

A rapid evidence map of what evidence is available on the effectiveness of community diagnostic centres

Authors: Alesha Wale¹, Chukwudi Okolie¹, Jordan Everitt¹, Amy Hookway¹, Hannah Shaw¹, Kirsty Little¹, Ruth Lewis², Alison Cooper², Adrian Edwards²

1 Public Health Wales, Wales, United Kingdom

2 Wales COVID-19 Evidence Centre, Wales, United Kingdom

Abstract: The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in increased demand and delays to diagnostic services. Community diagnostic centres (which are generally referred to as Regional Diagnostic Hubs in Wales) aim to reduce this backlog and the waiting times for patients by providing a broad range of elective diagnostic services in the community, away from acute hospital facilities. As diagnostic services account for over 85% of clinical pathways and cost the National Health Service (NHS) over six billion pounds a year (NHS 2022), community diagnostic centres across a broader range of diagnostic services may be an effective, efficient, and cost-effective introduction to the UK health sector. This Rapid Evidence Map aimed to identify, describe, and map the available evidence on the effectiveness of diagnostic centres.

50 primary studies were identified. Studies were published between 1995 and 2021:

A wide range of study designs were used, and studies were conducted in a range of countries including the UK. 30 studies were specific to cancer diagnosis, whilst the remaining 20 studies focused on diagnosis associated with: anaemia, autism, cerebral palsy, intellectual disability, multiple sclerosis, respiratory conditions, shoulder pain, and unexplained fever. Eleven studies reported information on multi-condition diagnostic centres, rather than a specific condition.


The majority of studies were conducted within hospital settings. Two studies evaluated diagnostic centres within a community setting. The diagnostic centres offered a wide range of diagnostic tests and incorporated different staff and facilities. Participants were mainly referred by GPs, primary care centres and emergency departments. However, referrals were also made from outpatient clinics located within the same hospital as the diagnostic centre.

Over 100 different outcomes were reported covering: patient data and referral outcomes, clinical outcomes, performance outcomes, economic outcomes, and patient and physician-reported outcomes.

The findings of this rapid evidence map were used to select a substantive focus for a subsequent rapid review on community diagnostic centres that can be accessed by primary care teams.

Funding statement: Public Health Wales was funded for this work by the Wales COVID-19 Evidence Centre, itself funded by Health & Care Research Wales on behalf of Welsh Government.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.



Wales COVID-19 Evidence Centre (WCEC) Rapid Evidence Map

A rapid evidence map of what evidence is available on the effectiveness of community diagnostic centres

Report number – REM00043 September 2022

Rapid Review Details

Review conducted by:
Public Health Wales (PHW)

Review Team:

- Alesha Wale, Public Health Wales, Alesha.Wale@wales.nhs.uk
- Chukwudi Okolie, Public Health Wales, Chukwudi.Okolie@wales.nhs.uk
- Jordan Everitt, Public Health Wales, Jordan.Everitt2@wales.nhs.uk
- Amy Hookway, Public Health Wales, amy.hookway2@wales.nhs.uk
- Hannah Shaw, Public Health Wales, Hannah.Shaw@wales.nhs.uk
- Kirsty Little, Public Health Wales, Kirsty.Little@wales.nhs.uk

Review submitted to the WCEC on: October 2022

Stakeholder consultation meeting: 13th September 2022

Rapid Evidence Map report issued by the WCEC on: November 2022

WCEC Team:

- Adrian Edwards, Alison Cooper, Ruth Lewis, Micaela Gal, Jane Greenwell and Helen Freegard involved in drafting the Topline Summary and editing

This review should be cited as:

REM00043.Wales COVID-19 Evidence Centre. A rapid evidence map of effectiveness of community diagnostic centres. October 2022

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors, not necessarily Health and Care Research Wales. The WCEC and authors of this work declare that they have no conflict of interest.

A rapid evidence map of what evidence is available on the effectiveness of community diagnostic centres

Report number – REM00043 September 2022

FULL REPORT

TOPLINE SUMMARY

What are Rapid Evidence Maps?

Our Rapid Evidence Maps (REMs) use abbreviated **systematic mapping or scoping review methods** to provide a description of the nature, characteristics, and volume of the available evidence for a particular policy domain or research question. They are mainly based on the assessment of abstracts and incorporate an a priori protocol, systematic search, screening, and minimal data extraction. They may sometimes include critical appraisal, but **no evidence synthesis is conducted**. Priority is given, where feasible, to studies representing robust evidence synthesis. They are designed and used primarily **to identify a substantial focus for a rapid review, and key research gaps in the evidence-base**. (*N.B. Evidence maps are not suitable to support evidence-informed policy development, as they do not include a synthesis of the results.*)

This report is linked to a subsequent focused rapid review published as: RR00043_Wales COVID-19 Evidence Centre. What is the effectiveness of community diagnostic centres: a rapid review. November 2022.

Who is this summary for?

Welsh Government Technical Advisory Cell (TAC)

Background / Aim of Rapid Evidence Map

The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in increased demand and delays to diagnostic services. **Community diagnostic centres** (which are generally referred to as Regional Diagnostic Hubs in Wales) aim to reduce this backlog and the waiting times for patients by **providing a broad range of elective diagnostic services in the community, away from acute hospital facilities**. As diagnostic services account for over 85% of clinical pathways and cost the NHS over £6 billion a year (NHS 2022), community diagnostic centres across a broader range of diagnostic services may be an effective, efficient, and cost-effective introduction to the UK health sector.

A preliminary review of the literature identified a large volume of primary studies looking at a broad range of outcomes in relation to different types of diagnostic centres. After discussion with the stakeholders, it was agreed that an evidence map would be useful to understand what evidence exists for the effectiveness of community diagnostic centres, enable stakeholders to identify a focus for a rapid review, and highlight the gaps in evidence base. **This Rapid Evidence Map aimed to identify, describe and map the available evidence on the effectiveness of diagnostic centres**. For the purpose of the report, we use the same 'community diagnostic centre' descriptor to incorporate the **variety of descriptors** used for these services. However, the different names and definitions provided within individual studies are also outlined and discussed. Due to the **variation in the location** of community diagnostic centres, **studies were not assessed for inclusion according to their location** (i.e., in the community, primary care, or hospital setting), instead, they were **assessed according to the services they provide, who they provide them for, and their accessibility to primary care / community health care services**.

Key Findings

50 primary studies were identified (sample sizes ranged from nine to 62,333 participants).

Summary of the evidence base

- There were 27 comparative studies and 23 non-comparative studies. A **wide range of study designs were used**, including RCTs (n=2), modelling study, quasi-experimental studies, descriptive audits, and evaluation studies looking at a single population as they passed through the diagnostic centre.
- Studies were conducted in a **range of countries including the UK (n=21)**, Spain (n=17), Canada (n=8), Australia (n=2), Denmark (n=1) and The Netherlands (n=1). Of the 21 studies conducted in the UK, three were from Wales (one was focussed on an autism diagnostic centre and two were cancer specific).
- **30 studies were specific to cancer diagnosis**, whilst the remaining 20 studies focused on diagnosis associated with: anaemia (n=1), autism (n=1), cerebral palsy (n=1), intellectual disability (n=1), multiple sclerosis (n=1), respiratory conditions (n=1), shoulder pain (n=1) and unexplained fever (n=1). Eleven studies reported information on multi-condition diagnostic centres, rather than a specific condition and one study did not report a diagnosis of interest.
- The **majority of studies were conducted within hospital settings (n=45)**. Two studies evaluated diagnostic centres within a community setting. Three studies did not report the location.
- The diagnostic centres offered a **wide range of diagnostic tests and incorporated different staff and facilities**.
- Participants were **mainly referred by GPs (n=23), primary care centres (n=21)** and emergency departments (n=18). However, referrals were also made from outpatient clinics located within the same hospital as the diagnostic centre (n=8), medical specialists (n=5), specialist outpatient clinics (n=3), other settings (the definition of this was not described) (n=3), inpatient wards (n=1), and community specialists (n=1). Four studies did not clearly report where the referrals originated.
- **113 different outcomes were reported** covering: patient data and referral outcomes (n=47); clinical outcomes (n=45); performance outcomes (n=43); economic outcomes (n=22) and patient and physician-reported outcomes (n=21).

Recency of the evidence base

- Studies were published between 1995 and 2021, with the data collected between 1993 and 2019

Best quality evidence

- **Two RCTs** (Harcourt et al 1998, Dey et al 2002) were identified, both conducted in the UK and were specific to the diagnosis of breast cancer. Both made comparisons between a one-stop clinic and conventional clinic arrangements.

Implications for a Rapid Review

The findings of the REM were used to select a substantive focus for a subsequent rapid review and the different options discussed at a stakeholder meeting (held on the 13th September 2022). A decision was made to focus on community diagnostic centres that can be accessed by primary care teams, and the evidence relating to any condition should be considered, not just cancer. It was decided that the primary outcomes should align with the need to evaluate whether community diagnostic centres can increase capacity for diagnostics and reduce pressure on secondary care, as well as ensure equity in uptake or access. Economic outcomes were also considered pertinent. Finally, the review should be limited to comparative studies, prioritising evidence from studies using more robust study designs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	5
1. BACKGROUND.....	7
1.1 Who is this Rapid Evidence Map for?	7
1.2 Purpose of this review	7
1.3 Definition of diagnostic centres	8
2. FINDINGS	8
2.1 Overview of the available evidence	8
2.2 Methodology of studies identified.....	11
2.3 Country of origin of included studies	11
2.4 Outcomes measured	12
3. DISCUSSION	15
3.1 Summary of the findings.....	15
3.2 Limitations of the available evidence/evidence gaps	15
3.3 Strengths and limitations of this Rapid Evidence Map	16
3.4 Implications and next steps.....	16
4. REFERENCES.....	17
5. RAPID EVIDENCE MAP METHODS	18
5.1 Eligibility criteria	18
5.2 Literature search.....	18
5.3 Study selection process.....	19
5.4 Data extraction and coding/charting	19
6. EVIDENCE	21
6.1 Study selection flow chart.....	21
7. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	22
7.1 Conflicts of interest	22
7.2 Acknowledgements.....	22
8. ABOUT THE WALES COVID-19 EVIDENCE CENTRE (WCEC)	23
9. APPENDIX	24
APPENDIX 1. Diagnostic centre characteristics table.....	24
APPENDIX 2. Investigation into the use of the same data across multiple studies	39
APPENDIX 3. Outcome map for all cancer specific studies and outcome map for all non-cancer specific studies	58
APPENDIX 4: Resources searched during Rapid Review Searching	62
APPENDIX 5. Search strategy used for MEDLINE	65

Abbreviations:

Acronym	Full Description
CDC	Complex Diagnostic Clinic
CMV	Cytomegalovirus
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease 2019
CT	Computed Tomography
DDC	Demyelinating Disease Diagnostic Clinic
EBV	Epstein–Barr virus
ED	Emergency Department
ERCP	Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography
FNPA	Fine-Needle Puncture Aspiration
FUN	Fever of Uncertain Nature
GNC	General Neurology Clinic
GP	General Practitioner
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IU	Inpatient Investigation Unit
MRI	Magnetic Resonance Imaging
NHS	National Health Service
PCC	Primary Care Centres
PET-CT	Positron Emission Tomography-Computed Tomography
PHC	Primary Healthcare
REM	Rapid Evidence Map
RR	Rapid Review
RCT	Randomised Controlled Trial
QDU	Quick Diagnosis Unit
TAC	Technical Advisory Cell
UK	United Kingdom
WCEC	Welsh Covid-19 Evidence Centre

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Who is this Rapid Evidence Map for?

This Rapid Evidence Map was conducted as part of the Wales COVID-19 Evidence Centre Work Programme. The above question was suggested by the Welsh Government Technical Advisory Cell (TAC).

1.2 Purpose of this review

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a direct impact on the number of patients awaiting diagnostic services due to the prioritisation of urgent treatments and the suspension of non-urgent appointments in March 2020 (Welsh Government 2021). The backlog brought about by the pandemic has resulted in an increased demand for diagnostic services, which in turn has resulted in increased waiting times for diagnostics and treatment. In Wales, evidence has shown that the number of patients waiting longer than the target of eight weeks for diagnostics increased by 41.2% between March 2020 and April 2022 (Welsh Parliament 2022). In order to reduce the backlog and delays to diagnostic services, a report of the Independent Review of Diagnostic Services for NHS England recommended the creation of community diagnostic centres (National Health Service England 2020). Community diagnostic centres aim to reduce this backlog and the waiting times for patients by providing a broad range of elective diagnostic services in the community, away from acute hospital facilities. In Wales, community diagnostic centres are generally referred to as **Regional Diagnostic Hubs**.

In England, community diagnostic centres were first launched in 2021 (Department of Health and Social Care 2021), and now over 90 community diagnostic centres have been opened with plans to open up to 160 centres by 2025 (National Health Service England 2022). In Wales, a plan to create a network of community diagnostic centres has also been outlined by the Welsh Government (Welsh Government 2022). As diagnostic services account for over 85% of clinical pathways and cost the NHS over £6 billion a year (National Health Service 2022), community diagnostic centres across a broader range of diagnostic services may be an effective, efficient, and cost-effective introduction to the UK health sector. These services will ensure timely diagnosis and reduced waiting times and would make sure people receive the right treatment or get referred to the right specialists.

Our initial investigation into this topic identified a large number of primary studies looking at a broad range of outcomes in relation to diagnostic centres. After discussion with stakeholders, it was agreed a rapid evidence map (REM) would be useful to understand the available evidence.

This REM seeks to understand what available evidence exists for the effectiveness of community diagnostic centres. This will be used to identify a substantive focus for a subsequent Rapid Review and highlight gaps in the evidence base.

1.3 Definition of diagnostic centres

For the purpose of this REM, community diagnostic centres are defined as health services aimed at improving population health outcomes by providing quicker and easily accessible diagnostic services in the community, which are accessible to primary care practitioners/services, thereby relieving pressure on secondary care services.

In Wales, community diagnostic centres are generally referred to as Regional Diagnostic Hubs to avoid confusion with the descriptors or acronyms used for other similar services. Diagnostic centres are also described within the international literature using a variety of terms and definitions. For the purposes of this REM, we will therefore use the same descriptor 'community diagnostic centres' to incorporate the range of terms used for these services. However, the different descriptors used within individual studies are also outlined and discussed in this report.

Due to the variation in the location of community diagnostic centres, studies were not assessed for inclusion according to their location (i.e., in the community, primary, secondary, or tertiary care), instead, they were assessed according to the services they provide, who they provide them for, and that they are accessible to primary care practitioners/services.

2. FINDINGS

2.1 Overview of the available evidence

Our searches identified a total of 50 primary studies which were published between 1995 and 2021. Data from the primary studies were collected between 1993 and 2019 and sample sizes ranged from nine to 62,333 participants.

We have mapped the location of the diagnostic centres, the diagnosis of interest, and referring physicians or services to the centres, see Table 1.

- We identified 30 primary studies specific to cancer diagnosis and 20 reporting other conditions (hereafter known as non-cancer specific). Non-cancer specific diagnostic centres covered a range of conditions including anaemia (n=1), autism (n=1), cerebral palsy (n=1), intellectual disability (n=1), multiple sclerosis (n=1), respiratory conditions (n=1), shoulder pain (n=1) and unexplained fever (n=1). Eleven studies reported information on multi-condition diagnostic centres, rather than a specific condition and one study did not report a diagnosis of interest.
- The majority of studies were conducted within hospital settings (n=45). Two studies evaluated diagnostic centres within a community setting while three studies did not report the setting or were unclear on the location of the diagnostic centre.
- Participants were most commonly referred to the diagnostic centres by GPs (n=23), primary care centres (n=21) and emergency departments (n=18). However, referrals were also made from outpatient clinics located within the same hospital as the diagnostic centre (n=8), medical specialists (n=5), specialist outpatient clinics (n=3), other settings (the definition of this was not described) (n=3), inpatient wards (n=1), and community specialists (n=1). Four studies did not clearly report where the referrals originated.

- Although three of the primary studies examined multiple diagnostic centres located within different hospitals, only 29 individual diagnostic centres were reported on across the 50 included studies in total.
- The diagnostic centres described within the included studies offered a range of diagnostic tests which can be seen in Appendix 1 (Diagnostic centre characteristics table), along with details about the location and setting of the diagnostic centre, staff and facilities, diagnostic tools, conditions, referrals, and referral criteria.

Table 1. Number of studies per location, diagnosis of interest and referring physician or service


	LOCATION			DIAGNOSIS OF INTEREST											
	Community	Hospital	Not reported/ not clear	Non-specific, multi condition	Autism	Cancer	Cerebral Palsy	Fever of uncertain nature	Intellectual disability	Multiple Sclerosis	Not reported/not clear	Respiratory	Severe Anaemia	Shoulder	Suspected severe conditions (including cancer)
REFERRING PHYSICIAN OR SERVICE	Primary care - GP	2	23*			20	1			1	1	1*		1	
	Primary care – not specific	1	18		8	6	1	1					1		3
	Emergency department		18		8	6		1					1		2
	Outpatient clinics		5		3	1									1
	Specialist outpatient clinic		1		1										
	Inpatient wards/Hospital		4		1	3									
	Medical specialists (not defined)		4			2			1	1					
	Community specialists		1			1									
	Others		1			1									
	Not reported/not clear		4	2		1	5								
Numbers in cells denote number of primary studies. Primary studies may be reporting on the same diagnostic centre															
Note: * One study (Hassett et al., 2006) included a centre that was initially set up within a secondary care hospital, but a peripatetic service was also offered to practices geographically farthest away from Charing Cross Hospital. This study has only been included in the hospital/GP cell															

2.2 Methodology of studies identified

We identified a wide range of study designs among our included studies, including descriptive audits and evaluation studies looking at a single population as they passed through the diagnostic centre. We also identified two RCTs, one modelling study, and some quasi-experimental studies. Some studies compared populations attending a new diagnostic centre with patients who had been diagnosed prior to the opening of a diagnostic centre (this was often classed as usual care). Some studies also compared two populations attending different diagnostic centres. Many studies utilised convenience sampling methods, and some conducted telephone interviews with patients and referring physicians three months or more after the patient had visited the diagnostic centres.

Due to the inconsistent and often poorly reported methods in most of the included studies, it has not been possible to identify the methodology used in the included studies in the given timeframe stipulated for this REM. In order to make inferences about the impact or effectiveness of diagnostic centres, it is important to identify the study methodology used so that only those studies using appropriate methodology are selected. We trialled an algorithm produced by Leatherdale (2019) to classify types of 'natural experiment' study designs, but this was not successful in identifying the study designs of most of our included studies. Any further analysis undertaken on the effectiveness of diagnostic centres will need to identify an appropriate tool to ensure only studies with an appropriate methodology are included.

2.3 Country of origin of included studies



The included primary studies were conducted in a range of countries including the UK (n=21), Spain (n=17), Canada (n=8), Australia (n=2), Denmark (n=1) and The Netherlands (n=1). Of the 21 studies conducted in the UK, three were from Wales.

The 50 primary studies included in this REM reported findings from 29 individual diagnostic centres. This included 17 diagnostic centres reported across the 21 UK studies, four diagnostic centres across the 17 Spanish studies, and four diagnostic centres across the eight Canadian studies. The two studies conducted in Australia reported on two separate diagnostic centres and only one diagnostic centre was included in the single study from Denmark, as with the single study conducted in the Netherlands. As many of the studies

evaluated and collected data on the same diagnostic centre and around the same time period it is possible that the same data were reported across multiple studies. Appendix 2 includes details on the data collection period, study design, population, outcomes, study comparison details and information on the potential risk of data being reported across multiple studies.

It is likely that the large number of Spanish studies identified utilised the same datasets. However, this was not possible to ascertain within our given timeframe because these studies included different (but often overlapping) data collection dates, various populations and often reported different outcomes. As a result, it was decided to treat all Spanish studies as individual studies within the maps.

2.4 Outcomes measured

Across the 50 included primary studies a total of 113 outcomes were reported, these outcomes were grouped into five categories:

- Patient demographics and referral outcomes
- Clinical outcomes
- Performance outcomes
- Economic outcomes and
- Patient and physician-reported outcomes.

Outcomes have been mapped against the location of the diagnostic centre and the referring physician or service in Table 2. Outcomes have also been mapped against the diagnosis of interest in Table 3. Detailed maps of the outcomes reported by each individual study can be seen in Appendix 3.

Table 2: Number of studies by location, referring physician or service and outcomes

		LOCATION			REFERRING PHYSICIAN OR SERVICE									
		Community (n=2)	Hospital (n=45)	Not reported/ not clear (n=3)	Primary care – GP (n=23)	Primary care – not specific (n=21)	Emergency department (n=18)	Outpatients clinic (n=8)	Specialist outpatient clinic (n=3)	Inpatient ward/hospital (n=1)	Medical specialists (not defined) (n=5)	Community Specialist (n=1)	Others (n=3)	Not reported/not clear (n=4)
OUTCOMES REPORTED	Patient demographics and referral	2	44	2	23	21	18	5	2	1	5	1	3	3
	Performance	2	39	1	21	19	18	5	2	1	5	1	3	3
	Clinical	2	40	1	20	16	18	6	3	1	4	1	3	3
	Economic	1	20		15	14	12	4			3		3	1
	Patient and physician-reported	2	17	2	15	7	6	2	1		4		2	2

Table 3: Number of studies by diagnosis of interest and outcomes

		DIAGNOSIS OF INTEREST											
		Non-specific Multi-condition (n=8)	Autism (n=1)	Cancer (n=30)	Cerebral Palsy (n=1)	Fever of uncertain nature (n=1)	Intellectual disability (n=1)	Multiple Sclerosis (n=1)	Not reported/not clear (n=1)	Respiratory (n=1)	Severe Anaemia (n=1)	Shoulder (n=1)	Suspected severe conditions (including cancer) (n=3)
OUTCOMES REPORTED	Patient demographics and referral	8		28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
	Performance	8		24	1	1	1	1	1	1		3	
	Clinical	8		25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	
	Economic	4		9		1	1	1	1		1	2	
	Patient and physician-reported	2	1	11	1		1		1	1	1	1	

3. DISCUSSION

3.1 Summary of the findings

A total of 50 primary studies were identified and reported a range of outcomes exploring the effectiveness of community diagnostic centres.

- A total of 47 studies reported patient demographics and referral outcomes, 45 studies reported clinical outcomes, 43 studies reported performance outcomes, 22 studies reported economic outcomes and 21 studies reported patient and physician-reported outcomes.
- The least common outcome group reported across all diagnosis of interest was patient and physician-reported outcomes. A higher number of cancer specific studies reported on each outcome group compared to the non-cancer specific studies, apart from economic outcomes, which was reported by 12 non-cancer specific studies and only nine cancer-specific studies.
- Only one study was conducted on a diagnostic centre for autism (Kerrell 2001) and this study only reported patient and physician-reported outcomes. However, all other diagnoses of interest reported outcomes in at least three of the outcome categories.
- The two RCTs (Harcourt et al 1998, Dey et al 2002) were both conducted in the UK and were specific to the diagnosis of breast cancer. Both made comparisons between a one-stop clinic and conventional clinic arrangements.
- Of the three studies conducted in Wales, one was focussed on an autism diagnostic centre (Kerrel 2001) and two were cancer specific (Sewell et al 2020, Vasilakis et al 2021).

3.2 Limitations of the available evidence/evidence gaps

The maps have highlighted several evidence gaps. As the majority of studies identified were specific to cancer diagnostic centres (n=30), further research is needed to evaluate diagnostic centres that are specific to a range of other conditions.

Only two studies described a diagnostic centre as being set within the community (rather than hospital-based) and as such further evidence is needed in order to understand how situating diagnostic centres in locations other than hospitals can be of benefit in terms of who accesses them and what effect this can have on waiting times.

It is possible that many of the primary studies identified are not methodologically robust enough to make inferences about the effectiveness of diagnostic centres. However, this has not been investigated in detail, but what is clear is that there was a wide range of methodologies applied to the included primary studies.

Although many of the included studies reported on the same diagnostic centre, the data collection dates typically varied, however many of the Spanish studies appeared to use the same datasets. This could introduce errors to review findings. Any further rapid review will need to take this into consideration and take steps to avoid potential double counting of the same data across multiple studies.

We identified two RCTs, however, the majority of studies included were descriptive in design and therefore not suitable for evaluating the effectiveness of interventions. Any further work conducted after this map will need to take this into account if the focus of the question is about effectiveness of diagnostic centres.

3.3 Strengths and limitations of this Rapid Evidence Map

The primary studies included in this REM were identified through an extensive search of electronic databases, trial registries, grey literature, as well as consultation of content experts in the field. Despite making every effort to capture all relevant publications and reduce the risk of bias, it is possible that additional eligible publications may have been missed or we may have introduced some biases to this REM. We have highlighted this where possible, for example in the investigation into the potential risk of multiple studies reporting the same data.

As we did not set date or country limits, and the data collection dates of the included primary studies are wide ranging, it is possible that the diagnostic centres we have included here may not be the same as the proposed diagnostic centres within Wales. It is also possible that as many of the diagnostic centres included were from other countries where the healthcare system is different to that of the UK, the results may not be generalisable to the UK. As this is a REM, we did not conduct any data synthesis or quality appraisal of included evidence, therefore we cannot report the quality of the studies or overall effectiveness of community diagnostic centres.

3.4 Implications and next steps

A stakeholder meeting was held on the 13th September 2022 where the findings of the REM were presented. Given the available evidence, it was decided to conduct a Rapid Review (RR) of the literature focussing on the effectiveness of community diagnostic centres that accepted referrals from a primary care setting. Due to the often descriptive nature of many of the included studies it was also decided that the RR would only include comparative studies prioritising evidence from studies using more robust study designs.

It was agreed with stakeholders that the primary outcomes should align with the need to evaluate whether community diagnostic centres can increase capacity for diagnostics and reduce pressure on secondary care, as well as ensure equity in uptake or access. Economic outcomes will also be considered as a secondary outcome measure.

4. REFERENCES

Chambers, et al (2016). [Evidence for models of diagnostic service provision in the community: literature mapping exercise and focused rapid reviews](#) *Health Services and Delivery Research*, 4(35), pp.1-362.

Department of Health and Social Care (2021) Available at: [40 community diagnostic centres launching across England - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#). [Accessed 13 July 2022].

Leatherdale; Scott T. Leatherdale (2019) Natural experiment methodology for research: a review of how different methods can support real-world research, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 22:1, 19-35, DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2018.1488449

NHS England (2020) Diagnostic: Recovery and Renewal. Report of the Independent Review of Diagnostic Services for NHS England. Available at: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/diagnostics-recovery-and-renewal-independent-review-of-diagnostic-services-for-nhs-england-2.pdf> [Accessed 12 July 2022].

NHS England (2022) One million checks delivered by NHS 'one stop shops'. News. Available at: [NHS England » One million checks delivered by NHS 'one stop shops'](#) [Accessed 12 July 2022].

NHS (2022) Document 3 - Community Diagnostic Hub (CDH) Draft Qualification Specification. Available at: <https://www.ardengemcsu.nhs.uk/media/2585/document-3-cdh-framework-specification-v111.pdf> [Accessed 12 July 2022].

Welsh Government (2021) NHS activity and performance summary: July and August 2021. Statistics. Available at: <https://gov.wales/nhs-activity-and-performance-summary-july-and-august-2021-html> [Accessed 12 July 2022].

Welsh Government (2022) Our programme for transforming and modernising planned care and reducing waiting lists in Wales. Available at: <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2022-04/our-programme-for-transforming--and-modernising-planned-care-and-reducing-waiting-lists-in-wales.pdf> [Accessed 13 July 2022].

Welsh Parliament (2022) Access delayed: The waiting times backlog in NHS Wales. Available at: <https://research.senedd.wales/research-articles/access-delayed-the-waiting-times-backlog-in-nhs-wales/> [Accessed 12 July 2022].

5. RAPID EVIDENCE MAP METHODS

5.1 Eligibility criteria

We searched for primary sources to answer the review question “What is the available evidence for the effectiveness of community diagnostic centres?”

The following eligibility criteria were used to identify studies for inclusion in the REM:

Table 4. Eligibility criteria

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Participants	Symptomatic patients, all conditions	
Settings	Diagnostic centres	Exclude screening programmes, or where there is treatment undertaken but no diagnostics.
Intervention / exposure	Diagnostic centres/units/hubs and clinics	
Comparison	Usual care	
Outcomes	All reported outcomes e.g. Mortality Clinical outcomes Patient reported outcomes Health care professional reported outcomes Resources Costs Process outcomes Workforce	
Study design	Any design	
Countries	All countries	
Language of publication	Studies published in English	Any study not published in English
Publication date	No date limits set	
Publication type	Published and preprint primary literature	All publication types other than primary literature

5.2 Literature search

COVID-19 specific and general repositories of evidence reviews noted in our resource list were searched on 6th July 2022 by three reviewers and an updated search was conducted on the 3rd of August 2022. An audit trail of the search process is provided within the resource list (Appendix 4). Searches were limited to English-language publications and included searches for primary studies. References of secondary sources identified during preliminary

work were scanned for relevant primary studies and forward and backward citation tracking was also conducted on the secondary sources. This included a mapping exercise and focussed rapid review by Chambers et al (2016) who identified current models of community diagnostic services in the UK and internationally and to identify evidence to support a broader range of diagnostic tests being provided in the community. Although this comprehensive work did not meet our inclusion criteria due to the focus being much broader than diagnostic centres, we draw the reader's attention to it.

Search concepts and keywords around diagnostic units, centres, hubs, and clinics were utilised. The searches combined free text words and descriptors when available. We deliberately kept our search strategy broad to capture as much evidence on diagnostic centres as possible. Resources searched during the REM are outlined in Appendix 4 and the search strategy used to search Medline is available in Appendix 5.

5.3 Study selection process

The searches conducted yielded a total of 4,492 records, 349 additional records were identified through citation tracking of secondary sources resulting in a total of 4,841 records. Records were imported into an Endnote database library and duplicates were removed. After deduplication, a total of 3,653 records remained. The title and abstract of the 3,653 records were screened by one reviewer using Rayyan and if relevant, the full text was also screened using the eligibility criteria from section 5.1. A second reviewer consistency checked all the studies selected for inclusion. If disagreements arose, these were discussed, and a third reviewer was consulted to make a final inclusion decision. After full text screening a total of 50 records met the inclusion criteria for this REM. Section 6.1 outlines this process.

5.4 Data extraction and coding/charting

Data extraction was undertaken based on the full text and conducted by one reviewer. Information extracted included: the countries where the studies were conducted, sample sizes, publication, and data collection dates. Details about the diagnostic centres including the location and setting, staff and facilities, diagnostic tools, diagnosis of interest, and referral criteria have been reported in Appendix 1: diagnostic centre characteristics table.

The maps utilised a basic coding structure. With 113 individual outcomes reported across the studies, coding was used to group the outcome measures into five categories. Patient demographics and referral outcomes included individual outcomes such as patient characteristics, referral source and reasons for referral. Performance outcomes included individual outcomes such as time to first visit, the number of visits and time to diagnosis. Clinical outcomes included diagnostic yield, diagnostic tests, and onward referrals. Economic outcomes included cost per patient, direct and indirect costs of running the diagnostic centres and overall cost saving. Lastly, patient and physician-reported outcomes included patient satisfaction, referring physician satisfaction and service quality.


Diagnostic location has been categorised as community, hospital or not clear/not reported. This coding was based on the information provided within the primary studies. Primary studies reporting on diagnostic centres set within hospital settings included a range of secondary and tertiary level hospitals, as well as the term hospital only. As many of the tertiary hospitals were set in Spain and other countries outside of the UK, and the lack of information provided within the primary studies, the evidence team were unable to ascertain if the typology used to describe the diagnostic centres was the same as for the UK. The

hospital location includes those within secondary and tertiary hospital settings, it was not possible to differentiate where within the community these diagnostic centres were located, so this broad descriptor was used. Unclear/not reported refers to primary studies where it was not possible to ascertain where the diagnostic centre was located.

Descriptors used for 'referring physician or service' and 'diagnosis of interest' were derived from the primary studies during data extraction. Referrals were often accepted from multiple locations and as such single studies have been reported in multiple categories. Diagnosis of interest was usually a single condition, but some studies reported multiple conditions being diagnosed in a single diagnostic centre. These have been categorised as non-specific and it should be noted that these often included a cancer diagnosis among other conditions.

6. EVIDENCE

6.1 Study selection flow chart



From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

7. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

7.1 Conflicts of interest

The review team declares no conflicts of interest.

7.2 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Brendan Collins, Delia Ripley, Jennifer Morgan, Joanna Charles, Leon Wong, Rob Orford and Sally Anstey for their contributions during stakeholder meetings in guiding the focus of the review and interpretation of findings.

8. ABOUT THE WALES COVID-19 EVIDENCE CENTRE (WCEC)

The WCEC integrates with worldwide efforts to synthesise and mobilise knowledge from research.

We operate with a core team as part of [Health and Care Research Wales](#), are hosted in the [Wales Centre for Primary and Emergency Care Research \(PRIME\)](#), and are led by [Professor Adrian Edwards of Cardiff University](#).

The core team of the centre works closely with collaborating partners in [Health Technology Wales](#), [Wales Centre for Evidence-Based Care](#), [Specialist Unit for Review Evidence centre](#), [SAIL Databank](#), [Bangor Institute for Health & Medical Research/ Health and Care Economics Cymru](#), and the [Public Health Wales Observatory](#).

Together we aim to provide around 50 reviews per year, answering the priority questions for policy and practice in Wales as we meet the demands of the pandemic and its impacts.

Director:

Professor Adrian Edwards

Contact Email:

WC19EC@cardiff.ac.uk

Website:

<https://healthandcareresearchwales.org/about-research-community/wales-covid-19-evidence-centre>

9. APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1. Diagnostic centre characteristics table

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
COMPARATIVE NON-CANCER STUDIES						
Bosch, et al (2011). Outpatient Quick Diagnosis Units for the evaluation of suspected severe diseases: an observational, descriptive study . Clinics, 66(5), pp.737-741.	Quick diagnosis unit (QDU) of a Spanish tertiary public university hospital (Hospital Clinic of Barcelona, Spain)	The QDU is staffed by a specialist in internal medicine and a registered nurse, with specialists from other fields assisting. It has a consulting room and a waiting room for patients and families, and it functions daily. The QDU physician and nurse devote five hours a day five days a week (Monday to Friday) to QDU work	Computed tomography, colonoscopy, endoscopy, abdominal echography, bone marrow aspiration, magnetic resonance, echography-guided needle aspiration, jejunoscopy, fiberbronchoscopy, echo-endoscopy, capsule endoscopy and endoscopic retrograde cholangio-pancreatography (ERCP)	Non-specific but including potentially severe diseases	Emergency department, outpatient clinics or primary health care centres	Anaemia, cachexia-anorexia syndrome, febrile syndrome, adenopathies and/or palpable masses, unexplained severe abdominal pain, chronic diarrhoea, rectorrhagia, jaundice, lung and/or pleural abnormalities, unexplained dyspnoea, dysphagia, ascites, anasarca, arthritis
Bosch, et al (2012a). Quick diagnosis units versus hospitalization for the diagnosis of potentially severe diseases in Spain Journal of Hospital Medicine, 7(1), pp.41-47.	QDU of a Spanish tertiary public university hospital (Hospital Clinic of Barcelona, Spain)	The QDU is staffed by a physician and a nurse, and receives administrative support from two secretaries shared with other units	Imaging or pathology tests (not specified)	Non-specific but including potentially severe diseases	Primary healthcare centres and emergency departments	Anaemia, cachexia-anorexia syndrome, febrile syndrome, adenopathies and/or palpable masses, unexplained severe abdominal pain, chronic diarrhoea, rectorrhagia, jaundice, lung and/or pleural abnormalities, unexplained dyspnoea, dysphagia, ascites, anasarca, arthritis
Bosch, et al (2012c). Quick diagnosis units or conventional hospitalisation for the diagnostic evaluation of severe anaemia: A paradigm shift in public health systems? European Journal of Internal Medicine, 23(2), pp.159-164.	QDU of a Spanish tertiary public university hospital (Hospital Clinic of Barcelona, Spain)	The QDU is staffed by a physician and a nurse, and receives administrative support from two secretaries shared with other units	Double endoscopy (colonoscopy, gastroscopy), duodenal biopsy, endoscopic capsule exam, imaging, laboratory or pathology tests	Severe anaemia	Primary healthcare centres and emergency departments	Anaemia, cachexia-anorexia syndrome, febrile syndrome, adenopathies and/or palpable masses, unexplained severe abdominal pain, chronic diarrhoea, rectorrhagia, jaundice, lung and/or pleural abnormalities, unexplained dyspnoea, dysphagia, ascites, anasarca, arthritis
Bosch, Jordán and López-Soto (2013). Quick diagnosis units: avoiding referrals from primary care to the ED and hospitalizations The	QDU of a Spanish tertiary public university hospital (Hospital Clinic of Barcelona, Spain)	The QDU is staffed by a consultant in internal medicine and a full-time nurse, with part-time support from two secretaries. In addition, consultations are provided by specialists from other services as required. The QDU has a dedicated	Imaging and laboratory services	Non-specific but including suspected serious disease, chiefly cancer	Primary healthcare centres and emergency	Anaemia, cachexia-anorexia syndrome, febrile syndrome, adenopathies and/or palpable masses, unexplained severe abdominal pain, chronic diarrhoea, recent severe constipation, rectorrhagia, jaundice, lung and/or pleural abnormalities, unexplained dyspnoea, dysphagia, ascites, anasarca, bone pain with suspicion of malignancy, arthritis, hemogram abnormalities

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
American Journal of Emergency Medicine, 31(1), pp.114-123.		consulting room and patient/family waiting room. It is open for five hours from Monday to Friday			department s	suggestive of primary hematologic disorder, splenomegaly and/or hepatomegaly, monoclonal paraprotein band with or without suspicion of multiple myeloma, neurologic disorders (central, spinal, and peripheral nervous system)
Bosch, et al (2014b). Primary care referrals of patients with potentially serious diseases to the emergency department or a quick diagnosis unit: a cross-sectional retrospective study BMC family practice, 15(1), pp.1-10.	QDU of a Spanish tertiary public university hospital (Hospital Clinic of Barcelona, Spain)	The unit is run by an internal medicine specialist and a nurse, who are assisted by physicians from other specialties. It has a consulting room and a waiting room for patients and companions and operates daily. The QDU physician and nurse dedicate five hours daily, from Monday to Friday, to QDU work	Laboratory tests (blood, urine, or stool analysis), chest X-rays. Further examinations are performed according to the results of previous ones or the clinical course of the disease	Non-specific but including potentially serious diseases	Primary healthcare centres and emergency department s	Anaemia, cachexia-anorexia syndrome, febrile syndrome, adenopathies and/or palpable masses, unexplained severe abdominal pain, chronic diarrhoea, recent severe constipation, rectorrhagia, jaundice, lung and/or pleural abnormalities, unexplained dyspnoea, dysphagia, ascites, anasarca, bone pain with suspicion of malignancy, arthritis, hemogram abnormalities suggestive of primary hematologic disorder, splenomegaly and/or hepatomegaly, monoclonal paraprotein band with or without suspicion of multiple myeloma, neurologic disorders (central, spinal, and peripheral nervous system)
Bosch, et al (2021). A comparative cost analysis between two quick diagnosis units of different levels of complexity. Journal of Comparative Effectiveness Research, 10(5), pp.381-392.	QDU of a tertiary public university hospital (Hospital Clinic) and the QDU of a secondary district hospital (Hospital Plato), both in Barcelona, Spain	Staff at the unit of the tertiary hospital includes a consultant general internist, a senior internal medicine resident, nursing, and administrative staff. The unit is open five days a week. The unit of the secondary hospital is staffed with two part-time general internists as well as administrative personnel	Endoscopies, ultra-sonographies, cytology/biopsy, CT scans, MRI	Non-specific but including potentially serious diseases	Primary healthcare centres and emergency department s	Anaemia, cachexia-anorexia syndrome, febrile syndrome, adenopathies and/or palpable masses, unexplained severe abdominal pain, chronic diarrhoea, rectorrhagia, jaundice, lung and/or pleural abnormalities, unexplained dyspnoea, dysphagia, ascites, anasarca, arthritis
Brito-Zerón, et al (2014). Diagnosing unexplained fever: can quick diagnosis units replace inpatient hospitalization? European Journal of Clinical Investigation, 44(8), pp.707-718.	QDU of a Spanish tertiary public university hospital (Hospital Clinic of Barcelona, Spain)	Staff at the QDU includes a consultant internist, a full-time nurse and two part-time secretaries	Laboratory tests included, among others, acute phase reactants (C-reactive protein, erythro sedimentation rate), hemogram (total leucocytes, manual white blood cell count, haemoglobin, haematocrit, platelets), liver function tests, serum lactate dehydrogenase, serum total proteins and protein electrophoresis, microbiological serologies [e.g. IgM and IgG for cytomegalovirus (CMV), Epstein-Barr virus (EBV), Toxoplasma gondii, human parvovirus B19], HIV testing, b2 microglobulin, specific serum tumour markers, specific serum autoantibodies, specific genetic studies (autoinflammatory diseases), including cultures, imaging studies, endoscopies and cytology/biopsy studies	Fever of uncertain nature (FUN)	Primary healthcare centres and emergency department s	Anaemia, cachexia-anorexia syndrome, febrile syndrome, adenopathies and/or palpable masses, unexplained severe abdominal pain, chronic diarrhoea, rectorrhagia, jaundice, lung and/or pleural abnormalities, unexplained dyspnoea, dysphagia, ascites, anasarca, arthritis
Montori-Palacín, et al (2017). Quick outpatient diagnosis in small district or general tertiary hospitals: A comparative	QDU of urban district hospital (Hospital Plato), and tertiary academic hospital	QDU1 (Hospital Plato) has an attending physician part-time but neither administrative nor nursing staff of its own. QDU2 (Hospital Clinic) staff includes a consultant general internist full-time, a senior internal medicine resident, a nurse part-time, a	Main diagnostic tests (analytical and microbiological tests, simple radiology [X-ray], computed tomography [CT], echography, nuclear scintigraphy, digestive endoscopy, biopsies and lymph node fine-needle puncture aspiration [FNPA])	Non-specific but including potentially serious diseases	Primary care centres (PCCs), hospital	Anaemia, cachexia-anorexia syndrome, febrile syndrome, adenopathies and/or palpable masses, unexplained severe abdominal pain, chronic diarrhoea, recent severe constipation, rectorrhagia, jaundice, lung and/or pleural abnormalities, unexplained dyspnoea, dysphagia, ascites, anasarca, bone pain

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
observational study . Medicine. 96;22, e6886.	(Hospital Clinic), both in Barcelona, Spain	nurse coordinator part-time, and two secretaries part-time. The unit is open 5hours a day, 4 days a week			emergency department s (EDs), outpatient clinics, and from inpatients wards	with suspicion of malignancy, arthritis, hemogram abnormalities suggestive of primary hematologic disorder, splenomegaly and/or hepatomegaly, monoclonal paraprotein band with or without suspicion of multiple myeloma, neurologic disorders (central, spinal, and peripheral nervous system)
Pallan, et al (2005). Evaluation of an independent, radiographer-led community diagnostic ultrasound service provided to general practitioners . Journal of Public Health. 27 (2) 176-181	Community based, mobile diagnostic ultrasound service, England, UK	A radiographer	Ultrasound scans included abdominal, pelvic, transvaginal, renal, and prostate	Not specified	General practitioners (GP)	Not stated
Porter, et al (2003). Diagnosis of MS: a comparison of three different clinical settings Multiple Sclerosis Journal, 9(5), pp.431-439.	Demyelinating disease diagnostic clinic (DDC) at the National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery, University College London Hospitals	The clinic is staffed by a consultant neurologist and a multiple sclerosis nurse specialist	Evoked potential (VEP) testing, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and blood screening	Multiple sclerosis	GP or another neurologist	GPs tend to refer patients with new neurological symptoms, lasting days or weeks with no obvious explanation. Neurologists refer difficult diagnostic cases including suspected primary progressive disease, those with an atypical presentation and those with nonorganic symptoms
Sanclimente-Ansó, et al (2016). Cost-minimization analysis favors outpatient quick diagnosis unit over hospitalization for the diagnosis of potentially serious diseases . European Journal of Internal Medicine. 30, 11-17.	QDU of a tertiary public hospital affiliated to the University of Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain (Bellvitge University Hospital)	The QDU staff included an attending physician, a nurse, and a caretaker.	Blood and urine analysis, X-ray CT, simple X-ray, PET-CT, biopsy, bronchoscopy, cytology, microbial culture, scintigraphy, mammography, specialist consultation, ultrasonography, colonoscopy, electrocardiography, lower and upper gastrointestinal series, esophagogastroduodenoscopy, blood marrow aspiration, flow cytometry	Non-specific but including potentially serious diseases	Primary care centre physicians, emergency department physicians	Anaemia, cachexia-anorexia syndrome, febrile syndrome, adenopathies and/or palpable masses, unexplained severe abdominal pain, chronic diarrhoea, recent severe constipation, rectorrhagia, jaundice, lung and/or pleural abnormalities, unexplained dyspnoea, dysphagia, ascites, anasarca, bone pain with suspicion of malignancy, arthritis, hemogram abnormalities suggestive of primary hematologic disorder, splenomegaly and/or hepatomegaly, monoclonal paraprotein band with or without suspicion of multiple myeloma, neurologic disorders (central, spinal, and peripheral nervous system)
Van Karnebeek, et al (2014). Diagnostic value of a multidisciplinary clinic for intellectual disability . The Canadian	Complex Diagnostic Clinic (CDC) at British Columbia's Children's Hospital	Management team: medical director (paediatrician-biochemical geneticist), clinic manager, senior medical advisor (paediatric neuro-metabolic specialist), and an evaluator. Supported by an interdisciplinary clinician/specialist collaborative	Chromosome microarray analysis, neuroimaging, sequential single gene tests and mitochondrial DNA, blood and urine analysis, biochemical tests, whole exome sequencing	Intellectual disability	Medical specialists (includes biochemical diseases,	Patients with unexplained complex systemic and/or neurologic features were referred to the CDC

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
journal of neurological sciences. 41;3, 333-45.	(BCCH) in Vancouver, Canada	team, with administrative assistance provided by clerks/ research coordinators. Clinical team: lead physicians (from biochemical diseases, paediatric, neurology, psychiatry, developmental paediatrics, and medical genetics. Diverse subspecialist physicians participate in the CDC on an "as needed" basis according to patient's phenotype and problems, including sleep medicine, rheumatology, haematology, neuroradiology and gastroenterology. A biochemical geneticist, a cytogeneticist, a molecular geneticist, and a bioinformatician contribute to case discussions at CDC post clinic rounds			neurology, medical genetics)	
COMPARATIVE CANCER STUDIES						
Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Diagnosis of interest	Referral	Referral criteria
Arnaout, et al (2013). <u>Improving Breast Diagnostic Services with a Rapid Access Diagnostic and Support (RADS)</u> Annals of surgical oncology, 20(10), pp.3335-3340.	Rapid Diagnosis and Support (RADS) Clinic at a university-affiliated tertiary care centre (The Women's Breast Health Centre of the Ottawa Hospital in Ottawa, Ontario, Canada)	A multidisciplinary team of breast cancer specialists (five radiologists, five surgeons, two pathologists, one nurse manager, two nurse navigators, and a diagnostic imaging manager)	Routine screening mammography, initial diagnostic imaging workup (mammogram and/or breast ultrasound) for a breast problem (e.g., palpable mass, breast pain, nipple discharge), or additional diagnostic imaging and biopsy workup following an abnormal mammogram performed at another institution	Breast cancer	Patients are routinely referred to the breast centre by their primary care physicians	Patients referred to the breast centre with a high probability of breast cancer. Patients are routinely referred to the breast centre for either: 1. Routine screening mammogram 2. Breast symptoms requiring diagnostic imaging workup 3. Abnormal outside imaging needing additional diagnostic workup/biopsy
Bosch, et al (2012b). <u>Comparison of Quick Diagnosis Units and Conventional Hospitalization for the Diagnosis of Cancer in Spain: A Descriptive Cohort Study</u> Oncology, 83(5), pp.283-291.	QDU of a Spanish tertiary public university hospital (Hospital Clinic of Barcelona, Spain)	The QDU, which has a dedicated consulting room and patient/ family waiting room, is open Monday to Friday for five hours and is staffed by a consultant in internal medicine, a full-time nurse, and two part-time secretaries. Consults are provided by other specialists on demand. Each of the two 25-bed internal medicine wards is staffed by two consultants, four residents, a nurse supervisor, three teams of three registered nurses working 8-hour daily shifts, three teams of two nursing assistants working 8-hour daily shifts, and a full-time secretary	Radiologic studies, blood tests or culture results, biopsy and other diagnostic analyses	Cancer	Referring agencies include, primary health care (PHC), the emergency department (ED), outpatient clinics	Anaemia, cachexia-anorexia syndrome, febrile syndrome, adenopathies and/or palpable masses, unexplained severe abdominal pain, chronic diarrhoea, recent severe constipation, rectorrhagia, jaundice, lung and/or pleural abnormalities, unexplained dyspnoea, dysphagia, ascites, anasarca, bone pain with suspicion of malignancy, arthritis, hemogram abnormalities suggestive of primary hematologic disorder, splenomegaly and/or hepatomegaly, monoclonal paraprotein band with or without suspicion of multiple myeloma, neurologic disorders (central, spinal, and peripheral nervous system)

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
Bosch, et al (2018). Time to diagnosis and associated costs of an outpatient vs inpatient setting in the diagnosis of lymphoma: a retrospective study of a large cohort of major lymphoma subtypes in Spain BMC cancer, 18(1), pp.1-15.	The QDU of a Spanish tertiary public university hospital (Hospital Clinic of Barcelona, Spain) (QDU1), the in-patient wards of the internal medicine department of Hospital Clinic, and the QDU of the Hospital of Bellvitge (QDU2), a public tertiary university hospital near Barcelona.	QDU (1) is integrated in the internal medicine department of the Hospital Clinic and its staff includes a full-time consultant internist, a senior internal medicine resident, a full-time nurse, a part-time nurse coordinator, and two part-time secretaries. QDU (2) is also integrated in the internal medicine department of the Hospital of Bellvitge and its staff includes a part-time consultant internist and a part-time nurse. Finally, staff in the inpatient setting (three wards) includes two full-time consultant internists, three residents, a full-time nurse coordinator, three teams of three full-time nurses and three teams of two full-time nursing assistants (8-hr daily shifts), and a full-time secretary.	Fine needle aspiration cytology (FNAC), excisional biopsies, Positron emission tomography-computed tomography (PET-CT)	Lymphoma	Primary care and emergency department	Anaemia, cachexia-anorexia syndrome, febrile syndrome, adenopathies and/or palpable masses, unexplained severe abdominal pain, chronic diarrhoea, recent severe constipation, rectorrhagia, jaundice, lung and/or pleural abnormalities, unexplained dyspnoea, dysphagia, ascites, anasarca, bone pain with suspicion of malignancy, arthritis, hemogram abnormalities suggestive of primary hematologic disorder, splenomegaly and/or hepatomegaly, monoclonal paraprotein band with or without suspicion of multiple myeloma, neurologic disorders (central, spinal, and peripheral nervous system)
Bosch, et al (2020). What is the relevance of an ambulatory quick diagnosis unit or inpatient admission for the diagnosis of pancreatic cancer? A retrospective study of 1004 patients. Medicine, 2020, vol. 99, num. 11, p. e19009.	The QDU is based on the Adult Day Care Centre of the Hospital Clinic, a public tertiary university hospital in Barcelona	Staff at QDU includes a full-time consultant internist, a senior internal medicine resident, a full-time nurse, a part-time nurse coordinator, and two part-time administrative assistants. The unit is open five hours a day, five days a week. Staff in each of the three medical wards includes two full-time consultant internists, two residents, a full-time nurse coordinator, three teams of three full-time nurses and three teams of two full-time nursing assistants (eight-hours daily shifts), and a full-time administrative assistant.	Upper gastrointestinal endoscopic ultrasound (EUS), US/CT-guided biopsy, contrast-enhanced thin-slice CT scan of the chest, abdomen, and pelvis	Pancreatic Cancer	Primary care centres and emergency departments	Not stated however presenting clinical manifestations included: presence or absence of weight loss, asthenia, anorexia, nausea or vomiting, change in bowel habit, abdominal pain, back pain, pruritus, lethargy or depression, thrombophlebitis, jaundice, new-onset diabetes, abdominal mass, hepatomegaly, and peripheral lymphadenopathy;
Choudhury, et al (2013). A multidisciplinary audit of head and neck referrals: considerations for patients' timelines and outcomes. European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology, 270(12), pp.3121-3126.	A 'Rapid Diagnostic Clinic' (RDC) within the ENT department (of Barts Health NHS Trust, London)	ENT head and neck specialist, either a consultant or specialist registrar, consultant head and neck radiologist, consultant histopathologist,	Ultrasonography, and fine needle aspiration cytology (FNAC)	Head and neck cancer	GPs and other specialities within the hospital	Not stated
Dey, et al (2002). Costs and benefits of a one stop clinic compared with a dedicated breast clinic: randomised controlled	A one stop clinic and a dedicated breast clinic at a teaching hospital (Withington)	The dedicated breast clinic staffed by two consultants, two senior registrars, and two registrars.	Mammogram, ultrasonography, fine needle aspiration cytology, core biopsy, aspiration of cyst and excision biopsy	Breast cancer	Not stated	Referred with a breast lump

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
trial. Bmj, 324(7336), pp.507-510.	Hospital, Manchester)	The one stop clinic staffed by a consultant radiologist, a consultant pathologist, and a grade 3 laboratory technician.				
Harcourt, et al (1998). <u>Evaluation of a one-stop breast lump clinic: a randomized controlled trial.</u> The Breast, 7(6), pp.314-319.	One stop clinic in a hospital (location not given)	All clinics were conducted by the same two surgeons (one consultant, one staff grade)	Triple assessment (consisting of clinical examination, ultrasound scanning and cytology). Mammography, when needed, was then carried out by radiologists in the hospital's general X-ray department. Cytology specimens were analysed in the pathology department sited elsewhere in the hospital.	Breast cancer	GP	Referred with a breast lump
McKevitt, et al (2017). <u>Reduced Time to Breast Cancer Diagnosis with Coordination of Radiological and Clinical Care.</u> Cureus. 9;12. e1919.	Rapid Access Breast Clinic (RABC) at a Hospital in British Columbia, Canada	Clerical staff, radiologists, surgeons, nurse navigator clinic family physician (FP)	Single site for coordinated clinical and radiological assessment of breast problems. Offers on-site mammography, breast ultrasound, ultrasound-guided biopsy, and mammographic and ultrasound-guided fine wire localization.	Breast cancer	Family physician (FP)	Referred with either an abnormal screening mammogram or for assessment of a breast symptom.
Næser, et al (2018). <u>Mortality of patients examined at a diagnostic centre: A matched cohort study.</u> Cancer epidemiology. 55, 130-135.	Diagnostic centre at the Diagnostic Centre, Silkeborg Regional Hospital, Denmark,	All medical specialties are represented in the Diagnostic Centre	Not really specified however at the diagnostic centre, patients undergo individual diagnostic programmes, based on the medical history and the results of investigations; these are developed in a close cooperation between relevant experts, and all medical specialties are represented in the Diagnostic Centre at Silkeborg Regional Hospital,	Cancer	GP referral	Not stated
Naik, et al (2001). <u>The feasibility of a one-stop colposcopy clinic in the management of women with low grade smear abnormalities: a prospective study.</u> European journal of obstetrics, gynaecology, and reproductive biology. 98;2, 205-208.	One-stop colposcopy clinic within the Northern Gynaecological Oncology Centre, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, England, UK	Not stated	Loop and punch biopsies, treatment at the first clinic visit for women with high grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN).	Cervical smear abnormalities	Not stated	Women with low-grade smear abnormalities
Nixon, et al (2020). <u>Evaluation of Lymphadenopathy and Suspected Lymphoma in a Lymphoma Rapid</u>	Lymphoma Rapid diagnosis clinic (LRDC) based in a tertiary cancer	The clinic was led by a Nurse practitioner; however, it appears weekly dedicated operating rooms for lymphoma biopsies were used by head and neck, thoracic, and general surgeons, and biopsy material	Laboratory tests, peripheral blood flow cytometry, tuberculosis skin testing, abdominal ultrasound, computed tomography scans, bone marrow biopsy, or FNA. Referral to surgical services for consideration of excisional lymph node biopsy or radiology for image	Lymphadenopathy and suspected lymphoma	Primary care or medicine, ER, or	Lymphadenopathy on the basis of clinical assessment or imaging, biopsy results suspicious for lymphoma, or peripheral blood abnormalities.

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
<u>Diagnosis Clinic</u> . JCO oncology practice. 16;1, e29-e36.	centre (Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, Toronto, Canada)	from outside facilities were reviewed by hemapathologists when available.	guided core biopsy was requested based on location and size of lymphadenopathy		community specialists	Patient symptoms included: symptoms of viral infection, "B" symptoms, new pain, pruritus, palpable lymph nodes, lymphocytosis (ALC > 4.0 X 10 ⁹ /L)
Racz, et al (2016). <u>Improving patient flow and timeliness in the diagnosis and management of breast abnormalities: the impact of a rapid diagnostic unit</u> . Current Oncology. 23;3. E260-5	Rapid diagnostic unit (RDU), Odette Cancer Centre, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, Toronto, Canada	Radiologists, pathologists, surgeons, nurses, and administrative personnel	Radiology, imaging with mammogram + / - ultrasound, sore biopsy + / - fine needle aspiration	Breast abnormalities including cancer	Not stated	Individuals with suspicious abnormalities (Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System 4 or 5) on mammography, breast ultrasonography, or clinical examination
Sethukavalan, et al (2013). <u>Improved wait time intervals for prostate cancer patients in a multidisciplinary rapid diagnostic unit compared to a community-based referral pattern</u> . Canadian Urological Association journal. 7;7, 244-250.	RDU (The Gale and Graham Wright Prostate Centre), North York General Hospital, Branson Site, Toronto, Canada	Radiation oncology and urology specialists	Not explicitly stated but appears to include biopsies	Prostate cancer	Urologists or family physicians	Patients with suspicion of cancer either from their family physician (based on a prostate-specific antigen (PSA) test), because of symptoms, or an abnormal digital rectal exam (DRE), which warranted further testing or referral to a specialist to definitively diagnose or rule out cancer
Sewell, et al (2020). <u>Rapid cancer diagnosis for patients with vague symptoms: a cost-effectiveness study</u> . The British journal of general practice. 70;692, e186-e192	Rapid diagnostic centre (RDC), Neath Port Talbot Hospital, Wales, UK	Consultant physician, a radiologist, a clinical nurse specialist (CNS), and a healthcare support worker (HCSW). Management and clinical guidance are provided by the RDC coordination manager and GP project lead. Two half-day clinics a week with five available clinic slots	Physical examination, computed tomography (CT)	Cancer	GPs	Patients with vague and/or non-specific symptoms suspicious of cancer, who do not meet criteria for referral under an urgent suspected cancer (USC) pathway
Webber, et al (2020). <u>Breast cancer diagnosis and treatment wait times in specialized diagnostic units compared with usual care: a population-based study</u> . Current Oncology. 27;4, e377-e385.	Breast assessment site, Ontario, Canada	Not stated	Diagnostic mammography, breast ultrasonography, breast MRI, biopsy	Breast cancer	Not clearly stated, but patients referred by physicians	Not clearly stated, but women with abnormal breast cancer screens or with breast cancer symptoms

NON-COMPARATIVE CANCER STUDIES

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Diagnosis of interest	Referral	Referral criteria
Al Hamarneh, Liew, and Shortridge, (2013). Diagnostic yield of a one-stop neck lump clinic. European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology, 270(5), pp.1711-1714.	Rapid access one-stop neck lump clinic at a head and neck referral unit (New Cross Hospital in Wolverhampton)	Not explicitly described but the unit appeared to be staffed by an ENT surgeon, a cytologist, and a radiologist	Ultrasound scan (USS), Flexible nasolaryngoscopy and Fine needle aspirate cytology (FNAC).	Neck lumps	GP	Not explicitly stated, however patients with a suspected head and neck malignancy were referred to the clinic by their GPs
Basta, et al (2016). Waiting time at a fast-track diagnostic clinic International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance.	One-day diagnostic fast-track clinic (FTC) for gastrointestinal malignancies, located in a Dutch university hospital	Multidisciplinary team (not specified)	Diagnostic tests not specified	Gastrointestinal malignancies	Practitioners throughout the Netherlands (not specified)	Not explicitly stated, however referred patients had either confirmed or suspected malignancy
Berry, et al (1998). An audit of patient acceptance of one-stop diagnosis for symptomatic breast disease European Journal of Surgical Oncology (Ejso), 24(6), pp.492-495.	The weekly symptomatic breast clinic at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, London, UK	Regular staff at the clinic included a consultant surgeon, a senior specialist registrar, a pre-fellowship senior house officer, two specialist breast nurses, a sister, two staff nurses and a variable number of medical and nursing students. For patients requiring 'one-stop' investigations, a consultant radiologist was available for immediate reporting of mammograms and/or the performance of ultrasound scanning. A consultant cytopathologist was available to perform clinical fine-needle aspiration and immediate reporting of dry smears	Mammography, ultrasound scan, fine-needle aspiration, dry smears, ultrasound-guided aspiration, core-biopsy	Symptomatic breast disease	General practitioner	Not explicitly stated, however referred patients had symptomatic breast pathology
Boghossian, et al (1996). The rapid access proctology clinic: An appraisal of one year's experience. Br J Gen Pract. 46;413, 741-742.	Rapid Access Proctology Clinic (RAPC) at St. George's Hospital London, UK	Not stated	Proctoscopy and rigid sigmoidoscopy. Further investigations (colonoscopy and referral to a consultant geneticist) were organised for patients with a positive family history of colorectal cancer.	Colorectal cancer	General Practitioner	Indications for referral included rectal bleeding, altered bowel habit, anorectal symptoms, or a family history of bowel cancer or polyps

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
Bosch, et al (2014a). Evaluation of unexplained peripheral lymphadenopathy and suspected malignancy using a distinct quick diagnostic delivery model: prospective study of 372 patients. Medicine, 93(16).	QDU of a Spanish tertiary public university hospital (Hospital Clinic of Barcelona, Spain)	A consultant internist (attending physician of the QDU)	Physical examination of enlarged lymph node, ultrasonography, cytological and histological investigations (FNAC), surgical biopsy, laboratory tests included, among others, acute phase reactants (C-reactive protein and erythro sedimentation rate), haemogram (total leukocytes, manual white blood cell count, haemoglobin, haematocrit, and platelets), liver function tests, serum lactate dehydrogenase, serum total proteins and protein electrophoresis, microbiologic serologies (e.g., IgM and IgG for cytomegalovirus, Epstein–Barr virus, Toxoplasma gondii, and human parvovirus B19), human immunodeficiency virus testing, serum β2 microglobulin, and serum tumour markers including carcinoembryonic antigen, prostate-specific antigen (men), cancer antigen 15-3 (women), cancer antigen 19-9, neuron-specific enolase, and cancer antigen 125.	Unexplained peripheral lymphadenopathy and suspected malignancy	Hospital emergency department (ED) and primary healthcare centres (PHC)	Anaemia, cachexia-anorexia syndrome, febrile syndrome, adenopathies and/or palpable masses, unexplained severe abdominal pain, chronic diarrhoea, recent severe constipation, rectorrhagia, jaundice, lung and/or pleural abnormalities, unexplained dyspnoea, dysphagia, ascites, anasarca, bone pain with suspicion of malignancy, arthritis, hemogram abnormalities suggestive of primary hematologic disorder, splenomegaly and/or hepatomegaly, monoclonal paraprotein band with or without suspicion of multiple myeloma, neurologic disorders (central, spinal, and peripheral nervous system)
Chapman, et al (2020). First results from five multidisciplinary diagnostic centre (MDC) pilot sites in England (Airedale, Greater Manchester (x2), Leeds, London (x5) and Oxford). British journal of cancer, 123(5), pp.722-729.	Multidisciplinary diagnostic centre (MDC) pilot sites (in-hospital) (n = 10) in England (Airedale, Greater Manchester (x2), Leeds, London (x5) and Oxford).	Not stated	Not stated	Non-specific but concerning symptoms, possibly indicative of cancer	Airedale: GP, A&E and Secondary Care Clinic Greater Manchester: GP Leeds: GP, Acute Medicine London: GP Oxford: GP	Airedale: Persistent unexplained abdominal pain, persistent unexplained weight loss, non-specific but concerning symptoms with a high risk of cancer, GP clinical suspicion and too unwell for 2-Week Wait referral Greater Manchester: Non-specific abdominal pain, unexplained weight loss, severe unexplained fatigue, nausea/appetite loss, lymphadenopathy, hepatomegaly, splenomegaly, bloating, GP clinical suspicion and non-iron- deficiency anaemia Leeds: Appetite loss + nausea (unexplained, 40 and over), weight loss (unexplained, 40 and over), abdominal pain without rectal bleeding or weight loss (<3-month duration or recent change in character/severity, 50 and over), anaemia (non-iron deficiency, without evidence of bleeding, 50 years and over), hypercalcaemia (unexplained and persisting <12 months), thrombocytopenia (unexplained and persisting <12 months and GP clinical suspicion and general condition (“poor” general condition) London: Broad range of abdominal symptoms with no clear referral pathway and where patients cannot wait for routine referral, including

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
						new unexplained abdominal pain, unexplained weight loss, persistent nausea/appetite loss, GP clinical suspicion and painless jaundice. Oxford: Severe unexplained fatigue, unexplained weight loss, persistent nausea or appetite loss, new atypical pain, unexplained laboratory findings, no organ-specific symptoms, no symptoms fulfilling referral via the standard 2-week wait pathway, over 40 years old and GP clinical suspicion ("gut feeling")
Chau, et al (2003). Rapid access multidisciplinary lymph node diagnostic clinic: analysis of 550 patients . British Journal of Cancer, 88(3), pp.354-361.	Lymph node diagnostic clinic (LNDC) at a tertiary referral comprehensive cancer centre (Royal Marsden Hospital), Surrey, UK	Medical oncologists and research nurses	Haematological assays including complete blood count, erythrocyte sedimentation rate and peripheral blood film; biochemistry profiles including serum electrolytes, urea, creatinine, bilirubin, total protein, serum albumin, liver transaminases and alkaline phosphatases, lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), immunoglobulins, b2 microglobulin, plasma and urine electrophoresis; bacterial, viral and parasitic serology and culture; imaging including chest X-ray (CXR), ultrasound (US), computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI); fine-needle aspiration and lymph node biopsy.	Unexplained lymphadenopathy	Primary care (GPs)	Not explicitly stated, however patients were referred to the clinic for unexplained lymphadenopathy, 'lumps' in extra nodal sites
Dolly, et al (2021). The effectiveness of the Guy's Rapid Diagnostic Clinic (RDC) in detecting cancer and serious conditions in vague symptom patients . British journal of cancer, 124(6), pp.1079-1087.	Rapid Diagnostic Clinic (RDC) at Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK	Internal medicine consultant, advanced nurse practitioner, admin WTEs	Chest radiograph, optional abdominal ultrasound, radiological investigations, CT scan, Endoscopy, biopsies	Cancer and symptoms concerning for malignancy	GP and internal referrals	Pts ≥ 18 yrs. with ≥ 1 of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General malaise/fatigue • >5% unintentional weight loss • Non-specific abdominal symptoms for > 4 wks. • New or unexplained breathlessness • Unexplained worsening pain (especially back) • Persistently abnormal tests: decreased Hb, increased CRP/ESR, increased platelets, increased Ca, increased LFTs • Significant GP concern for cancer
Elmi, et al (2017). Budget impact analysis of a breast rapid diagnostic unit . Current Oncology, 24(3), pp.214-219.	Breast rapid diagnostic unit (RDU) at a large comprehensive cancer centre (Odette Cancer Centre at Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre),	Nurse navigator, triage coordinator, pathologists, surgeons, radiologists, nurses, technologists and technicians, and other support staff	In addition to the standard tests, requirements extend to bilateral breast ultrasonography, additional mammographic cone views, repeat or bilateral breast biopsies, a fine-needle aspirate of a suspicious lymph node for cytology analysis, fluorescence in situ hybridization for biomarkers to resolve equivocal immunohistochemistry results, and repeat surgical assessment (additional required visit).	Suspicious breast lesions	Any physician within the province can refer a patient to the RDU	The base case was modelled in view of a typical RDU patient with a highly suspicious lesion who requires <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an initial radiology consultation and review of diagnostic images from the past or from the referring institution • bilateral mammography with at least 2 additional cone or magnification views • unilateral breast ultrasonography • ultrasonography-guided or stereotactic core biopsy (with radiography of the biopsy specimen to ensure retrieval of microcalcifications from the biopsy and site concordance) • pathology analysis of the core biopsy specimen

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
	Toronto, Ontario, Canada					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a surgical oncology consultation. (At our institution the surgical oncology team oversees the diagnostic process and discloses results to the patients.)
Gui, et al (1995). <u>Clinical audit of a specialist symptomatic breast clinic</u> . J R Soc Med. 88;6, 330-333.	Four symptomatic (one-stop clinics) breast clinics at St Bartholomew's Hospital, London, UK	Surgical and nursing staff at the clinic consisted of two consultant surgeons, one senior registrar, three registrars, two specialist nurse counsellors and three outpatient nurses. Two consultant radiologists and a cytologist are present at the clinic for immediate reporting of the results. The two radiologists reported mammography and ultrasound investigations, respectively, provided ultrasound guided aspiration, in addition to running routine breast (non-one-stop) radiological services.	Mammography, ultrasonography and cytology	Symptomatic breast conditions	GPs	Not explicitly stated, however, all referral letters were prioritised by a surgeon into urgent and routine categories based upon the presence of a discrete lump, patient's age, clinical suspicion of malignancy and cancer risk
Hawks, et al (2021a) <u>'One Stop Prostate Clinic': prospective analysis of 1000 men attending a public same-day prostate cancer assessment and/or diagnostic clinic</u> . ANZ Journal of Surgery, 91(4), pp.558-564.	One Stop Prostate Clinic (OSPC) at a tertiary public hospital, Western Australia	Consultant, clinical nurse	Same-day urological assessment and/or trans-rectal ultrasound (TRUS) prostate biopsies using periprostatic infiltration local anaesthetic (PILA) with antibiotic prophylaxis. In 2015, a same-day multi-parametric magnetic resonance imaging (mpMRI) prostate followed by OSPC appointment was introduced (reserved for rural men due to the high demand and limited availability).	Prostate cancer	GP	Referral criteria were either two age-related abnormal PSA results or abnormal digital rectal examination (DRE) irrespective of the PSA level.
Jones, et al (2001). <u>Experience with a one-stop colorectal clinic</u> . J R Coll Surg Edinb. 46	One-stop colorectal clinic located in the endoscopy/day case unit, UK	Two doctors (one consultant and one specialist registrar), five nurses, and a clerical assistant. Two consultant surgeons with a declared colorectal interest attended the clinic on alternate weeks.	Rigid sigmoidoscopy, proctoscopy and rubber band ligation, flexible sigmoidoscopy (as indicated), blood tests (as indicated).	Colorectal disease	GP	Patients with rectal bleeding, altered bowel habit, anorectal symptoms, and a family history of bowel cancer or polyps, were considered suitable for referral to the clinic.
Lamah et al. (2000). <u>Three-year evaluation of a rapid-access coloproctology clinic</u> . Dig Surg. 17	Rapid-Access Coloproctology Clinic at St. George's Hospital London, UK	The clinic is always staffed by a consultant, staff grade, senior registrar, and specialist registrar, all specializing in colorectal surgery, supported by four nurses two of whom are endoscopically trained.	All patients undergo rigid proctosigmoidoscopy, and those over 45 years of age suspected of having more proximal disease, undergo flexible sigmoidoscopy following a single phosphate enema. Patients under the age of 45, with bleeding not characteristic of simple haemorrhoidal disease, or with any other symptoms suggestive of more proximal disease also underwent flexible sigmoidoscopy.	Colorectal disease	Primary care physicians (PCP)	Not explicitly stated, however, patients presenting with colorectal or anorectal symptoms, or with a family history of bowel cancer wishing advice about screening, were eligible for referral to the clinic.
Szucs et al, (2016). <u>A Comprehensive Single Institutional Review of 2</u>	Cambridge Sarcoma Diagnostic Clinic of the	Not stated	Ultrasound, MRI, CT scan, X-ray, bone isotope scan, biopsies	Sarcoma	GP	Referrals were made for any soft tissue mass with one or more of the following established characteristics: larger than 5 cm, painful, increasing in size, deep to deep fascia, and recurring after previous

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
Years in a Designated Fast-Track Sarcoma Diagnostic Clinic Linked with a Sarcoma Specialist Advisory Group: Meeting the Target but Failing the Task? Sarcoma. 6032606.	Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (CUHFT), UK					excision or for any bone lesions with radiological suspicion of a primary bone tumour.
Vasilakis et al, (2021). Setting up a rapid diagnostic clinic for patients with vague symptoms of cancer: a mixed method process evaluation study. BMC Health Services Research. 21;357.	Hospital-based Rapid Diagnostic Clinic (RDC) in a University Health Board in South Wales	The multi-disciplinary RDC team is led by a consultant respiratory physician and at the time of the study included the following team members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant physicians (2) • Radiologist (3) • Advanced Nurse Practitioner (1) • GPs (3) • Clinic Coordinator (2) • Healthcare Support Worker (1) • Management support (provided by the Radiology Directorate and Planning Department) 	CT scan, (Blood and urine tests, chest X-ray requested by GPs at the point of referral, so results are available when the patient attends the clinic)	Cancer	GP	Abdominal pain Unexplained weight loss Fatigue Mild anaemia Shortness of breath Nausea Lack of appetite Unexpected lab result GP 'gut feeling'
NON-COMPARATIVE NON-CANCER STUDIES						
Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Diagnosis of interest	Referral	Referral criteria
Gwilym, et al (2007). The one-stop diagnostic clinic in shoulder surgery: costs and benefits. Clinician n management. 15: 37–41.	One-stop diagnostic clinic, Reading Shoulder Unit, Royal Berkshire Hospital, Berkshire, UK	The clinic is staffed by a consultant orthopaedic surgeon specialising in shoulder surgery, a senior clinical research fellow, an orthopaedic registrar, and a specialist physiotherapist.	Examination techniques, radiographs and ultrasound scans, MRI arthrogram	Shoulder problems	GP	Not explicitly stated, however referred patients had acute shoulder problems
Hassett, et al (2006). Enhancing the accuracy of respiratory diagnoses in primary care: a report on the establishment of a Community Respiratory Assessment Unit.	Community respiratory assessment unit (CRAU), Hammersmith and Fulham Primary Care Trust (PCT), UK	Clinic included two specialist nurses, and assistance of a local respiratory consultant Facilities not reported.	The nurse-led service utilised history taking, spirometry, oxygen saturation monitoring and semi-structured reporting	Respiratory diseases	GP	Not explicitly stated, however, referral forms included information on whether diagnosis was definite or suspected asthma or COPD, or unexplained cough or breathlessness Patient's contacted unit directly to arrange appointment

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
Primary care respiratory journal. 15 (6), 354-361.	(Initially Charing Cross Hospital, but a peripatetic service was also offered to practices geographically farthest away from Charing Cross Hospital)					
Kerrell, (2001). <u>Service evaluation of an autism diagnostic clinic for children</u> . Nursing standard (Royal College of Nursing (Great Britain). 15; 38, 33-37.	Autism Diagnostic Clinic, Gwent Healthcare NHS Trust, Wales, UK	Multidisciplinary assessment team (disciplines not stated)	Not stated	Autistic spectrum disorder	Not stated	Not explicitly stated, however the study was aimed at families of children that had recently been diagnosed as having autistic spectrum disorder
Montori-Palacín, et al (2020). <u>Quick diagnosis units: predictors of time to diagnosis and costs</u> . Medicine. 99:30.	Quick diagnosis unit at a district hospital (Hospital Plato), Barcelona, Spain	Not explicitly stated, however costs associated with the QDU include physician, surgeon, anaesthetist, and other medical consultation costs	Imaging, cytology/biopsy, endoscopy, pathology	Suspected severe conditions (including malignancies and other diseases)	Primary care	Not explicitly stated, however referred patients had suspected neoplasm related symptoms (Weight loss, Adenopathy/ masses, Anaemia, Unexplained tiredness, and Ascites Other referral reasons (Fever, Gastrointestinal symptoms, Osteoarticular symptoms, Respiratory symptoms, Neurologic disorders, other test abnormalities than anaemia, other symptoms)
Sancllemente-Ansó, et al (2013). <u>A quick diagnosis unit as an alternative to conventional hospitalization in a tertiary public hospital: a descriptive study</u> . Pol Arch Med Wewn. 123(11):582-8.	QDU of a tertiary public hospital affiliated to the University of Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain (Bellvitge University Hospital)	The unit comprises an internal medicine specialist and a nurse, who work for seven hours a day, two days a week. Support is received through coordinated assistance from other specialists. The QDU has a consulting room and a waiting room for patients and families	Magnetic resonance imaging, scintigraphy, and (F-18 fluorodeoxyglucose [FDG]) positron emission tomography-computed tomography (PET-CT) scans, dedicated circuit for the evaluation of lymphadenopathy. In the case of suspected malignant adenomegaly, fine needle puncture aspiration (FNPA) is performed with cytology studies available in 30 minutes and, flow cytometry is available for the diagnosis of some lymphomas.	Non-specific but including potentially serious diseases, including suspected malignancy	Primary care, emergency department and outpatient clinics	Adenopathies: anaemia, with or without symptoms (haemoglobin level <9 g/l) unintentional weight loss (loss of >10% of body weight during >6 weeks) unexplained febrile syndrome (temperature >38°C; >2 weeks) unexplained dysphagia unexplained persistent severe abdominal pain suspected tumour persistent change in bowel rhythm (>1 month) ascites in noncirrhotic patients lung and or pleural radiologic abnormalities hepatosplenomegaly changes in liver function nonobstructive jaundice abdominal mass metastatic cancer of unknown origin

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
Sancllemente-Ansó et al, (2015). <u>Perception of quality of care of patients with potentially severe diseases evaluated at a distinct quick diagnostic delivery model: a cross-sectional study.</u> BMC Health Science Research. 15;434.	QDU of a tertiary public hospital affiliated to the University of Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain (Bellvitge University Hospital)	The QDU comprises an internal medicine specialist and a nurse, who work for seven hours a day, two days a week in the Unit, with coordinated support from other specialists. The QDU has a consulting room and a waiting room for patients and families.	A wide range of diagnostic tests; care protocol consists of an urgent first visit followed by preferential programming of diagnostic tests and subsequent visits until a diagnosis is made. In addition to the diagnostic tests typical of a third-level hospital in Spain, there is a dedicated circuit for the evaluation of lymphadenopathy. In particular, in cases of suspected malignant lymphadenopathy, fine-needle aspiration cytology is performed immediately at the time of first patient encounter, with cytological results available in 30 minutes; in addition, since November 2011, immunocytochemical studies, especially flow cytometry, are available for the diagnosis of lymphomas.	Non-specific but including potentially serious disease	Emergency department s or primary care centres and specialist outpatient clinics	Predefined referral criteria include peripheral lymphadenopathies, anaemia (with or without symptoms) with haemoglobin level <9 g/l, unintentional weight loss (loss of > 10 % of body weight during > 6 weeks), unexplained febrile syndrome (temperature > 38 °C during > 2 weeks), lung and/or pleural radiologic abnormalities, suspected tumour, abdominal mass, unexplained dysphagia, unexplained persistent severe abdominal pain, persistent change in bowel rhythm (>1 month), ascites in non-cirrhotic patients, hepatosplenomegaly, abnormalities in liver function tests, and non-obstructive jaundice
Soley-Alsina (2020). <u>Quick Diagnosis Unit: an alternative to conventional hospitalization. Two years experience: an observational study.</u>	QDU, Hospital Universitari de Girona Doctor Josep Trueta, Barcelona, Spain	The unit was run by an internal medicine specialist and supported by a nurse. Two doctors attend two afternoons a week for two hours. An administrative assistance schedules visits and tests as required. Referrals are assessed by the Internal Medicine service.	Blood tests, urinalysis, faecal occult blood, culture: sputum, faeces, urine, PPD or IGRA, lumbar puncture, electrocardiogram, x-ray, mammography, CT, bone gammagraphy, ultrasound, MRI, PET-TC, fibro/gastro colonoscopy, bronchoscopy, biopsy, fine-needle aspiration, spirometry, electromyography, mediastinoscopy, inter-consultation with another specialist	Non-specific but including potentially serious illness	Primary care, emergency department (ED) or other hospital environment such as an outpatient clinic of a different specialty	Constitutional Syndrome (Sd) defined as the association of anorexia, weight loss and asthenia (37): due to the importance of this syndrome, if a patient presented it accompanied by another symptom (such as abdominal pain), it was included directly within Constitutional Sd, obviating the other alteration. Incomplete Constitutional Syndrome when they present only 2 of the 3 above categories Isolated weight loss Fever defined as more than 37,7°C axillary measured Adenopathy's defined as a swollen lymph node in any lymphatic region Analytical alterations Medical test alterations such as TC scan, RMN, ultrasound... Skin disorders Pain Lump Arthritis or arthralgia's Others: in which are included conditions that only some of the patients presented.
Te Velde et al, (2021). <u>Age of Diagnosis, Fidelity and Acceptability of an</u>	Early diagnosis clinic, South	Parent or health worker referral, Infant, family and multidisciplinary team attend initial appointment	Neuroimaging, General Movement Assessment (GMA), Hammersmith Infant Neurological Examination (HINE), genetic testing	Cerebral Palsy (CP)	A range of health care specialists,	Neurologist and intake officer assess eligibility

Reference	Location & setting	Staff & facilities	Diagnostic tools	Condition	Referral	Referral criteria
<u>Early Diagnosis Clinic for Cerebral Palsy: A Single Site Implementation Study</u> . Brain sciences. 11;8.	Western Sydney, NSW, Australia.	Ongoing appointments with the purpose of diagnostic process and/or developmental surveillance to 2 years of age. MDT including neurologist, physiotherapist, occupational therapist, speech pathologist, social worker, intake officer, administration assistant and manager. One day/week with 4 x 90 min appointments/day			including GPs and primary care givers	Signs of motor dysfunction, for example: Trajectory of cramped synchronised general movements at writhing age, absent fidgety general movements at fidgety age; or a. Below average scores on standardised motor assessment; or b. Specific motor milestones delay, e.g., hand asymmetry >4 months, not sitting >9 months and either: 5. Clinical history with risks for CP; or 6. Neuroimaging indicating motor impairment

APPENDIX 2. Investigation into the use of the same data across multiple studies

Spanish Studies: Includes 17 individual studies investigating four diagnostic centres NB: Groupings are by hospital site						
Reference	Study duration	Study type	Population	Outcomes	Study comparison details	Information on potential data crossover
<i>Hospital Clinic de Barcelona – Barcelona - described as an 885 bed tertiary hospital with a reference population of around 550,000. Earlier sources describe it as a 840 bed tertiary hospital with a reference population of around 540,000</i>						
Bosch, et al. (2021)	2009 to 2017	Comparative	Aged ≥18 years attending the two QDUs between January 2009 and January 2017 Sample size: 407 patients from each unit (the tertiary unit sample were randomly selected from 6,960 consecutive patients)	Participant characteristics Referral source Referral reason Number of visits Time to diagnosis Diagnosis Mean cost per visit Mean cost per patient Direct and structural costs Indirect costs Personnel costs Diagnostic investigation costs	QDU of Hospital Clinic (tertiary unit) vs QDU of Hospital Plato (secondary unit)	unclear
Bosch, et al. (2020)	2005 to 2018	Comparative	Aged ≥ 18 years with diagnosis of pancreatic adenocarcinoma referred to both settings Sample size: 508 patients from QDU and 496 inpatients	Participant characteristics Referral source Time to first visit Time to diagnosis Risk factors for cancer Predictors of hospitalisation Mean tumour size Tumour site Cancer stage on presentation Charlson comorbidity index Surgical characteristics Mean cost per hospital stay Mean cost per visit Mean cost per patient	QDU of Hospital Clinic vs inpatient setting at same hospital	potential QDU data overlap with Bosch 2021 (i.e., pancreatic ca data only between 2009 and 2017)

				Cost of diagnostic tests Personnel costs Costs of catering/cleaning/laundry/travel/maintenance/administrative/depreciation/consultation		
Bosch, et al. (2018)	2006 to 2016	Comparative	Aged ≥18 years with lymphoma (4 types) Sample size: 1,779 patients. 1,184 outpatients (688 from QDU1 and 496 from QDU 2) and 535 inpatients	Patient characteristics Referral source Time to first visit Number of visits Time to examination Time to diagnosis Diagnostic tests Diagnosis Onward referral Mean cost per hospital stay Mean cost per visit Mean cost per patient Cost of diagnostic tests Cost saving from hospitalisation Personnel costs	QDU1 (Hospital Clinic) vs inpatient wards (within Hospital Clinic) vs QDU2 of hospital of Bellvitge	potential QDU1 data overlap with Bosch 2021 (i.e., lymphoma data only between 2009 and 2016)
Montori-Palacín, et al. (2017)	2009 to 2016	Comparative	Aged ≥18 referred to both settings (chosen randomly) Sample size: 866 participants, 336 from QDU1 and 530 from QDU2	Participant characteristics Referral source Referral reason Time to first visit Number of visits Time to examination Time to diagnosis Diagnosis Diagnostic tests Onward referrals	QDU1 (Hospital Plato) vs QDU2 (Hospital Clinic)	potential QDU1 and 2 data overlap with Bosch 2021 (i.e., pxt data between 2009 and 2016) – note that cases were chosen randomly
Brito-Zerón, et al. (2014)	2008 to 2011	Comparative	All consecutive patients referred to the QDU between November 2008 and April 2011 due to undiagnosed fever Sample size: 344 patients, 176 from QDU and 168 controls (internal medicine dept)	Participant characteristics Referral source Referral reason Number of visits Time to diagnosis Diagnosis Length of hospital stay Diagnostic tests Death during evaluation	QDU (Hospital Clinic) vs internal medicine dept (unclear if same wards as in Bosch 2020 and Bosch 2018)	potential QDU data overlap with Bosch 2021, i.e., FUN data only between 2009 and 2011

				Onward referrals Mean cost per hospital stay Mean cost per visit Mean cost per patient		
Bosch, et al. (2014a)	2006 to 2013	Non-comparative	Patients aged ≥18 years consecutively referred from primary health care and ED to the QDU with peripheral lymphadenopathy between July 2006 and September 2013 Sample size: 372 patients	Participant characteristics Referral source Time to first visit Time to diagnosis Time to treatment Diagnosis Size and site of lump	QDU (Hospital Clinic)	potential QDU data overlap with Bosch 2021 and Montori-Palacín 2017, (i.e., lymphadenopathy data only between 2009 and 2013). Also, likelihood of data overlap with Bosch 2020, Bosch 2018, and Brito-Zerón 2014 (if lymphadenopathy presented with their respective symptoms)
Bosch, et al. (2014b)	2007 to 2012	Comparative	Patients attending the QDU between December 2007 and December 2012 Sample size: 2,190 patients were evaluated, including 1,186 PHC-QDU patients and 1,004 PHC-ED-QDU patients.	Participant characteristics Referral source Referral reason Referral appropriateness Time to first visit Number of visits Time to diagnosis Diagnosis Charlson comorbidity index Death during evaluation Onward referrals	Group 1: patients referred from PHC to QDU (PHC-QDU) Group 2: patients referred from primary health care to emergency department then on to QDU (PHC-ED-QDU)	potential QDU data overlap with Bosch 2021 and Montori-Palacín 2017 (i.e., pxt data from 2007 to 2012). Also, likelihood of data overlap with Bosch 2020, Bosch 2018, and Brito-Zerón 2014, Bosch 2014a and Bosch 2013
Bosch, et al. (2013)	2006 to 2012	comparative	Consecutive patients attending the QDU and patients admitted to the internal medicine service (randomly chosen) between September 2006 and January 2012 Sample size: 4,170 QDU patients and 3.030 hospitalised patients	Participant characteristics Referral source Referral reason Referral appropriateness Time to first visit Number of visits Referral patterns over time Time to diagnosis Diagnosis Length of hospital stay	QDU patients (Hospital Clinic) vs patients admitted to the internal medicine service	QDU data overlap with Bosch 2012a (2,000 consecutive patients evaluated between 2007 and 2010)

				Death during evaluation Onward referrals Mean cost per hospital stay Mean cost per process Mean cost per visit Patient preferences		
Bosch, et al. (2012a)	2006 to 2010	Comparative	Consecutive QDU patients evaluated between December 2007 and July 2010 and patients diagnosed with anaemia (n = 548), cachexia-anorexia syndrome (n = 458), febrile syndrome (n = 240), and adenopathies or palpable masses (n = 208) admitted to the internal medicine department between September 2006 and June 2010. Sample size: 2,000 QDU patients and 1,454 patients admitted to the internal medicine department	Participant characteristics Referral source Referral reason Time to first visit Number of visits Time to diagnosis Diagnosis Length of hospital stay Charlson comorbidity index Hospital bed days saved Onward referrals Cost per hospital stay Cost per process Cost per visit Patient satisfaction Patient preferences	QDU patient's vs patients admitted to the internal medicine department	QDU data overlap with Bosch 2013 (2,000 consecutive patients evaluated between 2007 and 2010)
Bosch, et al, (2012b)	2008 to 2010	Comparative	QDU patients with both initially suspected and ultimately confirmed (pathologically proven) cancer evaluated between November 2008 and April 2010. Also included patients newly diagnosed with cancer admitted to the internal medicine department Sample size: 169 (62.8% of 269 consecutive patients evaluated for inclusion) QDU patients, and 53 Hospitalised patients	Patient characteristics Referral source Reason for referral/consultation Time to first visit Number of visits Time to diagnosis Length of hospital stay Diagnosis Onward referral Mean cost per hospital stay Mean cost per visit Mean cost per process	QDU (Hospital Clinic) vs internal medicine dept	potential QDU data overlap with above studies by Bosch et al.
Bosch, et al. (2012c)	2006 to 2010	Comparative	Consecutive patients with severe anaemia attended by the	Participant characteristics Referral source	QDU (Hospital Clinic) vs internal	likely overlap of patient data with above studies

			QDU and consecutive patients with the same diagnosis admitted to the internal medicine department Sample size: 282 cases from QDU, 252 hospitalised patients	Referral reason Time to first visit Number of visits Time to examination Time to diagnosis Diagnosis Length of hospital stay Charlson morbidity index Diagnostic tests Treatment received at unit Onward referrals Mean cost per hospital stay Mean cost per process Mean cost per visit Patient satisfaction Patient preferences	medicine department	
Bosch, et al. (2011)	2008 to 2010	Comparative	Consecutive patients evaluated in the QDU Sample size: 1,000 QDU patients and ?150 patients admitted to internal medicine department	Participant characteristics Referral source Referral reason Referral appropriateness Time to first visit Number of visits Time to diagnosis Diagnosis Length of hospital stay Diagnostic tests Hospital bed days saved Onward referral Mean cost per hospital stay Mean cost per process Mean cost per patient Patient satisfaction Patient preference	QDU (Hospital Clinic) vs internal medicine dept	likely overlap of patient data with above studies
Bellvitge Hospital – Barcelona - described as a 750 bed tertiary hospital with a reference population of around 350,000						
Sancllemente-Ansó, et al. (2016)	2008 to 2012	Comparative	Patients diagnosed with severe anaemia, lymphoma, and lung cancer selected from consecutive patients referred to	Referral source Number of visits Time to diagnosis Diagnosis	QDU (Bellvitge) vs internal medicine dept	potential QDU data overlap with Bosch 2018 (QDU2)

			the unit between March 2008 and June 2012 and those electively hospitalised at the Internal Medicine Department of the hospital for diagnostic workup during the same period and who had the same final diagnoses. Sample size: 195 QDU patients and 237 Internal Medicine department patients	Length of hospital stay Diagnostic test Mean cost per hospital stay Mean cost per patient Direct and structural costs Indirect costs Personnel costs Diagnostic investigation costs Mean cost saving per patient Overall cost saving Diagnostic investigation cost saving Hospitalisation cost saving Cost saving per patient		potential QDU data overlap with Sanclemente-Ansó (2013) possibly small data overlap with Sanclemente-Ansó (2015)
Sanclemente-Ansó, et al. (2015)	2012	Non-comparative	Consecutive patients aged ≥ 18 years attending the QDU over a 9-month period Sample size: 159 patients (98% response rate)	Participant characteristics Referral source Number of patients seen at clinic Reason for referral Time to first visit Number of visits Time to diagnosis Duration of visit Time in waiting room Diagnosis Onward referrals Patient preferences Patient perception and opinions of healthcare quality	No comparison group	possible QDU data overlap with Sanclemente-Ansó (2016) (i.e., pxt data from June 2012 to December 2012) and possibly Sanclemente-Ansó (2013)
Sanclemente-Ansó, et al. (2013)	2008 to 2012	Non-comparative	Patients attending the QDU between March 2008 and June 2012 Sample size: 1,226 patients	Participant characteristics Referral source Number of patients seen at clinic Reason for referral Appropriateness of referrals Number of successive visits generated from initial visit Time to first visit Time to diagnosis Diagnosis Diagnostic tests Hospital bed days saved	No comparison group	possible QDU data overlap with Sanclemente-Ansó (2016) and Sanclemente-Ansó (2015)

				Onward referrals		
Hospital Universitari de Girona Doctor Josep Trueta - Barcelona - described as opening in 2017 with 364 beds, serving a reference population of approx. 800,000 people.						
Soley-Alsina (2020)	2017 to 2019	Non-comparative	All patients referred to the QDU between June 2017 and June 2019 Sample size: 161 patients	Participant characteristics Referral source Number of patients seen at clinic Reason for referral Time to first visit Number of visits Time to diagnosis Duration of visit Diagnosis Comorbidity index (other measure) Onward referrals	No comparison group	No potential data crossover
Hospital Plato – small district hospital in Barcelona, 160 beds for acute patients and is the healthcare provider for a population of 140,000 inhabitants						
Montori-Palacín, et al. (2020)	2009 to 2016	Non-comparative	consecutive outpatients aged ≥18 years referred to the QDU between November 2009 and December 2016 Sample size: 404 patients	Participant characteristics Reason for referral Time to diagnosis Diagnosis Facilities costs Direct and structural costs Indirect costs Personnel costs Diagnostic investigation costs	No comparison group	possible QDU data overlap with Montori-Palacín 2017 and Bosch 2021 (i.e., pxt data from 2009 to 2016)
Canadian Studies: Includes 8 individual studies investigating four diagnostic centres. Two studies looked at multiple sites across Canada. NB: Groupings are by hospital site						
Reference	Study duration	Study type	Population	Outcomes	Study Comparison details	Info on potential data crossover
Mount St Joseph Hospital, Vancouver						
McKevitt et al. (2017)	November 2009 to December 2009	Comparative	Consecutive patients seen by the three breast surgeons (99% female) Sample size: 373 patients	Participant characteristics Reason for referral/consultation Number of visits Time to examination	Standard care (patients referred to a radiology diagnostic centre by family practitioner,	Rapid Access Breast Clinic, Mount St Joseph Hospital, Vancouver, Canada No data overlap

			Rapid access breast clinic group n=64 Comparison group n=178	Time to surgical consultation/assessment Time from consultation to treatment Time to diagnosis Diagnostic tests	who then discusses results and arranges next steps in diagnostic workup)	
Multiple Sites across Ontario						
Van Karnebeek et al. (2014)	Between 2011 and 2013 (period of 16 months)	Comparative	Children evaluated during seven clinics held over 16 months. The average patient age was 7 years 11 months (range 9 months-18 years) Sample size: 24 children (9 male)	Participant characteristics Reason for referral/consultation Time to first visit Diagnosis Diagnostic yield Diagnostic tests Mean cost per patient Travel and lost income costs Clinic coordination costs Diagnostic investigation costs Patient satisfaction Provider satisfaction	Comparison appears to be each patient's evaluation previous to the CDC, and to reports in the literature of comparable patient groups.	Part of the TIDEX study which was undertaken across multiple locations across Canada Only study looking at intellectual disability, so no risk of data overlap
Webber et al. (2020)	January 2007 to 31 December 2015	Comparative	female patients between the ages of 18 and 104 years of age with bca (International Classification of Diseases for Oncology, 3rd edition, code C50) identified in the Ontario Cancer Registry and diagnosed from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2015 Sample size: 62,333 Breast assessment site group n=34,957 Usual care group n = 27,376	Participant characteristics Frequency of health care encounters Time to diagnosis Diagnosis to treatment Total interval	Usual care diagnosis – (defined as undergoing biopsies in institutions that did not house a breast assessment site)	Multiple breast assessment sites across Ontario Potential duplicate data with Racz (2016) and Arnaout (2013) as data collection dates overlap, but unclear May also be a small data overlap with Nixon (2020) due to overlap of data collection dates, but unclear
Odette Cancer Centre, Toronto, Ontario						

Elmi et al. (2017)	1 year study duration. No dates provided	Non-comparative	No information provided on sample	Personnel costs Diagnostic investigation costs Initiation cost for centre	No comparison group	Rapid diagnostic unit Overlap of data with other studies unclear as not data collection dates provided
Racz et al. (2016)	January 2010 and December 2012	Comparative	Intervention group n=260 patients Control group n=287 patients	Patient characteristics Time to first visit Number of biopsies Time from consultation to treatment Time to diagnosis Diagnosis to treatment Time from immunohistochemistry to management Overall time from referral to management/treatment Lesion size Tumour laterality Lymph node involvement Distant metastatic spread Tumour morphology Treatment modality Diagnostic tests Diagnosis	Historical controls (patients evaluated between January 2020 and December 2010 prior to initiation of the RDU)	Rapid diagnostic unit, Potential duplicate data with Webber (2020) as data collection dates overlap and contain multiple sites, but unclear
Sethukavalan et al. (2013)	2011 to 2012	Comparative	Consenting patients (median age of 70 years (range 48 to 84 years) from the community and RDU who were treated with radical radio therapy at the Odette Cancer Centre in 2011 and 2012 Sample size: 87 patients (from a convenience sample of 100)	Participant characteristics Time from consultation to treatment Time from cancer suspicion to treatment Time to diagnosis Gleason score Time from diagnosis to treatment Time from diagnosis to specialist consultation Patient perceived delays	Patients referred to Odette cancer centre from the community (and not through the RDU)	Rapid diagnostic unit no data overlap as only study looking at Prostate cancer from the Odette Centre

			44 RDU (intervention) patients and 43 community (control) patients			
Ottawa Hospital, Ottawa, Ontario						
Arnaout, et al (2013)	April 2011 March 2012	Comparative	<p>Patients eligible for the RADS programme (mean age 62 years old)</p> <p>Sample size: 211 patients (intervention), 255 patients (control)</p>	<p>Patient characteristics</p> <p>Wait time from the date of confirmation of BI-RADS 5 status of referred abnormal diagnostic mammogram to biopsy</p> <p>Time from biopsy to pathology verification</p> <p>Time to surgical consultation/assessment</p> <p>Time from consultation to treatment</p> <p>Diagnostic tests</p> <p>Diagnosis</p> <p>Personnel costs</p> <p>Patient satisfaction</p>	<p>Historical controls (patients who had a BI-RADS 5 diagnostic imaging in the year before the study)</p>	<p>The Women's Breast Health Centre – a rapid access diagnostic unit</p> <p>Potential duplicate data with Webber (2020) as data collection dates overlap and contain multiple sites, but unclear</p>
Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, Toronto, Ontario						
Nixon et al, (2020)	June 2015 to November 2017	Comparative	<p>Median age 55 years (range, 18 to 95 years), 53% female</p> <p>Sample size: 126 (intervention group only). Unclear number of historical control sample size</p>	<p>Participant characteristics</p> <p>Referral source</p> <p>Reason for referral/consultation</p> <p>Number of biopsies to arrive at diagnosis</p> <p>Imaging available at initial assessment</p> <p>Time from consultation to treatment</p> <p>Time to diagnosis</p> <p>Patient factors and probability of non-malignant diagnosis</p> <p>Lymph node size</p> <p>Location of lymphadenopathy</p> <p>Splenomegaly</p> <p>Diagnostic tests</p> <p>Diagnosis</p> <p>All-cause mortality</p> <p>Death during follow-up</p>	<p>Historical controls (comprised of patients diagnosed with lymphoma at university health network in 2008 and 2012)</p>	<p>lymphoma rapid diagnosis clinic</p> <p>Potential duplicate data with Webber (2020) as data collection dates overlap slightly and Webber (2020) contained multiple sites, but unclear</p>

UK studies:							
Includes 21 individual studies investigating 17 different diagnostic centres. One study looked at multiple sites across England. NB: Groupings are by area							
Reference	Hospital name or location	Study duration	Study type	Population	Outcomes	Study Comparison details	Info on potential data crossover
London							
<i>Dolly et al (2021)</i>	Guy's Hospital	2016 to 2019	Non-comparative	Aged ≥ 18 years with symptoms that do not fit a specific 2 week wait criteria or fit multiple pathways referred between December 2016 and June 2019 Sample size: 1,341 patients	Participant characteristics Referral source Time to diagnosis Time to treatment Diagnosis Cancer stage at diagnosis Cancer detection rate Diagnostic tests Onward referrals	No comparison group	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies
<i>Hassett et al. (2006)</i>	Hammersmith & Fulham CRAU, (community site, no details)	2005 to 2006	Non-comparative	Adults aged 18 to 90 years who were referred by GP with definite or suspected diagnosis of asthma, COPD, unexplained cough or unexplained breathlessness. Sample size: 364 patients	Participant characteristics Number of patients seen at clinic Reason for referral Total number of referrals per month Referral patterns over time Diagnosis Patient satisfaction Referring physician satisfaction Action taken if unit not available	No comparison group	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies
<i>Chau et al. (2003)</i>	Royal Marsden Hospital	1996 to 2001	Non-comparative	Patients aged between 14 and 90 year old patients with unexplained lymphadenopathy or 'lumps' in extra nodal sites.	Participant characteristics Time to first visit Time to diagnosis Time to treatment Diagnosis Size and site of lump	No comparison group	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies

UK studies:							
Includes 21 individual studies investigating 17 different diagnostic centres. One study looked at multiple sites across England. NB: Groupings are by area							
Reference	Hospital name or location	Study duration	Study type	Population	Outcomes	Study Comparison details	Info on potential data crossover
				Sample size: 550 patients	Associations of selected factors with diagnosis of cancer Diagnostic tests Accuracy of diagnostic tests		
Berry, et al (1998).	St Bartholomew's Hospital	1997 (November)	Non-comparative	Patients given appointments (new and follow-up) Sample size: 356 patients	Attendance rates Diagnosis Patient satisfaction Patient preferences	No comparison group	One stop breast clinic Likely to be same clinic as Gui et al. (1995), but different data collection points
Choudhury et al. (2013)	St Barts Health NHS Trust (runs five hospitals – four of which ENT/head and neck services)	2009 to 2011	Comparative	New referrals to the head and neck clinic during a 6-month period Sample size: 197 patients pre-RDC and 299 patients during the RDC	Referral source Time to first visit Number of visits Time from consultation to treatment Diagnostic tests Onward referral	Pre RDC patients and during RDC patients compared	Head and neck clinic, unclear if located in one setting or across multiple No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies
Gui et al, (1995).	St Bartholomew's Hospital	1993	Non-comparative	New and follow-up patients attended over four consecutive clinics. Sample size: 134 new and 386 follow-up patients	Participant characteristics Referral source Reason for referral Number of new patients attending clinic Time to first visit Time from first visit to tests	One-stop clinic vs usual care	Symptomatic breast clinic – one stop. Likely to be same clinic as Berry et al. (1998), but

UK studies:							
Includes 21 individual studies investigating 17 different diagnostic centres. One study looked at multiple sites across England. NB: Groupings are by area							
Reference	Hospital name or location	Study duration	Study type	Population	Outcomes	Study Comparison details	Info on potential data crossover
					Total wait time Time to treatment Diagnosis Support after diagnosis		different data collection points
Lamah et al. (2000).	St. George's Hospital,	Unclear (states over a three-year period) Unit opened in 1993 so may be a 3-year evaluation	Non-comparative	patients presenting to primary care physicians with colorectal or anorectal symptoms, or with a family history of bowel cancer wishing advice about screening Sample size: 3,119 patients (age range 6 months to 96 years)	Participant characteristics Reason for referral Number of new patients attending clinic Number of patients seen per clinic Time to treatment Diagnosis Size and site of lump Referral numbers Patient satisfaction	No comparison group	Coloproctology clinic Likely to include some of the same data as Boghossian et al. (1996) Descriptive study design
Boghossian et al, (1996).	St George's Hospital,	1993 to 1994	Non-comparative	New and follow-up patients seen within first year of clinic opening Sample size: 1,268 patients (mean age 48 years (range 6 months to 96 years)	Participant characteristics Time to first visit Time to treatment Diagnosis Patient satisfaction Referring physician satisfaction	No comparison group	Same clinic as Lamah et al. (2000) and data collected in this study is likely to be included in the Lamah et al (200) study Descriptive study design

UK studies:							
Includes 21 individual studies investigating 17 different diagnostic centres. One study looked at multiple sites across England. NB: Groupings are by area							
Reference	Hospital name or location	Study duration	Study type	Population	Outcomes	Study Comparison details	Info on potential data crossover
<i>Porter, et al (2003).</i>	University College London	1999 to 2001	Comparative	written evidence of a confirmed diagnosis of MS in the case notes of patients investigated during the period April 1999-April 2001. Sample size: 50 patients (age range between 31 and 68 years) DDC patients n=20 GNC n= 10 IJU patients n= 20	Participant characteristics Referral source Time to first visit Number of visits Time to examination Time to receiving results Length of hospital stay Diagnostic tests Support after diagnosis Mean cost per visit Mean cost per patient	Comparison of three different clinical settings: Demyelinating Disease Diagnostic Clinic (DDC) General neurology clinics (GNC) Inpatient investigation unit (IJU)	Retrospective audit over 12 months No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies
Elsewhere in England (or multiple sites)							
<i>Chapman, et al. (2020)</i>	Multiple sites across England	2016 to 2018	Non-comparative	Patients presented with non-specific symptoms in either isolation or in varying combinations. Sample size: 2,961 patients (ages ranged from 17 to 97 years, with an average of 66.7 [SD 14.9]).	Participant characteristics Diagnosis Size and site of lump Cancer stage at diagnosis Associations of selected factors with diagnosis of cancer	No comparison group	Ten operational multidisciplinary diagnostic centre sites (Greater Manchester x 2, Leeds, London x 5 and Oxford) Potential risk of data overlap with Dolly (2021) as study period overlaps, but unsure of exact sites used in

UK studies:							
Includes 21 individual studies investigating 17 different diagnostic centres. One study looked at multiple sites across England. NB: Groupings are by area							
Reference	Hospital name or location	Study duration	Study type	Population	Outcomes	Study Comparison details	Info on potential data crossover
							this pilot study, so unclear risk
<i>Al Hamarneh, Liew, and Shortridge (2013)</i>	Wolverhampton	2008 to 2011	Non-comparative	Consecutive patients attending the rapid access one-stop neck lump clinic over a period of 30 months Samples size: 333 patients	Participant characteristics Diagnostic yield Size and site of lump Diagnostic test Accuracy of diagnostic test	No comparison group	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies
<i>Szucs, et al. (2016)</i>	Cambridge Sarcoma Diagnostic Clinic, Cambridge	2013 to 2014	Non-comparative	All patients referred under the 2ww rule to the Cambridge Sarcoma Diagnostic Clinic of the Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (CUHFT) between 1 January 2013 and 31 December 2014 were identified through the electronic appointments system Sample size: 397 patients (mean age 56.1 years. Range 16 to 93)	Participant characteristics Diagnosis Size and site of lump Diagnostic tests Geographical site of diagnosis	No comparison group	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies

UK studies:							
Includes 21 individual studies investigating 17 different diagnostic centres. One study looked at multiple sites across England. NB: Groupings are by area							
Reference	Hospital name or location	Study duration	Study type	Population	Outcomes	Study Comparison details	Info on potential data crossover
<i>Gwilym, et al. 2007</i>	Royal Berkshire hospital	Unclear	Non-comparative	No information provided	Number of patients seen at clinic Cost per appointment Patient/society cost per patient Total cost per patient Diagnostic investigations costs Overall cost saving (per annum) Total savings to DGH/PCT Cost saving per annum to DGH/PCT Total saving per annum	No comparison group	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies Descriptive study design
<i>Pallan, et al. (2005)</i>	West Midlands (community)	2001 to 2002	Comparative	200 adult patients who underwent diagnostic ultrasound in the community and 193 adult patients who underwent diagnostic ultrasound in NHS trusts	Participant characteristics Time to examination Diagnostic tests Diagnostic investigation costs Average cost per abnormality detected Patient satisfaction Patient preferences Physician satisfaction Service quality	Comparison between community based diagnostic ultrasound services and NHS Trust services	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies Descriptive study design
<i>Dey, et al. (2002)</i>	Withington Hospital, Manchester	1995 to 1996	Comparative	Women aged 35 or over referred with a breast lump. Sample size: 670 women One-stop clinic: 326 Dedicated breast clinic: 307	Participant Characteristics Reason for referral/consultation Number of visits Diagnostic tests Diagnosis Mean cost per patient Patient anxiety and depression	random allocation to attend a one stop clinic or a dedicated breast clinic.	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies RCT
<i>Jones, et al. (2001)</i>	Blackburn Royal Infirmary	Unclear	Non-comparative	Patients referred with rectal bleeding, altered bowel habit, anorectal symptoms and those	Participant characteristics Reason for referral Time to first visit Waiting list numbers	No comparison group	No risk of potential data overlap with

UK studies:							
Includes 21 individual studies investigating 17 different diagnostic centres. One study looked at multiple sites across England. NB: Groupings are by area							
Reference	Hospital name or location	Study duration	Study type	Population	Outcomes	Study Comparison details	Info on potential data crossover
				requesting screening advice Sample size: 197 patients (n=1 screening request)	Diagnosis Diagnostic tests Patient satisfaction		other included studies
<i>Naik, et al. (2001)</i>	Gateshead	1999	Comparative	First 118 women managed in a 'one-stop' clinic during an 8-month period Controls came from a two-week period prior to introducing the new process to target women managed in the standard manner Sample size: 118 intervention group and 110 in control group	Participant characteristics Time from biopsy to pathology verification Time to first visit Time from consultation to treatment Time from first visit to management plan Follow-up for patients who didn't undergo treatment Diagnostic tests Diagnosis Patient preference for future management Patient anxiety and depression	One-stop clinic intervention group and standard care group	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies
<i>Harcourt, et al. (1998)</i>	Bristol	Unclear	Comparative	Women with no previous diagnosis of breast cancer, living within a reasonable travelling distance of the hospital and whose GP referral letter stated the presence of a breast lump were eligible for inclusion. Sample size: 791 (mean age 42.75 years [s.d.	Participant characteristics Time to diagnosis Support offered after diagnosis Diagnosis Cost-effectiveness Patient satisfaction Patient anxiety and depression Quality of life	One-stop clinic and two-stop clinic	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies RCT

UK studies:							
Includes 21 individual studies investigating 17 different diagnostic centres. One study looked at multiple sites across England. NB: Groupings are by area							
Reference	Hospital name or location	Study duration	Study type	Population	Outcomes	Study Comparison details	Info on potential data crossover
				12.90 years; range 16 to 85 years]) One-stop clinic n= 416 Two-stop clinic n=375			
Wales – no data crossover							
<i>Vasilakis, et al. (2021)</i>	Glamorgan Hospital, Cwm Taf UHB	Up to March 2019	Non-comparative	Sample size for RDC activity: 681 Sample size for patient engagement focus groups: 7	Participant characteristics Reason for referral Time to first visit Time to diagnosis Diagnosis Size and site of lump Cancer diagnosis rate Onward referrals Personnel costs Diagnostic investigation costs Patient satisfaction Referring physical satisfaction	No comparison group	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies Descriptive study design
<i>Sewell, et al. (2020)</i>	Neath Port Talbot Hospital, Swansea Bay UHB	2017 to 2018	Comparative	Adults aged ≥18 years in the pilot area who were referred by their GP to the RDC at Neath Port Talbot Hospital (NPTH) for further investigation of non-specific and/or vague symptoms that could be due to cancer between June 2017 and	Participant characteristics Reason for referral/consultation Time to diagnosis Diagnosis Quality adjusted life years Mean cost per patient Cost of diagnostic tests Personnel costs Cost-effectiveness	Intervention: those attending the RDC Control group: referred to the USC pathway by Go but downgraded to non-urgent pathway because	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies Modelling study

UK studies:							
Includes 21 individual studies investigating 17 different diagnostic centres. One study looked at multiple sites across England. NB: Groupings are by area							
Reference	Hospital name or location	Study duration	Study type	Population	Outcomes	Study Comparison details	Info on potential data crossover
				May 2018 were included in the evaluation. Sample size: 1,000 (simulated based on real-life data for intervention and control group)		of the absence of red-flag symptoms	
<i>Kerrell, (2001)</i>	Gwent	Unclear	Non-comparative	All families whose child had been diagnosed by the clinic were contacted and invited to take part Sample size: 9 children (average age 3.7 years). 11 parents	Patient satisfaction Parental satisfaction/acceptability	No comparison group	No risk of potential data overlap with other included studies Descriptive study design

APPENDIX 3. Outcome map for all cancer specific studies and outcome map for all non-cancer specific studies

Cancer studies outcomes map																																	
	Al Hamameh et al	Arnaout et al 2013	Basta et al 2016	Berry et al 1998	Boghossian et al 1996	Bosch et al 2012b	Bosch et al 2014a	Bosch et al 2018	Bosch et al 2020	Chapman et al 2020	Choudhury et al 2013	Chau et al 2003	Dey et al 2002	Dolly et al 2021	Elmi et al 2017	Gui et al 1995	Harcourt et al 1998	Hawks et al 2021a	Jones et al 2001	Lamah et al 2000	McKevitt et al 2017	Næser et al 2018	Naik et al 2001	Nixon et al 2020	Racz et al 2016	Sethukavalan et al	Sewell et al 2020	Szucs et al 2016	Vasilakis et al 2021	Webber et al 2020	Total no of studies		
Patient demographics and referral outcomes																																	
Participant characteristics	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	27
Referral source						X	X	X	X		X			X		X						X											8
Reason for referral/consultation						X						X				X			X	X	X			X				X		X		9	
Number of new patients attending clinic															X					X												2	
Performance outcomes																																	
Time from referral to last visit																						X										1	
Wait time from confirmation of BI-RADS 5 status of abnormal diagnostic mammogram to biopsy		X																														1	
Time from biopsy to pathology verification		X																					X									2	
Time to first visit			X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X				X			X			X		X					X			13	
Number of visits						X		X			X		X								X											5	
Number of patients seen per clinic																				X												1	
Frequency of health care encounters																														X		1	
Number of biopsies to arrive at diagnosis																							X									1	
Number of biopsies imaging available at initial assessment																								X								1	
Time to examination								X													X											2	
Time from first visit																X																1	
Time to surgical consultation/assessment		X																			X											2	
Time from consultation to treatment		X									X										X		X	X	X	X						7	
Time from cancer suspicion to treatment																										X						1	
Time from first visit to management plan																							X									1	
Time to diagnosis						X	X	X	X	X			X			X					X		X	X	X	X			X	X		14	
Time from diagnosis to treatment						X	X					X	X			X				X				X	X					X		9	
Time from diagnosis to specialist consultation																									X							1	
Immuno-histochemistry to management																								X								1	
Overall time from referral to management/treatment																								X								1	
Total wait times																X																1	
Total interval (days from index contact to diagnosis or initial treatment, whichever occurred later)																														X		1	
Support offered after diagnosis																	X															1	
Follow-up for patients who didn't undergo treatment																							X									1	
Waiting list numbers																				X												1	
Clinical outcomes																																	
Risk factors for cancer									X																							1	
Associations of selected factors with diagnosis of cancer										X		X																				2	
Patient factors and probability of non-malignant diagnosis																								X								1	
Predictors of hospitalisation									X																							1	
Mean tumour size									X																							1	
Lesion size																										X						1	
Lymph node size																								X								1	
Tumour site									X																							1	
Size and site of lumps	X					X			X	X	X										X								X	X		7	
Location of lymphadenopathy																								X								1	
Splenomegaly on presentation																								X								1	
Tumour Laterality																									X							1	

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.01.22282959>; this version posted December 6, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/).

Cancer studies outcomes map

	Al Hamarneh et al	Arnaout et al 2013	Basta et al 2016	Berry et al 1998	Boghossian et al 1996	Bosch et al 2012b	Bosch et al 2014a	Bosch et al 2018	Bosch et al 2020	Chapman et al 2020	Choudhury et al 2013	Chau et al 2003	Dey et al 2002	Dolly et al 2021	Elmi et al 2017	Gui et al 1995	Harcourt et al 1998	Hawks et al 2021a	Jones et al 2001	Lamah et al 2000	McKevitt et al 2017	Næser et al 2018	Naik et al 2001	Nixon et al 2020	Racz et al 2016	Sethukavalan et al	Sewell et al 2020	Szucs et al 2016	Vasilakis et al 2021	Webber et al 2020	Total no of studies	
Lymph node involvement																								X							1	
Distant metastatic spread																									X							1
Tumour morphology																								X							1	
Treatment modality																								X							1	
Completion of trans-rectal ultrasound (TRUS) prostate biopsies																		X													1	
Use of mpMRI imaging																		X													1	
Cancer stage on presentation									X																						1	
Cancer stage at diagnosis										X				X																	2	
Cancer detection/diagnosis rate													X					X											X		3	
Length of hospital stay						X																									1	
Geographical site of diagnosis																												X			1	
Accuracy of diagnostic tests	X											X																			2	
Diagnostic tests	X	X						X			X	X	X	X					X		X	X	X	X	X			X			14	
Diagnosis		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X		22	
Diagnostic yield	X																														1	
Charlson comorbidity index									X																						1	
Gleason score																		X								X					2	
Surgical characteristics									X																						1	
Onward referral						X	X			X			X					X											X		6	
Referral numbers																					X										1	
Attendance rates				X																											1	
All-cause mortality																						X									1	
Medical and specialist nursing support after diagnosis																X															1	
Death during follow-up																							X								1	
Quality adjusted life years																												X			1	
Economic outcomes																																
Mean cost per hospital stay						X	X	X																							3	
Initiation cost for centre															X																1	
Mean cost per visit						X	X	X																							3	
Mean cost per process						X																									1	
Mean cost per patient							X	X				X															X				4	
Cost of diagnostic tests per patient							X	X																			X				3	
Diagnostic investigation costs															X														X		2	
Cost saving from hospitalisation							X																								1	
Travel and clinic cost savings																		X													1	
Personnel costs		X					X	X							X												X	X			6	
Costs of catering/cleaning/laundry/travel/maintenance/administrative/depreciation/consultation								X																							1	
Cost-effectiveness																	X										X				2	
Patient and physician-reported outcomes																																
Patient satisfaction	X	X	X	X													X		X	X									X		8	
Patient perceived delays																										X					1	
Patient preferences			X	X																			X								3	
Physician satisfaction					X																								X		2	
Patient Anxiety and depression												X					X						X								3	
Quality of life																	X														1	

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.01.22282959>; this version posted December 6, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/).

Non-cancer studies outcomes map																					
	Bosch et al 2011	Bosch et al 2012a	Bosch et al 2012c	Bosch et al 2013	Bosch et al 2014b	Bosch et al 2021	Brito-Zerón, et al 2014	Gwiyn et al 2007	Hassett et al 2006	Kerrell 2001	Montori-Palacín et al 2017	Montori-Palacín et al 2020	Pallan et al 2005	Porter et al 2003	Sanclemente-Ansó et al 2013	Sanclemente-Ansó et al 2015	Sanclemente-Ansó et al 2016	Soley-Alsina 2020	Te Velde et al 2021	Van Karnebeek et al 2014	Total no of studies
Patient demographics and referral																					
Participant characteristics	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	17
Referral source	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	X	X		X			13
Reason for referral/consultation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X			X	X		X		X	14
Appropriateness of referrals	X			X	X										X						4
Total number of referrals per month of operation									X												1
Number of patients seen at clinic								X	X						X	X		X			5
Performance outcomes																					
Time to first visit	X	X	X	X	X						X			X	X	X		X		X	11
Number of visits	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X			X		X	X	X			12
Number of successive visits generated from initial visit															X						1
Referral patterns over time				X					X												2
Time to examination			X								X		X	X							4
Time to receiving results														X							1
Time to diagnosis	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X			X	X	X	X			13
Duration of visit																X		X			2
Time in waiting room																X					1
Fidelity to guideline recommendations																			X		1
Clinical outcomes																					
Diagnosis	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	16
Diagnostic yield																				X	1
Comorbidity index (other measure)																		X			1
Length of hospital stay	X	X	X	X			X							X			X				7
Charlson comorbidity index		X	X		X																3
Diagnostic tests	X		X				X				X		X	X	X		X		X	X	10
Support after diagnosis (Medical & Specialist nursing support)														X							1
Treatment received at unit			X																		1
Death during evaluation				X	X		X														3
Hospital bed days saved	X	X													X						3
Onward referrals	X	X	X	X	X		X				X				X	X		X			10
Economic outcomes																					
Mean cost per hospital stay	X	X	X	X			X										X				6
Cost per appointment								X													1
Travel and lost income costs																				X	1
Clinic coordination costs																				X	1
Total cost per patient								X													1
Facilities cost												X									1
Mean cost per process	X	X	X	X																	4
Mean cost per visit	X	X	X	X			X	X						X							7
Mean cost per patient							X	X						X			X			X	5
Direct and structural costs							X					X					X				2
Indirect costs							X					X					X				2
Personnel costs							X					X					X				2
Diagnostic investigation costs							X	X				X	X				X				5
Average cost per abnormality detected													X								1
Mean cost saving per patient																	X				1
Overall cost saving																	X				1
Overall cost saving per annum								X													1
Total savings (DGH/PCTs)								X													1
Cost saving to DGH and PCTs (per annum)								X													1
Saving (patient/society)								X													1
Saving per patient/society (per annum)								X													1
Total saving per annum								X													1
Cost saving related to diagnostic investigation																	X				1
Cost saving from hospitalisation																	X				1
Cost saving per patient related to structural and general functioning costs of hospitalisation																	X				1
Patient and physician-reported outcomes																					
Patient satisfaction	X	X	X							X			X							X	6
Parental satisfaction									X										X		2
Patient preferences	X	X	X	X									X			X					6
Patient perception and opinions of healthcare quality																X					1
Physician satisfaction									X				X								2
Provider satisfaction																				X	1

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.01.22282959>; this version posted December 6, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/).

Service quality (structure, process and outcome indicators)													X						X		2	
Action taken if unit not available									X													1

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.01.22282959>; this version posted December 6, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/).

APPENDIX 4: Resources searched during Rapid Review Searching

A single list of resources has been developed for guiding and documenting the sources searched as part of a Rapid Review. All 'core' resources should be searched, but other resources may be considered if appropriate to the topic, or time allows.

For those resources used, record the search strategies used below the table.

Resource	Success or relevancy of the retrieval
Priority COVID resources for reviews	
Cochrane COVID Review Bank (Browse list of titles) https://covidreviews.cochrane.org/search/site	Searched, nothing found
WHO Global Coronavirus Database - secondary evidence (Use filter options to limit search results to secondary evidence under "Type of Study" and English language under "Language") https://search.bvsalud.org/global-literature-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/	Searched, results found
L*OVE COVID - systematic reviews (Links to the systematic reviews section) https://app.iloveevidence.com/loves/5e6fdb9669c00e4ac072701d?population=5e7fce7e3d05156b5f5e032a&classification=systematic-review	Searched, nothing found
VA-ESP (Use "search this page" to limit to a concept. A second (or subsequent) concept can be applied to the results list by using "search this page" again.) https://www.covid19reviews.org/index.cfm	Searched, nothing found
Additional COVID resources for reviews <i>(Tailor the list according to the topic and potential evidence base. In some cases, it may be preferable to scan the main (generic) source rather than COVID-19 specific product; listed under secondary research)</i>	
LitCovid (Subset of PubMed. Abstracts do not download, but if using EndNote or Mendeley you can use the 'Find Reference Updates' feature to import the abstracts from PubMed. Covered by VA-ESP for reviews) https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/research/coronavirus/	Not searched, not relevant
EPPI-Centre - Living map of the evidence of studies on COVID-19 identified in MEDLINE and EMBASE, that groups the evidence into broad themes (Select "Access current version" below first picture) https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Projects/DepartmentofHealthandSocialCare/Publishedreviews/COVID-19Livingssystematicmapoftheevidence/tabid/3765/Default.aspx	Not searched, not relevant
EUnetHTA – COVID 19 response (Not a searchable database but lists of evidence reviews covering diagnostics and treatments) https://eunetha.eu/services/covid-19/	Not searched, not relevant
Trip – for guidelines (TripPro can be accessed by an institutional based subscription based via institution, otherwise use Trip) As a COVID-19 resource for guidelines – search for (covid-19 OR covid19 OR sars-cov-2 OR sars-cov2 OR sarscov2) and the topic/concept of interest, then filter by UK guidelines, covers NICE and SIGN. Can also filter for non-UK guidance. https://www.tripdatabase.com/	Not searched, not relevant
For topic specific / focused review questions	
COVID-END – Evidence summaries (McMaster Health Forum) (Incorporates multiple COVID-19 resources, including many listed here. May be useful for topic specific/focused questions; may not be useful for border questions) https://www.mcmasterforum.org/networks/covid-end	Not searched, not relevant

COVID-19 Evidence Alerts from McMaster PLUS™ Usefulness dependent on topic; may not be user friendly for broad/complicated questions https://plus.mcmaster.ca/COVID-19/	Not searched, not relevant
Additional COVID resources for primary studies	
WHO Global Coronavirus Database - primary studies (Use filter options to limit search results to primary evidence under "Type of Study" and English language under "Language") https://search.bvsalud.org/global-literature-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/	Not searched, not relevant
L*OVE COVID - primary studies https://app.iloveevidence.com/loves/5e6fdb9669c00e4ac072701d?population=5e7fce7e3d05156b5f5e032a&classification=primary-study	Not searched, not relevant
Cochrane COVID-19 Study Register https://covid-19.cochrane.org/	Not searched, not relevant
LitCovid (Subset of PubMed. Abstracts do not download, but if using EndNote or Mendeley you can use the 'Find Reference Updates' feature to import the abstracts from PubMed) https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/research/coronavirus/	Not searched, not relevant
Secondary resources for reviews relevant to local/UK context	
United Kingdom Health Security Agency (UKHSA) – COVID-19 Rapid Reviews https://ukhsalibrary.koha-ptfs.co.uk/covid19rapidreviews/	Searched, nothing found
NICE resources for COVID reviews https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/conditions-and-diseases/respiratory-conditions/covid19/products?Status=Published Any queries regarding ongoing or planned reviews contact Chris Connell: Chris.Connell@nice.org.uk	Searched, nothing found
Healthcare Improvement Scotland – COVID-19: Evidence for Scotland (not a searchable database but a lists Once for Scotland guidance, rapid evidence reviews, NICE rapid guidelines evidence covering diagnostics and treatments) http://www.healthcareimprovementscotland.org/our_work/coronavirus_covid-19/evidence_for_scotland.aspx	Searched, nothing found
Ireland, HSE Library, COVID-19 Summaries of Evidence not a searchable database but a list of all summaries of evidence that HIQA have been asked to address) https://hselibrary.ie/covid19-evidence-summaries/	Searched, nothing found
HIQA Health Information and Quality Authority (Ireland) – Rapid reviews https://www.hiqa.ie/reports-and-publications/health-technology-assessments?tid_1=All&field_hqa_topics_target_id=112	Searched, nothing found
SAGE (if relevant) https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/scientific-advisory-group-for-emergencies	Not searched, not relevant
Secondary resources for reviews produced by key international organisations	
NCCMT COVID-19 rapid reviews (Canada) https://www.nccmt.ca/covid-19/covid-19-rapid-evidence-service	Searched, nothing found
ECDC European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (COVID-19 outputs) https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data	Searched, nothing found
CDC centre for Disease Control and Prevention - Guidance for COVID-19 (US) https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/communication/guidance.html	Searched, nothing found
AHRQ Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US)	Searched, nothing found

(Note: only 1 of these covid-19 reviews are actively being kept updated as a living review: “Antibody Response Following SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Implications for Immunity: A Living Rapid Review” https://www.ahrq.gov/coronavirus/health-systems-research.html	
NASEM The National Academy of Sciences Engineering Medicine - Coronavirus Resources Collection (US) https://www.nap.edu/collection/94/coronavirus-resources	Searched, nothing found
Australian National COVID-19 Clinical Evidence Task Force - Living Guidelines; mainly treatment https://covid19evidence.net.au/ (also incorporated in Trip)	Searched, nothing found
Secondary research resources for (non-COVID-19) reviews (Tailor the list according to the topic and potential evidence base, talk to stakeholder before proceeding with this type of search)	
Trip (TripPro can be accessed by an institutional based subscription based via institution, otherwise use Trip) https://www.tripdatabase.com/	Searched, results found
Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR) https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/reviews	Searched, results found
Campbell Collaboration https://www.campbellcollaboration.org/better-evidence.html	Searched, nothing found
JBIC (via OVID) (Subscription based service – WCEBC has a subscription)	Not searched, maybe relevant
Epistemonikos https://www.epistemonikos.org/en/advanced_search https://www.epistemonikos.org/ (for the simple search)	Searched, results found
International HTA database (INAHTA-HTA) (for technology & intervention questions only) https://database.inahta.org/	Searched, nothing found
PROSPERO https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospéro/	Searched, nothing found
PubMed/MEDLINE Filter by systematic reviews, reviews or meta-analysis once search undertaken https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/	Searched, results found
Additional resources searched (Add in any additional resources that have been used, e.g., Scopus, HMIC, Social Care Online)	
Google Advanced Search https://www.google.co.uk/advanced_search	Not searched, maybe relevant
Google Scholar https://scholar.google.com/	Searched, results found
Google	Searched, results found
EMBASE	Searched, results found

APPENDIX 5. Search strategy used for MEDLINE

Set#	Searched for	Results
S1	((TI,AB("community diagnos* centre*")))	1
S2	((TI, AB ("community diagnos* clinic*")))	1
S3	((TI, AB ("community diagnos* hub*")))	1
S4	((TI, AB ("community diagnos* unit*")))	0
S5	((TI, AB ("rapid diagnos* unit*")))	16
S6	((TI, AB ("rapid diagnos* clinic*")))	12
S7	((TI, AB ("rapid diagnos* centre*")))	4
S8	((TI, AB ("rapid diagnos* hub*")))	0
S9	((TI, AB ("mobile diagnos* hub*")))	0
S10	((TI, AB ("mobile diagnos* clinic*")))	0
S11	((TI, AB ("mobile diagnos* centre*")))	0
S12	((TI, AB ("mobile diagnos* unit*")))	8
S13	((TI, AB ("multidisciplinary diagnos* unit*")))	0
S14	((TI, AB ("multidisciplinary diagnos* hub*")))	0
S15	((TI, AB ("multidisciplinary diagnos* centre*")))	4
S16	((TI, AB ("multidisciplinary diagnos* clinic*")))	2
S17	((TI, AB ("mobile healthcare unit*")))	2
S18	((TI, AB ("accelerate coordinate evaluate")))	3
S19	S18 OR S17 OR S16 OR S15 OR S14 OR S13 OR S12 OR S11 OR S10 OR S9 OR S8 OR S7 OR S6 OR S5 OR S4 OR S3 OR S2 OR S1	52
S20	((TI, AB ("diagnos* centre*")))	408
S21	((TI, AB ("diagnos* clinic")))	282
S22	((TI, AB ("diagnos* clinics")))	86
S23	((TI, AB ("diagnos* hub*")))	7
S24	((TI, AB ("diagnos* unit*")))	462
S25	S24 OR S23 OR S22 OR S21 OR S20 OR S19	1247°
S26	(MJMESH.EXACT("Diagnostic Services"))	1211°
S27	S26 OR S25	2436°