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Abstract: This article focuses on the randomised clinical trial (RCT) as research method in nursing interventions and problematises its methodological ability and delimitations considering the extensive use of this method in the healthcare system. The article aims to examine if and how RCT in nurse-led interventions are handling questions concerned with contextual influences and discusses the outcome. A systematic literature review was conducted, consisting of 55 RCT from 2006-2010. The results show: all interventions were placed in a social arena and address interactions but did not incorporate or reflect the meaning and importance of the social context in the design; altogether made recommendations for interventions leading to implementation of profound changes in clinical practices; or, if not, then the existing control intervention is assumed to be the best current intervention. Meaning that RCT operates as if no contextual impact exists, and at the same time, make claims to guide and change actions in the clinical practice. This has implications for the understanding of Evidence-based nursing according to the Evidence Hierarchy. Further discussion concerning RCT design and impact in clinical practices are called for.
Introduction

In 1948, the modern concept of RCT was developed (Christensen 1999; Lilienfeld 1982). Today, RCTs is a frequently used method amongst all healthcare professionals in the medical field; ranging from testing medicine on patients to testing other forms of interventions in the medical clinic, such as psychological interventions, educational interventions and nursing interventions. An outcome of this historical movement in research is that nursing care is assumed to contribute evidence in the same way as required in the medical research tradition. It means that there today is a strong research claim for nurse-designed studies using RCT involving a focus on clinical care (Heyman 1995; Pravikoff, Tanner & Pierce 2005; Pruitt & Privette 2001; Petersen 1998). The RCT is considered to be ‘the golden standard’ for evaluating the effectiveness of interventions; the preconception is that RCT works in evidence-informed policy making and in practice (Torgerson & Torgerson 2008). Thus, there is an underlying understanding or assumption that a practice in clinical medicine is not judged to be sufficiently justified if not tested through an RCT (Doll 1982; Glasdam 2003).

The RCT as a research design and method is grounded on epistemological and ontological assumptions and developed into a specific research paradigms, as many other research methods are. The RCT methodology rests on principles delineated in the positivistic paradigm research tradition forming the basis of the understanding of the so-called Evidence-based medicine. Evidence-based medicine has been described as an integration of best research evidence, clinical expertise, and patient values (Sackett, Strauss, Richardson, Rosenberg & Haynes 2000).
Evidence-based medicine was expanded to Evidence-based Practice (EBP) to accommodate other professions than medicine. Based on the work of the US Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality in 1992, the Evidence Hierarchy of Study Types has been an accepted system for grading guideline recommendations in Evidence-based medicine and Evidence-base Nursing. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses of RCT are placed at the top of this Evidence Hierarchy; RCT is placed second highest. At the bottom of the hierarchy are non-experimental studies and expert opinions (Guyatt et al 1995). This Evidence hierarchy is widely accepted in the international medical field, and also in nursing research, even though concerns have been raised concerning the RCTs. These concerns are of a philosophical nature, such as when it is taken for granted that the results from the study in ‘the laboratory’ or other ‘constructed contexts’ per se are assumed to become transformed and guide changes in practice involving people’s health, well-being and approaches related to their life-word (Christensen 1999; Glasdam 2003; Jensen 2004; Martinsen & Boge 2004; Martinsen 2009). Further, researchers have argued that these concerns are also of a methodological and an epistemological nature. The main reason is that the concept of RCT presupposes a fundamental condition based on a premise of constants and therefore disregards or even excludes the impact of changeable social and contextual influences (Christensen 1999; Hansen & Tjoernhoej-Thomsen 2012). The RCT also states variables to be selected and defined a priori in order to address the corresponding objectives of the study, in order to enhance the reliability and validity of the eventual findings through statistical calculations and statistical significance (Thelle 2004).

Many results from RCTs based on interactional nurse-led interventions are published (Vedelø & Lomborg 2011), but only a few researchers have until now addressed the contextual impacts in relational-based intervention projects (Berk 2005; Coates 2010). This paper is concerned with how the
RCTs handle these circumstances when it comes to interventions that consist of interactions between human beings, and how the methodological and epistemological issues related with conceptuality are critically reflected upon in the vast amount of studies based on RCT. Our assumption is that healthcare research has a tendency to over-simplify, by assuming that all contextual variables and outcomes can be controlled in studies in clinical practice as was the case in the ‘laboratory’. Further, researchers have pointed out that it is not possible, even in a carefully planned study, to predict the impact that external influences may have on the subject (Coates 2012). Therefore, this paper focuses on the randomised clinical trial (RCT) as a research method in nursing interventions and problematises its methodological ability and delimitations considering the extensive use of this method in the healthcare system. The aim of this paper is to explore if and how studies are handling questions concerned with contextual influences, by re-doing a systematic literature review on literature used in an already published literature study (Fridlund et al 2014) in which two of the authors of this study took part. Also, this present study aims to contribute to the debate and discussion of the importance of considering the contextual and relational influences in research focussing on intervention-based studies, RCTs; Further, we problematize the ontological claim in RCT-based research, that is, the ontological assumption of a constant in intervention programmes or strategies which is invariant in different settings. This study also aims to contribute to reflections on epistemological issues concerning with RCT as designated by researchers in the medical field being the preferable research method in nursing, which is leading to that RCT-based research in present time is meant to guide the complex (clinical) healthcare practices through its results.

**Method**
The interest in conducting this study emerged from a systematic literature review conducted in 2011 involving RCT-designed interventions in somatic adult healthcare contexts (Fridlund et al 2014). It became notable that the included RCT studies in general did not consider the contextual influences. We found it interesting to explore this further, by focusing more explicit on if any considerations were taken to contextual influences. The present study is re-analysing the data of the former literature review of Fridlund et al. (2014). Our literature review analysis uses the same data/studies as Fridlund et al. (2014), but we have different aims, and we explore if and how the studies are handling questions concerned with contextual influences in nurse-led RCT interventions.

**Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

The literature search was carried out with a primary criterion of including studies with a focus on nurse led interventions concerning adults in somatic healthcare (Fridlund et al 2014). Specific inclusion criteria were: nurse-led RCTs concerning caring actions in adult patients in somatic healthcare; evaluating caring actions and articles not older than five years (2006-2010).

Exclusion criteria were: psychiatric healthcare; women’s health; children (<18 years); low quality of the study according to The Swedish Council on Health Technology Assessment’s well-established audit template (Statens beredning för medicinsk utvärdering 2010). Women’s health is excluded because it includes both somatic and mental health, and also delivery of babies and issues related to children (Fridlund et al 2014).

**The Literature Search and Studies included**
The International databases PubMed/Medline and CINAHL were used to search literature in English, produced between 2006 and 2010. Both controlled vocabulary (Medical Subject Headings [MeSH]) and free-text words were used. The MeSH-terms were “Nurse Clinicians” OR “Nurse Practitioners” and the free-text words were nurse specialist, nurse practitioner, nurse-led and nurse-managed. The literature search also excluded the following free text words from the search: gynecology, pediatrics, pregnancy and psychiatric. In total, 244 references were found and 55 studies (marked with asterisks in the reference list) were included in the study (Figure 1) (Fridlund et al 2014).

Analysis Strategy

First, all the articles we found were read and tabulated, one by one for this study. Questions of importance when exploring the aims of this study were: What are the contexts of care; what is the Intervention about; who were together, where and how and why; how are the results of the intervention measured? The articles were all reviewed by two of the authors. Second, each review was discussed together with the third author, aiming at identifying and not missing out any aspects mentioned about the social context in which the studies were performed. Finally, the authors compared the studies across all data by posing the same questions when analysing each article.

Results
All included studies were based on randomisation between two or three arms, where the concept of the experimental intervention(s) was described in all studies. The concept of the control arms was described in 38 studies, but unspecified and only stated as “usual practice/usual care” in 17 studies (Table 1). This could be illustrated by the study of Goessens et al (2006):

“Patients were randomized [...] to either nurse practitioner care plus usual care (intervention group) or usual care alone (control group)” (Goessens et al 2006: p.997).

They do not describe ‘usual care’ explicitly in the article, only the overall components in ‘nurse practitioner care’ (intervention):

“At the first visit, patients were told about their vascular risk factors and individualized, realistic goals were set in co-operation with the patients. Action plans were made for lifestyle changes: smoking cessation, regular exercise, healthy diets, and medical treatment of risk factors (antiplatelet agents, blood pressure, lipid, and glucose-lowering agents, or folic acid).....” (Goessens et al 2006: p.997).

The issue is that the elements of the intervention programme maybe interfere with ‘care as usual’ since we know nothing about that. However, the description of the elements of the intervention is often included in care as usual and the outcome of the intervention might be problematic or even uncertain.

All interventions were placed in a social context (healthcare activity of some kind), either at hospitals (nine studies), professional settings outside hospitals (ten studies), private homes of the patients (seven studies), telephone- and web meetings (19 studies), or combinations of those contexts (ten studies). All interventions addressed interactions between at least one nurse and one patient. Further, all intervention in the studies were
evaluated by quantitative measurement taking into account the patient as a sole actor and nine of these studies also measured on cost-benefit of the intervention. Again the study of Goessens et al (2006) could serve as an example:

"At both follow-up evaluations, data were collected on current medication use and smoking behavior. The vascular risk factor levels were again determined by physical examination and a fasting blood sample. Quality of life was assessed by the Medical Outcomes Study 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36) [...]. The primary outcome was the cardiovascular risk profile at 1 year after randomization. We measured change in risk factors and medication usage. The proportion of achieved treatment goals for each risk factor before and after the intervention was compared for the intervention and the control group” (Ibid: p.998).

Thus the nurse is an active part in above mentioned intervention in the study of Goessens et al’s (2006) and interacts with the patient (s)he is not regarded as a part or a component of the evaluation concept of the intervention. None of the studies evaluated the professionals, nor their mutual interactions, and consequently left out issues concerned with the way social influences might have impact on the intervention (Table 1). Nor the place of intervention is pointed out as significant for or as an evaluation parameter for the outcome of the intervention in the study of Goessens et al’s (2006). It became clear that none of the studies in this literature review evaluate the social contexts’ influence and impact on the intervention (Table 1). Nor did any of the studies evaluate the interaction between those involved in the health activity and how the interaction(s) influenced and impacted on the intervention. Taking all into consideration, none of the studies included, incorporated or reflected on the meaning and importance of contextual aspects in the study design or consequently in the evaluation of the studies. These social arenas, social actors and
interactions were regarded as insignificant constants in RCT. All studies made recommendations, based on their results, either for experimental interventions representing profound changes for implementation in daily clinical practices, or, that the existing (control) intervention is assumed to be the best current intervention, for example: “In conclusion, our findings show that care provided by a nurse practitioner, in addition to usual care and on top of a vascular screening and prevention program, improved the management of important risk factors in patients with a recent clinical manifestation of a vascular disease. Adequately managed risk factors will contribute to a reduction in vascular morbidity and mortality in this group of high-risk patients” (Goessens et al 2006: p1002).

**Discussion**

In this section, we discuss our results in relation to the importance of a social dimension when humans act together. Further we reflect the fact that the studies in this systematic literature review operate as if non-contextual impact exists, and at the same time make claims that experimental or controlled interventions from the studies should be implemented or further developed in clinical healthcare practices, for example in various health activities. Also, we reflect on the absence of consideration of social dimensions in the studies included in this review in relation to the discourse of evidence-based nursing in theoretical and clinical nursing. Finally, we reflect on the method used in our study. When we discuss the social context it should be considered on an abstract level since the issue here is not to discuss the complexity of these contexts per se.

The studies included in this systematic literature review handle the social context(s) and interactions in an unproblematic, unreflected way, as if
they were insignificant constants. As the chosen example of the study of Gooesen et al (2006) showed, the meeting between nurse and patient took place in a specific social context with an interaction between two persons. Such a communicative interaction probably has an influence on the given information, the way the information is received and interpreted in the care action plan and how this plan is applied into action by the patient. In general, the included studies do not regard social conditions in terms of dynamic movements or interactive with other factors considered in the studies. The humans present in the experimental situation and what humans do together in the concrete situation are therefore disregarded and treated in a somewhat instrumentalist and reductionist way. This is not the case in for example life-world research traditions, also frequently used in healthcare research (e.g. McCloud, Harrington & Kin 2012; Thomas 2005), such as in phenomenology and hermeneutics, where the social interactions between humans are essential and central (e.g. Gadamer 2004a,2004b; Husserl 2002; Merleau-Ponty 1994). In addition, the social constructivists and post-structuralistic research traditions (e.g. Berger & Luckmann 1966; Bourdieu 1999; Giddens 1991) focus on social contexts, concerned with the impact of social-political discourses influences, emphasising how we experience illness, diseases or construct coping strategies. These research traditions’ ontological and epistemological approaches argue in favour of the importance of contextual and relational influences, and these approaches are also often used in healthcare research (e.g. Glasdam 2003; Hardcastle, Usher KJ & Holmes 2005; Raunkiaer 2007). The life-world and everyday situation, as experienced, is not considered to be constructed solely by the person, or imposed upon her, but rather it is constituted as an internal relationship between the experiencing subject and influences of the surrounding external social context (Marton & Booth, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978).
All the RCT studies in this review, illustrated by the chosen example of the study of Gooesen et al (2006), evaluate their success on the outcomes of the patients included in the intervention, without knowing or stating what actually affected the benefits of the intervention. The studies consist of several components of the intervention and it is unclear how these inter-relate. Contrary to previously mentioned philosophers and researchers, who argue for the importance of various relationships as being essential to the intervention itself, the implementation of the experimental and control interventions make the opposite and rules out the circumstances and processes, which have been left aside as unimportant (Damschroeder et al 2009; Nielsen, Fredslund, Christensen & Albertsen 2006; Hansen & Tjørnhoj-Thomsen 2011,2012). It is reasonable to raise questions, concerning the importance of the social dimension considering it is not taken into account in RCT research since not involving any kind of acknowledging about the interaction between patients and nurses or other healthcare professionals. We argue in favour of that healthcare research using RCT design should become contextual aware of the importance of relationships. Furthermore, if the outcomes of the studies should serve as a basis for changing or not changing clinical healthcare practices, the inclusion of social contextual factors is a necessary presumption, for the validation of results. Contextual changes and variations should be dealt with and not be treated as unimportant or non-existent; at least outlined as distinct delimitations when not dealt within the RCT designed studies.

From our reasoning follows that RCTs operate as if no contextual impacts exist and at the same time the studies consider that the addressed health activity has as its core element the encounter between humans. All the studies, and in the section of results illustrated by the study of Gooesen et al (2006), claim that by using RCT this can per se justify interventions from the studies as sufficient or insufficient; and that the
evaluations of the interventions claim validity for recommending implementation of change versus maintenance of the status quo in clinical healthcare practice (activity). This assertion could be regarded as a problematic ontological issue. The concept of ‘care/treatment as usual’ is problematic as a reference to a baseline. Firstly, ‘care/treatment as usual’ vary in content between different healthcare settings (hospitals, primary health care centres, care in municipalities), but still outcome recommendations are given in general without considering this variation. Secondly, it is problematic to refer to ‘care/treatment as usual’ without in detail describe the content and how it differ from the components of the intervention programme. If this is not done we do not know the operative component of a measured effect in the outcome of an intervention. The analysis of the included studies showed a problematic vagueness in respect of these two aspects of the use of concept ‘as usual’.

An intervention, per se, usually aims to change something and can be defined as an intentional ‘change strategy’ (Fraser, Richman, Galinsky & Day 2009); or argue in favour of not changing, as a way of maintaining the ‘best’ preference. For that reason, the intentional meaning and the contextual and relational influences concerning the social aspects must be considered when setting objectives for measurement of changes. The interventions always take place in relation to health activity and include interaction between humans. The complexity cannot be organised or treated as a fixed entity, that is, as a standardised procedure where a given input generates a given output. Consider, it is not possible to create a teaching and learning situation where every teacher (here the nurses) teaches the same content in the same way and that every student (here the patient) learns and make sense in a similar way (Marton & Booth, 1997). Circumstances such as our history (Gadamer 2004a, 2004b), backgrounds, societal history, personal experiences and preconceptions (Bourdieu 1984,1999), the people with whom we interact, and our
specific life circumstances at the moment the interventions is carried out, have an essential influence on how things turn out. These circumstances should be taken into consideration in any social intervention implemented and evaluated in clinical healthcare practice(s) before it can be regarded as a valid result and thereby become significant for those involved in the situation. Thus, it is difficult to provide an identical social intervention programme because human acting and interaction are always rooted in attitude formation, social contexts and histories (Bourdieu, 1984; Gadamer, 2004b; Glasdam 2003; Hansen & Tjoernhoej-Thomsen 2012; Krogstrup 2011). The challenge is to consider the importance of contextual influences in relation to RCT conducted studies results. Particular when far-reaching implication from RCT studies are made in terms of changing interventions and routines in healthcare practices. In research as well as in clinical interventions, we must acknowledge variations rather than treat the context from which we collect out data (as in RCT based research) in an instrumentalist way, as constant.

Firstly, the lack of consideration of the social aspects, secondly, the rationale that is based on the notion of fixed constants and defined variables (see Kendall 2003) in the analysed studies in this literature review of RCTs is an issue worth to discuss. This has some implications for the understanding of Evidence-based nursing according to the Evidence Hierarchy (Guyatt et al 1995). In the medical understanding of Evidence-based nursing, the RCTs rank highest as evidence and are designed to create the guidelines for Evidence-based practice. This is despite the fact that research based on RCTs with negative results is often excluded in the formation of evidence due to publication difficulties (Dimick, Diener-West & Lipsett 2001; Jaarsma et al 2008). All the studies in our literature review are assigned the power to define and guide the actions in clinical practices, without considering the importance of the social context in that very same practice. We find it justifiable to debate the power
RCT studies have in contemporary nursing research and how evident RCTs studies actually are, considering this lack of consideration of the social contexts impact. And what consequences will it have for patients if we build our clinical nursing practice (or any health activity) based on these RCT results? At best nothing happens, at worst the results are misleading and could do harm to patients.

Finally, we discuss the literature review method in the light of the assessment of the studies as low-middle-high quality according to The Swedish Council on Health Technology Assessment’s well-established audit template (Statens beredning för medicinsk utvärdering 2010). Many factors are assessed in this template, aiming to guarantee an overall quality in a study. One or more factors can be marked with low quality, and still the overall outcome can be assessed as middle or high quality. The view developed in this article is that all of the studies included in the literature review alternatively might be regarded as having a low quality since none of them deals with the variables of social contexts and actors. Looking at other reviews and anthropological studies of RCT (e.g. Glasdam, Timm & Vittrup 2010, Dickson et al 2013, Tjoernhoej-Thomsen & Hansen 2013), many other methods or tools are proposed to measure the quality of research not taken into account in the studies included in our analysis.

**Conclusion**

The results of this systematic literature review show that the RCTs handle the contextual dimension, understood as interactions between th humans and the contextual influencing aspects at hand, in which the experimental and controlled interventions takes place, as if non-interactiveness or contextual impact exists. In other words, the studies treat the complex social context in terms of constants. All studies give
recommendations based on their results; either the experimental interventions are supposed leading to implementation of profound changes in daily clinical practices, or the existing (control) intervention is assumed to be the best current intervention. This must have implications for the understanding of Evidence-based nursing according to the Evidence Hierarchy. Paradoxically, the RCTs operate as if no contextual impact exists, and at the same time it is considered that the very same practice has as its core element the encounter between humans and emphasises the relational and contextual. By failing to deal with presumed influences and conditions from a methodological research perspective, in ignoring and not acknowledging ‘contextual movements’, healthcare research has a tendency to over-simplify by the use of variables as fixed entities and as constants. An important assumption in this review is that a social context and a social interaction should be taken into consideration and a more critical stance should be taken in clinical healthcare based on RCT research and their outcomes in the form of evaluation of interventions. If the large amount of supported RCT research is to continue to guide and direct clinical practice, with a continuing high impact on the healthcare practice of today, then, a critical reflection concerning the lack of consideration about the contextual movements must come to the fore and be debated from an ontological, an epistemological and a clinical, practical perspective. The RCT design consequently is suggested to become further analysed and discussed in terms of delimitations and force of predictability, generalisability, and changeable impact in clinical practices. We argue in favour of further RCT research on social interventions should be combined, in other words mixed methods should be applied, such as including anthropological field studies and other kind of qualitative research approaches. If recommendations are made for changes, there is a need for exploring the social complexity in which the RCT are placed to gain more knowledge about what works, how it works and in which context it works.
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Figure 1 Flow diagram of the systematic review process
Table 1 Descriptive overview of the studies included (n=55); context, interventions, place, participants, main content, main goal, and measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors, year, country</th>
<th>Intervention and control groups</th>
<th>Place for the intervention</th>
<th>Participants in the social interactions</th>
<th>Main Content</th>
<th>Main Goal</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leimig et al. 2008, USA</td>
<td>Video conference health follow-up vs usual (unspecified) procedure</td>
<td>Interactive session between clinic and the home of the patient</td>
<td>Nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Transplant outcomes (infections, rejections, hospitalizations)</td>
<td>Detection</td>
<td>Blood tests, review of medication, physical assessment, transplant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthbertson et al. 2009, UK</td>
<td>Follow-up physical rehabilitation intervention vs unspecified standard care</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>QoL, cost-benefit</td>
<td>Short Form 36 (SH-36), Quality Adjusted Life Years (QALY’s), Davidson Trauma Score, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), APACHE II severity of illness and Comorbidity, Intensive Care Experience (ICE score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franzén et al. 2009, Sweden</td>
<td>Telephone follow-up vs none</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Advice</td>
<td>QoL</td>
<td>Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS), EuroQoL (EQ-5D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcantonio et al.</td>
<td>Delirium abatement programme vs. Skilled nursing facilities in a</td>
<td>Nurse, patient</td>
<td>Symptom management</td>
<td>Treatment and</td>
<td>Charlson Scale, Activities of Daily Living Scale, Minimum Data Set (MDS) 2.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design Details</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Outcome Measures</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapointe et al. 2006, Canada</td>
<td>Telephone follow-up programme by hospital nurse vs usual (unspecified) control by GP</td>
<td>Metropolitan region (and family)</td>
<td>Follow-up, education, treatment of risk factors</td>
<td>Treatment, prevention, self-care, lifestyle changes, QoL, cost-benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittag et al. 2006, Germany</td>
<td>Telephone counseling and information in written vs information in written</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Self-care, lifestyle changes, prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisk et al. 2006, USA</td>
<td>Education and management programme vs received guidelines for managing systolic dysfunction</td>
<td>Hospital, telephone</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Prevention, self-care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baig et al. 2007, USA</td>
<td>Faith community nurse referrals vs telephone-assisted physician appointed intervention</td>
<td>Office in the church</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiang et al. 2007, China</td>
<td>Rehabilitation programme vs unspecified routine care</td>
<td>Hospital and the home of the patient (and eventual family)</td>
<td>Support, education</td>
<td>Self-care, lifestyle changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lipids, time spend with nurse management, Medical Outcomes Study 36-item Short Form (SF-36), medication, Symptom Checklist-90 (SCL-90), Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D), health-related behaviours as smoking pattern, diet, physical activity (interview), BP, lipids, BMI, Hospitalization, Short Form-12 physical component score (SF-12), Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire (MLHF), death, Socio-demographic data, smoking status, (family) history of hypertension, other diseases, BP, medication, hypertension knowledge (MDRTC), Hypertension self-care (MDRTC), Smoking cessation measure, Jenkins Activity Checklist for Walking, 3-day dietary record, self-reported drug compliance scale, serum lipid Body weight, and BP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Intervention Details</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanssen et al. 2007, Norway</td>
<td>Telephone follow-up intervention and open telephone line vs current clinical practice (one outpatient visit to a physician and subsequent visits to GP)</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>QoL, lifestyle changes, 36 item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36), self-constructed questionnaire on lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malm et al. 2007, Sweden</td>
<td>Self-care programme vs specified standard check up</td>
<td>Hospital and telephone</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient (and spouse)</td>
<td>QoL, Socio-demographic and clinical information from medical record, six-minute walk test, The one-and-a-half-minute stair test, Euro-QoL (EQ-5D), Psychological General Well-being Scale (PWBG), Subjective Consequences of Pacemaker Therapy (SCOP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearer et al. 2007, USA</td>
<td>Telephone empowerment support vs nothing</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Self-management, Self-care, Socio-demographic data, the Power as Knowing Participation in Change Tool VII (PKPCT), Ware Short-Form Health Survival (SF-36), Self-management of Health Failure scale (SMHF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman et al. 2008, UK</td>
<td>Homecare support and education programme vs usual care (hospital helpline telephone and a pre-information day)</td>
<td>The home of the patient</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Self-care, lifestyle changes, preparation for surgery, QoL, HAD Scale, BP, BMI, Cholesterol, change in smoking rates, blood glucose, Coronary Revascularization Outcome Questionnaire (CROQ), SF-36, post-operative complications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaarsma</td>
<td>Additional basis</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Support, Cost- Data on mortality, number of re-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Critical perspectives on how to handle social contexts in RCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Support Type</th>
<th>Location/Setting</th>
<th>Matched Controls</th>
<th>Primary Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>et al. 2008, The Netherlands</td>
<td>Nurse vs Intensive support by nurse vs follow-up by cardiologist</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Computer standard program</td>
<td>Hospitalization, history of disease(s) and medication, BP, blood tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherrard et al. 2009, Canada</td>
<td>Follow-up interactive voice call for screening of symptoms x 11 vs usual care consisting of interactive voice call for screening of symptoms x 2</td>
<td>The home of the patient</td>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>Questionnaires about medication safety and symptoms, user satisfaction on the interactive voice call system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao and Wong 2009, China</td>
<td>Transitional care programme vs routine discharge care involving attention point at home</td>
<td>Home visit and telephone</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Demographic and baseline health assessment data; understanding of diet, medication exercise, health related life style, health care utilization and satisfaction with care (self-constructed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andryukhin et al. 2010, Russia</td>
<td>Education programme in three parts: 1) group education on lifestyle 4 x 1½ h. 2) 4 x ½h introduction to exercise training. 3) Nurse consultation ½ min weekly in 5 month vs. usual care according to the clinic of GP and telephone</td>
<td>Education in self-care</td>
<td>QoL and self-care</td>
<td>New York Heart Association Class of CHF, BMI, waist circumference, 6-min walking test, biochemical parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Intervention Details</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Control Group Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smeulders et al. 2010, The Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronic disease self-management programme and usual care vs unspecified usual care</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Group of patients and one nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goessens et al. 2006, The Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurse consultation and unspecified usual care (by GP) vs unspecified usual care (by GP)</td>
<td>Risk-factor management clinic</td>
<td>One nurse, one GP and one patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artinian et al. 2007, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tele monitoring BP and usual care vs usual care (unspecified)</td>
<td>The home of the patient, computer and telephone</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sol et al. 2007, The Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk factor management by nurse vs specified usual care</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonstad et al. 2007,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual education vs nothing</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Amoako and Skelly 2007, USA</td>
<td>Psycho-educational telephone intervention vs unspecified usual care</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Kim and Jeong 2007, South Korea</td>
<td>Web-input, SMS support and outpatient control vs outpatient control</td>
<td>Computer/telephone, SMS</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Houweling et al. 2009, The Netherlands</td>
<td>Case-management by CNS vs internist</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>MacMahon Tone et al. 2009, Ireland</td>
<td>Intensive nurse-led diabetes care vs specified standard diabetes care</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Hawkins 2010</td>
<td>Videophone self-management education 1x12 weeks+1x3 month vs 1x6 month</td>
<td>Interactive session between clinic and the home of the patient</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Huizinga et al.</td>
<td>Telephone quarterly follow-up vs</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>One nurse/oth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Number of Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010, USA</td>
<td>Telephone monthly follow-up vs unspecified usual follow up</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Nurse and one</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesari et al. 2010, Iran</td>
<td>Telephone follow-up vs no follow up after 3 day’s self-care education programme</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Nurse and one</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone et al. 2010, USA</td>
<td>Home-based telemedicine support vs telephone calls</td>
<td>Interactive session between clinic and the home of the patient</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Prevention, support, education, medication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raje et al. 2007, UK</td>
<td>Telephonic consultation vs nothing</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan et al. 2009, UK</td>
<td>GNP led follow-up with individual counselling vs unspecified usual care by GP</td>
<td>Nurse-led clinic</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Assessment, counselling, self-care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chow and Wong 2010, Hong Kong</td>
<td>Discharge planning and 6 week telephone follow up vs standard information and hotline service</td>
<td>Hospital and telephone</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Education, organization, support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong et al.</td>
<td>Unspecified Routine</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>QoL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Authors and Year</td>
<td>Context Description</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Primary Outcomes</td>
<td>Instruments and Scores Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al. 2010, Hong Kong</td>
<td>Care and Disease management programme vs unspecified routine care</td>
<td>Nurse and one patient</td>
<td>symptom control, self-care</td>
<td>Questionnaire (DDFQ), Kidney Disease Quality of Life (KDQOL), La Monica-Oberst Patient Satisfaction Scale, symptoms control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verschuur et al. 2009, The Netherlands</td>
<td>Follow-up home visits by CNS vs outpatient clinic follow-up</td>
<td>The home of the patient</td>
<td>Follow-up, advices, support</td>
<td>QoL, patient satisfaction, cost-benefit, EuroQoL-5D, incl. EQ-VAS (overall self-rated health), EORTC QLQ-C30 questionnaire, EORTC QLQ-OES18, self-constructed patient satisfaction questionnaire, estimated full cost prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimman et al. 2010, The Netherlands</td>
<td>Telephone follow-up vs. hospital follow-up</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>Patient satisfaction, Ware’s Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire III (PSQ III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espie et al. 2007, UK</td>
<td>Small group teaching based on CBT, 5 x 1 h vs unspecified usual treatment from GP</td>
<td>Local GP</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Self-care, QoL, Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, Epworth Sleepiness Scale, structured sleep diary, actigraphs, hypnotic medication use, Short Form 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elley et al. 2008, New Zealand</td>
<td>Home-based nurse assessment of falls-and-fracture risk factors and home hazards, referral to intervention vs unspecified usual care and social visits</td>
<td>The home of the patient</td>
<td>Screening followed by intervention</td>
<td>Fall prevention, Rate of falls, demographic and clinical data, Timed Up and Go Test, 30-second chair stand test, four-test balance scale, 7.5-cm block step test, Modified Falls Efficacy Scale, Nottingham Extended Activities of Daily Living Profile, Auckland Heart Study physical activity questionnaire, Medical Outcomes Study 36-Short Form Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison et al. 2008, Canada</td>
<td>Leg ulcer management at home vs nurse clinic</td>
<td>The home of the patient</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Wound care, QoL, patient satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dierick-van Daele et al. 2009, The Netherlands</td>
<td>Consultation by NP vs consultation by GP</td>
<td>GP practice</td>
<td>One nurse/GP and one patient</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumville et al. 2009, UK</td>
<td>Larval therapy vs standard debridement technique (hydrogel) for slough or necrotic leg ulcer</td>
<td>Hospital and the home of the patient</td>
<td>Nurse and patient</td>
<td>Wound care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spice et al. 2009, UK</td>
<td>Nurse assessed risk factors and targeted referral to professionals in the community vs multi-</td>
<td>General practices and clinic in the community</td>
<td>One professional and one patient</td>
<td>Screening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Critical perspectives on how to handle social contexts in RCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ter Bogt et al. 2009, The Netherlands</td>
<td>Life-style intervention vs unspecified usual care by GP</td>
<td>Clinic and Telephone</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Instruction, Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamers et al. 2006, 2010, The Netherlands</td>
<td>Minimal psychological intervention and unspecified usual care vs unspecified usual care</td>
<td>The home of the patient</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Counselling, education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulm et al. 2010, Germany</td>
<td>Intensive care programme vs routine visits at GP</td>
<td>GP’s clinic</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Disease control, advice on lifestyle change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearden et al. 2006, 2010, UK</td>
<td>Pragmatic rehabilitation vs Supportive Listening treatment vs GP usual treatment (unspecified)</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>One Nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan et al. 2006, UK</td>
<td>30-min follow-up consultation by CNS vs by respiratory doctor</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>One Nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Assessment, education, medication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sridhar et al. 2008, UK</td>
<td>Pulmonary rehabilitation vs unspecified care from GP/nurse</td>
<td>Hospital, the home of the patient and telephone</td>
<td>Groups of patients/one patient and one nurse</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willems et al. 2008, The Netherlands</td>
<td>Tele-monitoring programme vs unspecified regular outpatient care</td>
<td>Internet and telephone</td>
<td>One Nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Symptom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antic et al. 2009, Australia</td>
<td>Home-based simplified nurse-led model of care vs two laboratory polysomnograms to diagnose and treat OSA, with clinical care supervised by physician</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Consultation, managemen t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitacca et al. 2009, Italy</td>
<td>Tele-assistance care programme vs specified usual outpatient follow-up</td>
<td>Interactive session between clinic and the home of the</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Consultation, counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Patient Details</td>
<td>Counseling/Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamers et al. 2010, The Netherlands</td>
<td>Minimal psychological intervention vs usual care according to the clinical guidelines for the treatment of COPD of the Dutch College of GPs</td>
<td>The home of the patient</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Counselling, therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Meer et al. 2009, 2010, The Netherlands</td>
<td>Internet based self-management algorithm vs asthma care according to the Dutch GP guidelines</td>
<td>Internet and telephone</td>
<td>Professionals and patient</td>
<td>Managing asthma, advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan et al. 2006, UK</td>
<td>Consultation according to Pendleton’s seven task by CNS vs outpatient consultation by clinical nurse</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>One nurse and one patient</td>
<td>Consultation, monitoring, medication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill et al. 2009, UK</td>
<td>Case management by CNS vs Case management by JHD</td>
<td>CNS clinic</td>
<td>One professional and one patient</td>
<td>Consultation, treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QoL=Quality of Life, HRQoL= Health-related quality of life, AMI=acute myocardial infarction, SPB=Systolic blood pressure, LOS=length of
hospital stay, BP=Blood Pressure, BMI=Body Mass Index, CNS=clinical nurse specialist, NP=Nurse Practitioner, GP=General Practitioner, CBT=cognitive behavioral therapy, COPD=Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, BP=blood pressure, JHD=junior hospital doctor.