li>– Active follow up of defaulters</li> <li>– Regular meetings for peer review and ideas sharing</li> </ul>	– Achieve 95% uptake of all childhood immunisations	Uptake of first MMR1 vaccine before age 2 rose from 80% in Sept 2009 to 94% in March 2011  Step change in rate of increase of MMR1 compared to before and after ( $P < 0.001$ ), London and England	Total for 8 networks: £112,000 (used as financial incentive; £14,000/network)  50% in advance, 50% dependent on performance  NB: this was in addition to existing direct enhanced services (DES) funding for childhood immunisation

<p>Hull and others (2013), <i>BMJ Quality and Safety</i> (23)</p>	<p>Improving outcomes for patients with type 2 diabetes using general practice networks: a quality improvement project in East London</p>	<p>Observational study. Time-series analysis. Comparison with trends in two neighbouring PCTs, London and England</p> <p>Intervention phased in Oct 2009 – Apr 2010</p> <p>Period of data analysis presented yearly</p> <p>2007–2012 (retinopathy screen)</p> <p>2006–2012 (total cholesterol)</p> <p>2006–2012 (blood pressure)</p> <p>2005–2012 (HbA1c)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Financial incentives</li> <li>– Standardised recording of data</li> <li>– Systematic call and recall with IT</li> <li>– Monthly dashboard feedback on performance</li> <li>– Bi-monthly multidisciplinary team (MDT) meetings with diabetic specialist team</li> <li>– Supported case management and education</li> <li>– Rapid access to consultants via email or phone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Number of care plans completed, target: 90%</li> <li>– Proportion of patients attending retinal screening, target: 80%</li> <li>– Proportion of patients achieving blood pressure (BP) <math>\leq 140/80</math> mmHg and total cholesterol <math>\leq 4</math> mmol/l: target 50%</li> <li>– Network population average HbA1c: target 7.5%</li> </ul>	<p>Rise in care plans from 10% in Q1 2009 to 88% in Q1 2012</p> <p>Rise in retinal screening from 72% in Q1 2009 to 82.8% in Q1 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Step change catch-up with London and England (no P value)</li> </ul> <p>Rise in joint BP and cholesterol target achieved, from 35.3% in Q1 2009 to 46.1% in Q1 2012 (did not meet target)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Perform better than London and England (no P value)</li> </ul> <p>Average HbA1c fell from 7.8% in 2009 to 7.66% in 2012 (did not meet 7.5% target)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Trend similar to London and England (no P value)</li> </ul>	<p>Total for 8 networks: £1.7 million (&gt;£200,000/ network)</p> <p>70% in advance, 30% dependent on performance</p>
---	---	---	--	--	--	---



<p>Hull and others (2014), <i>Primary Care Respiratory Medicine</i> (24)</p>	<p>Improving outcomes for people with COPD by developing networks of general practice: evaluation of a quality improvement project in East London</p>	<p>Observational study. Time-series analysis. Comparison with trends in London and England.</p> <p>Intervention phased in Apr 2010 – Jun 2010</p> <p>Period of data analysis presented yearly</p> <p>2010–2013 (annual review)</p> <p>2005–2013 (flu vaccination)</p> <p>2005–2011 (COPD admissions)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Financial incentives</li> <li>– Standardised recording of data (including co-morbidities, medication review, encourage non-pharmaceutical interventions)</li> <li>– Systematic call and recall with IT</li> <li>– Active follow up of non-attenders</li> <li>– Monthly dashboard feedback on performance</li> <li>– Regular patient review</li> <li>– Quarterly MDT meeting including respiratory consultant and community respiratory team</li> <li>– Supported case management and education</li> <li>– Community-based pulmonary rehab</li> <li>– Hospital admission avoidance service</li> <li>– Rapid access to consultants via email or phone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Increase number of COPD cases on network registers: target 10% increase in first year</li> <li>– Increase in number of care plans: target 80%</li> <li>– Increase in referrals to community-based pulmonary rehab: target 75% in patients with Medical Research Council (MRC) score <math>\geq 3</math></li> <li>– Improve influenza vaccination (no target, not financially incentivised as already incentivised by Quality and Outcomes Framework; QOF)</li> <li>– Reduce smoking prevalence (no target, not financially incentivised as already incentivised by QOF)</li> <li>– Reduce emergency hospital admission for COPD (no target, not financially incentivised, only tracked)</li> </ul>	<p>COPD register increased by 21% between 2010 and 2013</p> <p>Annual reviews and care planning increased from 53% in 2010 to 86.5% in 2013</p> <p>Pulmonary rehab in patients with MRC score <math>\geq 3</math> increased from 45% in 2010 to 75% in 2013. No national comparator</p> <p>Flu vaccination high prior to intervention, showed ‘steady improvement’. In 2012 it was ‘significantly higher’ than rate in England</p> <p>No improvement in smoking prevalence: in 2010 39% of patients with COPD smoked; in 2013 40.4% smoked</p> <p>Emergency COPD admissions ‘have fallen’ but remain higher than London average. Trend suggests a step-change compared to London and England trends</p>	<p>Total for 8 networks: £300,000/annum for 3 years</p> <p>70% in advance, 30% dependent on performance</p>
--	---	--	---	---	---	---

<p>Robson and others (2014), <i>British Journal of General Practice</i> (25)</p>	<p>Improving cardiovascular disease using managed networks in general practice: an observational study in inner London</p>	<p>Observational study. Comparison with trends in two local PCTs, London and England</p> <p>Intervention phased in 2008 – Apr 2010</p> <p>Period of data analysis presented yearly</p> <p>2009–2011 (lipid lowering prescribing)</p> <p>2004–2012 (coronary heart disease [CHD] BP &lt; 150/90mmHg)</p> <p>2004–2012 (CHD cholesterol &lt;5mmol/l)</p> <p>2004–2010 (myocardial infarction mortality in patients &lt;75 years)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Financial incentives</li> <li>– Systematic call and recall with IT</li> <li>– Standardised recording of data</li> <li>– Monthly dashboard feedback on performance</li> <li>– Three whole-time community specialist CVD nurses across all networks</li> <li>– Training for practice nurses</li> <li>– Clinical guidelines developed by local clinical effectiveness group</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– BP &lt;140/90mmHg for hypertension, stroke and CHD</li> <li>– Cholesterol &lt;4mmol/l for stroke, CHD and diabetes</li> <li>– BP &lt;140/80mmHg for diabetes</li> </ul> <p>From Apr 2010:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Proportion of new heart attacks reviewed at GP surgery &lt; 3 weeks of hospital discharge</li> <li>– Attendance at cardiac rehab</li> <li>– Recording of care plan</li> </ul>	<p>Statin prescribing increased more than in two local PCTs between 2009 and 2011 (p&lt;0.01)</p> <p>Improvements in cholesterol levels and BP took place at a faster rate than London and England for patients with hypertension, stroke, CHD and diabetes (p&lt;0.05 – p&lt;0.001)</p> <p>Proportion of patients with a care plan increased from 42.7% in 2011 to 61.6% in 2012</p> <p>Proportion of people with a new heart attack seen &lt; 3 weeks of discharge increased from 68.9% in 2009 to 71.3% in 2012</p> <p>Attendance at cardiac rehab decreased from 34.8% in 2009 to 27.7% in 2012</p> <p>There was no change in influenza vaccination (83%) between 2009 and 2012</p> <p>Paper also reported a faster rate of decline in deaths from acute myocardial infarction between 2008 and 2012 than local PCTs, London or England. It reduced by 43% compared to an average of 25% for the top 10 PCTs in 2008 ranked by mortality. The authors recognise association is speculative</p>	<p>Total for all 8 networks for all 4 packages of care (CVD, COPD, diabetes, childhood immunisations): £10 million/annum for 3 years</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

**Table 2: The impacts of a large-scale general practice collaboration from a qualitative study (multi-practice organisation England)**

<b>Author and journal</b>	<b>Title of paper</b>	<b>Study methods</b>	<b>Reported impact on processes and indicators of quality of care</b>	<b>Reported impact on workforce satisfaction</b>	<b>Reported impact on patient experience</b>
Baker and others (2013), <i>Journal of Health Services Research and Policy</i> (26)	Primary care quality and safety in the English National Health Service: a case study of a new type of primary care provider	Interviews with senior staff and owners with responsibility for policy on quality and safety Ethnographic observation in non-clinical areas Interviews with staff in three practices Analysis of company documentation Study undertaken 2011–2012	- Standardised policies and procedures - Facilitated the implementation of systems, e.g. incident reporting, investigating and sharing learning - Reduced continuity of care in some cases	Relieved some clinical staff of administrative duties Enhanced training and inter-staff support Reports of feeling undervalued Recruitment and retention difficulties with high staff turnover (particularly of GPs)	Patients viewed as customers with strong focus on monitoring patient experience Overall positive, caring attitude towards patients Indications of unpopularity of call centre Indications of dissatisfaction with level of continuity of care Indications of antipathy towards a commercial organisation