Rapid review of Allied Health Professionals working in neonatal services

Authors

Nathan Bromham[1], Leona Batten[1], David Jarrom[1], Elizabeth Gillen[2], Juliet Hounsome[3], Jacob Davies[4], Rhiannon Tudor Edwards[4], Alison Cooper[5], Adrian Edwards[5], Ruth Lewis[6]

Author Affiliations

1 Health Technology Wales, UK
2 Wales Centre for Evidence Based Care, Cardiff University, UK
3 Specialist Unit for Review Evidence (SURE), Cardiff University, UK
4 Centre for Health Economics and Medicines Evaluation (CHEME), Bangor University, UK
5 Health and Care Research Wales Evidence Centre, Cardiff University, UK
6 Health and Care Research Wales Evidence Centre, Bangor University, UK

Abstract

Background

This review aimed to quantify the impact of allied health professionals (AHPs) embedded in neonatal services on outcomes by asking the following review questions:

Q1. What is the effectiveness of neonatal services with embedded allied health professionals compared to neonatal services without embedded allied health professionals?

Q2. What is the effectiveness of early interventions provided by allied health professionals in neonatal units?

Research Implications and Evidence Gaps

There was very little directly relevant evidence on AHPs embedded in neonatal services. Most of the evidence related to multidisciplinary team working or early interventions provided by AHPs. Few early intervention trials were from the UK, leading to uncertainty about the availability and applicability of interventions in the UK setting. Further UK-based research is needed to better understand the best way to integrate allied health professionals in neonatal services.

Economic considerations

There is no published evidence on the cost of AHPs working within neonatal units. There is marked variability in the reporting of cost estimates for neonatal care units in the UK, making the evaluation of cost implications of adopting AHP recommendations difficult. Subsequent economic evaluations could explore the Budget Impact to the NHS of increasing AHP presence in neonatal units to align with recommendations from AHP professional bodies and Royal Colleges.

Funding statement

Health Technology Wales were funded for this work by the Health and Care Research Wales Evidence Centre, itself funded by Health and Care Research Wales on behalf of Welsh Government.

Health and Care
Research Wales
Evidence Centre

Canolfan Dystiolaeth
Ymchwil Iechyd a
Gofal Cymru

Rapid review of Allied Health Professionals working in neonatal services

July 2024

Ymchwil Iechyd
a Gofal Cymru
Health and Care
Research Wales

Ariennir gan
Lywodraeth Cymru
Funded by
Welsh Government

Technoleg Iechyd Cymru
Health Technology Wales

Review conducted by **Health Technology Wales.**

Report Contributors

Review Team
Nathan Bromham, Leona Batten and David Jarrom, *Health Technology Wales*
Elizabeth Gillen, *Wales Centre for Evidence Based Care*
Juliet Hounsome, *Specialist Unit for Review Evidence, Cardiff University*

Economic Considerations
Jacob Davies and Rhiannon Tudor Edwards, *Centre for Health Economics & Medicines Evaluation (CHEME), Bangor University*

Methodological Advice
Ruth Lewis

Evidence Centre Team
Adrian Edwards, Alison Cooper, Natalie Joseph-Williams, Micaela Gal and Elizabeth Doe involved in stakeholder engagement, review of report and editing

Public Partners
Beti-jane Ingram

Stakeholders
Margaret Manton, *Cwm Taf Morgannwg University Health Board*
Catherine Pape, *Health Education and Improvement Wales (HEIW)*

When needing more in-depth profession specific information, the stakeholders were also supported by the following members the **Clinical Support Group:**

- Elen Elias, *Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board*
- Stephanie Griffiths, *Hywel Dda University Health Board*
- Amanda Lawes, *Swansea Bay University Health Board*
- Louise Leach, *Health Education Improvement Wales*
- Fiona Luff, *Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board*
- Catriona Matthews, *Cardiff & Vale University Health Board*
- Debbie Paris, *Aneurin Bevan University Health Board*
- Bethan Phillips, *Cwm Taf Morgannwg University Health Board*
- Ceri Selman, *Swansea Bay University Health Board*
- Leah Watson, *Swansea Bay University Health Board*

Evidence need submitted to the Evidence Centre: December 2023

Initial Stakeholder Consultation Meeting: February 2024

Final report issued: July 2024

This review should be cited as: Health and Care Research Wales Evidence Centre. Rapid review of Allied Health Professionals working in neonatal services. (RR0028). July 2024.

Rapid review of Allied Health Professionals working in neonatal services

July 2024

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

What is a Rapid Review?

Our rapid reviews (RR) use a variation of the systematic review approach, abbreviating or omitting some components to generate the evidence to inform stakeholders promptly whilst maintaining attention to bias.

Who is this Rapid Review for?

The review question was suggested by Health Education and Improvement Wales (HEIW). This review is intended to inform those responsible for staffing in neonatal services.

Background / Aim of Rapid Review

This review aimed to quantify the impact of allied health professionals (AHPs) embedded in neonatal services on outcomes by asking the following review questions:

- Q1. What is the effectiveness of neonatal services with embedded allied health professionals compared to neonatal services without embedded allied health professionals?
- Q2. What is the effectiveness of early interventions provided by allied health professionals in neonatal units?

Results

Recency of the evidence base

- The review included evidence available up until March 2024. Included studies were published between 2016 and 2024.

Extent of the evidence base for Q1

- 7 studies were identified: 6 before-after studies and 1 comparative cohort study.
- The studies were conducted in Canada (n=2), USA (n=2), Australia (n=1). South Korea (n=1) and Japan (n=1).
- 1 study compared before with after the implementation of a neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) with embedded physiotherapy staff. The other studies compared neonatal units with and without multidisciplinary teams including AHPs.

Key findings and certainty of the evidence for Q1

- Low certainty evidence suggests AHPs embedded in neonatal services may improve gross motor ability and lead to earlier oral feeding.
- Results from before-after and cohort studies of multidisciplinary nutrition support teams in neonatal units are too inconsistent to draw conclusions.

Extent of the evidence base for Q2

- 5 studies were identified: 5 systematic reviews including 57 unique randomised controlled trials (RCTs)

- The studies were conducted in the USA (n=23), Iran (n=5), Australia (n=5), Brazil (n=4), India (n=3), France (n=3), UK (n=3), Canada (n=3), Spain (n=2), Switzerland (n=1), Netherlands (n=1), South Korea (n=1), Italy (n=1), Denmark (n=1) and Taiwan (n=1).
- The studies investigated early interventions actively involving parents, oral stimulation multisensory stimulation, and early interventions which continue post-discharge.

Key findings and certainty of the evidence for Q2

- Moderate certainty evidence suggests that early interventions provided by AHPs in neonatal units are associated with shorter length of stay, better parental sensitivity and quicker oral feeding.
- There is moderate certainty that these interventions are associated with small improvements in general cognitive and general gross motor ability in infancy compared to standard care.
- There is low certainty evidence from RCTs that early interventions delivered by AHPs do not impact parental stress in the short-term.

Research Implications and Evidence Gaps

- There was very little directly relevant evidence on AHPs embedded in neonatal services. Most of the evidence related to multidisciplinary team working or early interventions provided by AHPs.
- Few early intervention trials were from the UK, leading to uncertainty about the availability and applicability of interventions in the UK setting.
- Further UK-based research is needed to better understand the best way to integrate allied health professionals in neonatal services.

Policy and Practice Implications

- AHP professional bodies and Royal Colleges have issued recommendations of number of whole time equivalent (WTE) AHP staff of each type needed for each level of neonatal unit.
- This rapid review supports the idea that the involvement of AHPs neonatal units is likely to improve outcomes, but it does not inform the exact numbers of staff required.
- Implementing the recommendations of the AHP professional bodies in Welsh neonatal units is likely to be a major change in practice as no Welsh neonatal unit currently has the recommended WTE number of AHP staff.

Economic considerations

- There is no published evidence on the cost of AHPs working within neonatal units.
- There is marked variability in the reporting of cost estimates for neonatal care units in the UK, making the evaluation of cost implications of adopting AHP recommendations difficult.
- Subsequent economic evaluations could explore the Budget Impact to the NHS of increasing AHP presence in neonatal units to align with recommendations from AHP professional bodies and Royal Colleges.

The certainty of evidence has been assessed using the GRADE (Grading of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation) approach (https://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

Abbreviations

Acronym	Full Description
AHP	Allied health professional
BAPM	British Association of Perinatal Medicine
ATVV	Auditory-Tactile-Visual-Vestibular
CBT	Cognitive Behavioural Therapy
CI	Confidence Interval
EMDR	Eye Movement Desensitisation and Reprocessing
EPOC	Effective Practice and Organisation of Care
GRADE	Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation
HDU	High Dependency Unit
ICN	Intensive Care Nurse
MD	Mean Difference
MDT	Multidisciplinary Team
NHSE	NHS England
NHSI	NHS Improvement
NICU	Neonatal intensive care unit
OR	Odds Ratio
PMA	Post Menstrual Age
PSI	Parenting Stress Index
PSI-SF	Parenting Stress Index – Short Form
RCT	Randomized Controlled Trial
ROB	Risk of Bias
SCBU	Special Care Baby Unit
SMD	Standardized Mean Difference
TC	Transitional Care
TDPCI	Therapist-Delivered Postural Control Intervention
TKS	Tactile-Kinaesthetic Stimulation
WTE	Whole Time Equivalent

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Who is this review for?

This Rapid Review was conducted as part of the Health and Care Research Wales Evidence Centre Work Programme. The review question was suggested by Health Education and Improvement Wales (HEIW). The Maternal Neonatal Safety Support Programme Cymru discovery phase report (PHW 2023) identified that to ensure services are equitable for babies across Wales all neonatal units should have a plan and be allocated capacity to have early developmental intervention using allied health professional (AHP) input. HEIW is undertaking a Strategic Perinatal Workforce Plan programme of work (HEIW 2024) to develop a plan to recruit, retain, train, and transform the perinatal workforce including AHPs. This review is intended to support that work.

1.2 Background and purpose of this review

Infants who are critically ill or are born prematurely require medical care in neonatal units to address their immediate physical health needs and ensure survival. These infants also need developmental care, focusing on their longer term neurodevelopmental and psychosocial needs. There can be a perceived trade-off between medical and developmental care for several reasons. Medical care is high intensity with significant staff attention and resources needed – appearing more urgent than developmental care. The busy environment of the neonatal intensive care unit may sometimes interfere with the sleep cycle and sensory development of the infant. Parents and carers may become sidelined if most of their child's care is provided by healthcare professionals.

Neonatal services, however, increasingly integrate medical and developmental care: an approach which research and guidelines suggest leads to better outcomes for the infant. Examples of this include developmentally supportive care which aims to reduce the stress of the neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) environment on the infant. Family-centred care encourages parents to become involved in the care of their child. Interdisciplinary teams include a range of professionals including allied health professionals who can address all the medical and developmental needs of the infant.

Table 1 BAPM 2022 AHP staffing recommendations

AHP Specialty	WTE per designated unit cot				Additional WTE for follow-up / outpatient / community	Network WTE roles per 10,000 births
	NICU	HDU	SCBU	TC		
Dietetics	0.10	0.05	0.033	0.033	0.15 per ½ day clinic and/or per follow-up service required	0.2
Physiotherapy	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.15 per ½ day clinic	0.2
Occupational therapy	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.15 per ½ day clinic	0.2
	NICU	LNU	SCU	TC		
Speech & language therapy	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.02	Not specified	0.3

Abbreviations: AHP: allied health professional; BAPM: British Association of Perinatal Medicine; HDU: high dependency unit; LNU: local neonatal unit; NICU: neonatal intensive care unit; SCBU: special care baby unit; SCU: special care unit; TC: transitional care; WTE: whole time equivalent.

Allied health professionals (AHPs) such as Physiotherapists, Dieticians, Occupational therapists, Speech and language therapists and Psychologists are key members of interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary teams. They provide specialist early interventions and assessments for children in neonatal units. Workforce recommendations for neonatal services (see Table 1) state that AHPs should be embedded as part of the team within

neonatal units (BAPM 2022), but currently no Welsh neonatal unit has the recommended whole time equivalent (WTE) number of AHP staff.

This rapid review aims to quantify the impact of the embedded AHP team in neonatal units on outcomes by asking the following review question:

- Q1. What is the effectiveness of neonatal services with embedded allied health professionals compared to neonatal services without embedded allied health professionals?

Preliminary literature searches identified very little evidence comparing AHPs embedded in neonatal services to standard care. For this reason, we asked an additional question, to estimate some of the ways AHPs can impact outcomes in neonatal services:

- Q2. What is the effectiveness of early interventions provided by allied health professionals in neonatal units?

2. RESULTS

2.1 Q1. Review of neonatal services with embedded allied health professionals

Overview of the Evidence Base

Seven studies were included that addressed Q1 (see section 5.1, Table 5 for full eligibility criteria). Six were before-after studies (Furtado et al. 2016, Jeong et al. 2016, Morioka et al. 2024, Muirhead & Bates 2023, Sneve et al. 2008, Welch et al. 2017) and 1 was a comparative cohort study (Gover et al. 2014). The studies were conducted in Canada (n=2), USA (n=2), Australia (n=1). South Korea (n=1) and Japan (n=1). See section 6.2, Table 8 for a detailed summary of the included studies.

Only 1 study (Morioka et al. 2024) directly addressed the review question by comparing before with after the implementation of a neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) with embedded physiotherapy staff. The other studies compared neonatal units with and without multidisciplinary teams including, but not limited to, AHPs. Four of the studies concerned NICU nutritional support multidisciplinary teams with dieticians (Furtado et al. 2016, Gover et al. 2014, Jeong et al. 2016, Sneve et al. 2008). The remaining 2 studies (Muirhead & Bates 2023, Welch et al. 2017) evaluated NICU multidisciplinary teams including occupational therapists, physiotherapists and speech therapists.

All the studies were considered to be at a high risk of including bias in their results or conclusions. This was because of study designs that were more prone to bias, lack of controlling for confounders and lack of published study protocols. (See section 6.3, Table 10 and Table 11 for the summary of the risk of bias assessment for each study).

The certainty of the evidence on which the findings are based has been categorised using the GRADE approach (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation) into high, moderate, low or very low. These ratings provide the degree of confidence we have in the findings, with a high rating indicating, that having assessed the potential problems with the available evidence we are very confident that our summary estimate of the intervention effect represents the true value, whilst very low certainly indicates that we have very little confidence that our summary of the effect represents the

true underlying effect. Further detail on how studies were assessed is provided in section 6.4.

Table 2 Summary of results and certainty of the evidence for Q1 comparison: neonatal services with embedded AHPs versus services without embedded AHPs

Outcomes	№ of participants (studies)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)	Anticipated absolute effects	
			Risk with standard care	Risk difference with Neonatal services with embedded AHPs
Length of stay assessed with: days	90 (1 non-randomised study)[a]	Very low[b,c]	The mean length of stay was 121.2 days	MD 0.3 days higher (12.35 lower to 12.95 higher)
General gross motor ability assessed with: Hammersmith Neonatal Neurological Examination, total points follow-up: mean 39 weeks PMA	90 (1 non-randomised study)[a]	Very low[b,c,d]	The mean general gross motor ability was 26.8 points	MD 1.2 points higher (0.15 higher to 2.25 higher)
Time to full oral feeding assessed with: weeks PMA	90 (1 non-randomised study)[a]	Very low[b,c]	The mean time to full oral feeding was 41.0 weeks PMA	MD 1.43 weeks PMA fewer (2.28 fewer to 0.58 fewer)

Abbreviations. CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; PMA: post-menstrual age

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High certainty: we are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect.
Moderate certainty: we are moderately confident in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different.
Low certainty: our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect.
Very low certainty: we have very little confidence in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect.

Explanations
a. Morioka 2024
b. Very serious risk of bias per EPOC criteria
c. Study not from UK, Europe, Australia, New Zealand or Canada
d. HNNE is a surrogate measure of general gross motor ability

Length of stay
Very low certainty evidence from 1 before-after study (Morioka et al. 2024) suggests that NICU with embedded physiotherapists compared to standard physiotherapy care does not affect length of stay in NICU.

General gross motor ability
Very low certainty evidence from 1 before-after study shows (Morioka et al. 2024) a benefit in terms of Hammersmith Neonatal Neurological Examination total points score for infants cared for in a NICU with embedded physiotherapists compared to standard physiotherapy care.

Oral feeding

Very low certainty evidence from 1 before-after study (Morioka et al. 2024) that infants cared for in a NICU with embedded physiotherapists reached full oral feeding around 1½ weeks sooner (post menstrual age) than infants receiving standard physiotherapy care.

Table 3. Summary of results and certainty of the evidence for Q1 comparison: neonatal MDTs including allied health professionals versus no such MDT

Outcomes	№ of participants (studies)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated absolute effects	
				Risk with standard care	Risk difference with MDTs with AHPs in neonatal services
Mortality	785 (4 non-randomised studies)[a]	Very low[b,c,d,e,f]	OR ranged from 0.46 to 5.20	60 per 1,000	60 fewer per 1,000 (31 fewer to 188 more)
Length of stay assessed with: days	785 (4 non-randomised studies)[a]	Very low[b,c,d,f]	-	The median length of stay was 73.4 days	MD 10 days lower (0 to 0)
Parental confidence assessed with: Parents contribute to care planning	97 (1 non-randomised study)[g]	Very low[b,d,e]	RR 1.61 (1.09 to 2.40)	413 per 1,000	252 more per 1,000 (37 more to 578 more)
Time to oral feeding assessed with: days	722 (3 non-randomised studies)[h]	Very low[b,c,d,f]	-	The median time to oral feeding was 34 days	0 days (0 to 0)

Abbreviations. CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; OR: odds ratio; RR: risk ratio

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High certainty: we are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect.
Moderate certainty: we are moderately confident in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different.
Low certainty: our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect.
Very low certainty: we have very little confidence in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect.

Explanations

a. Furtado 2016, Gover 2014, Jeong 2016, Sneve 2008
b. Very serious risk of bias as per ROBINS-I or EPOC criteria
c. Very serious heterogeneity - effect estimates ranged from favouring MDTs to favouring standard care
d. Intervention is indirectly applicable (neonatal MDT with AHPs is not the same as AHP embedded in neonatal unit)
e. Confidence interval includes 1 default minimal important difference (0.8, 1.25)
f. Serious uncertainty about the effect estimate
g. Muirhead 2023
h. Furtado 2016, Gover 2014, Jeong 2016

Mortality

Very low certainty evidence from 3 before-after studies (Furtado et al. 2016, Jeong et al. 2016, Sneve et al. 2008) and 1 cohort study (Gover et al. 2014) shows inconsistent results in terms of mortality when comparing infants cared for by a multidisciplinary nutritional support team including a dietician with those not cared for by such a team. Study results ranged from clinically important benefit to clinically important harm with the nutritional support MDT and it was not appropriate to pool the results.

Length of stay
Very low certainty evidence from 3 before-after studies (Furtado et al. 2016, Jeong et al. 2016, Sneve et al. 2008) and 1 cohort study (Gover et al. 2014) shows inconsistent results in terms of length of stay when comparing infants cared for by a multidisciplinary nutritional support team including a dietician with those not cared for by such a team. Study results ranged from clinically important benefit to clinically important harm with the nutritional support MDT and it was not appropriate to pool the results.

Parental confidence
Very low certainty evidence from 1 before-after study (Muirhead & Bates 2023) showed that NICU staff rated parents as much more likely to contribute to care planning following implementation of multidisciplinary developmental care rounds including an advanced practice nurse, an occupational therapist, a physiotherapist, and a speech therapist.

Oral feeding
Very low certainty evidence from 2 before-after studies (Furtado et al. 2016, Jeong et al. 2016) and 1 cohort study (Gover et al. 2014) shows inconsistent results in terms of time to full oral feeding when comparing infants cared for by a multidisciplinary nutritional support team including a dietician with those not cared for by such a team. Study results ranged from clinically important benefit to clinically important harm with the nutritional support MDT and it was not appropriate to pool the results.

Bottom line results for review of neonatal services with embedded allied health professionals

Evidence from a single before-after study suggests AHPs embedded in neonatal services may improve gross motor ability and lead to earlier oral feeding, but this evidence is uncertain. Results from before-after and cohort studies of multidisciplinary nutrition support teams in neonatal units are too inconsistent to draw conclusions. There was a lack of evidence on general cognitive ability, quality of life, visual or hearing impairment, parental bonding, attachment, mental health or mood outcomes.

2.2 Q2. Review of early interventions provided by allied health professionals in neonatal units

Overview of the evidence base

Five studies were included that addressed Q2 (see section 5.1, Table 6 for full eligibility criteria) all were systematic reviews (Girabent-Farrés et al. 2021, Greene et al. 2023, Lavallée et al. 2021, Orton et al. 2024, Rodovanski et al. 2023). The systematic reviews were checked for trials relevant to our review (where the early intervention was delivered by an AHP while the infant was in a neonatal unit) and 57 relevant randomised controlled trials (RCTs) were identified. See Table 9 for a summary of the included systematic reviews and relevant trials.

The systematic reviews focused on different types of early intervention including: early interventions actively involving parents (Girabent-Farrés et al. 2021, Lavallée et al. 2021),

oral stimulation (Greene et al. 2023), early interventions which continue post-discharge (Orton et al. 2024) and multisensory stimulation (Rodovanski et al. 2023).

The systematic reviews were at low (Greene et al. 2023, Lavallée et al. 2021, Orton et al. 2024) or unclear (Girabent-Farrés et al. 2021, Rodovanski et al. 2023) risk of bias (see Table 12). Reasons for unclear risk of bias were concerns with the search strategy and inability to access the review protocol. This means that some relevant trials may have been missed by the systematic reviews.

The risk of bias judgements for the individual trials were also extracted from the systematic reviews and used to inform certainty in the body of evidence (see Forest plots in Appendix 1).

The main risk of bias issue in the randomised trials was lack of blinding, although some of the oral or multisensory stimulation trials did have blinding. Many of the trials were at high or unclear risk of bias from allocation concealment.

Effectiveness of early interventions provided by AHPs in neonatal services

The effectiveness evidence comes from RCTs identified in the included systematic reviews that were relevant to our review question.

Table 4. Summary of results and certainty of the evidence for Q2 comparison: AHP delivered or supported early intervention versus standard care

Outcomes	№ of participants (studies)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)	Anticipated absolute effects	
			Risk with standard care	Risk difference with AHP delivered or supported early intervention
Length of hospital stay (oral stimulation studies) assessed with: days	534 (10 RCTs)[a]	Moderate[b]	The median length of hospital stay (oral stimulation studies) was 45 days	MD 6.61 days lower (8.52 lower to 4.71 lower)
Length of hospital stay (TKS studies) assessed with: days	570 (13 RCTs)[c]	Low[b,d]	The median length of hospital stay (TKS studies) was 25.5 days	MD 1.73 days lower (3.22 lower to 0.25 lower)
Length of hospital stay (ATVV studies) assessed with: days	923 (9 RCTs)[c]	Very low[b,d,e]	The median length of hospital stay (ATVV studies) was 30.1 days	MD 0.06 days lower (1.85 lower to 1.73 higher)
Parental bonding and attachment assessed with: Parental Sensitivity	247 (3 RCTs)[f]	Moderate[g,h]	-	SMD 0.32 SD higher (0.07 higher to 0.57 higher)
General cognitive ability assessed with: developmental quotient	743 (7 RCTs)[i]	Moderate[b]	-	SMD 0.22 SD higher (0.07 higher to 0.36 higher)

Outcomes	№ of participants (studies)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)	Anticipated absolute effects	
			Risk with standard care	Risk difference with AHP delivered or supported early intervention
General gross motor ability assessed with: developmental quotient	786 (8 RCTs)[i]	Moderate[b]	-	SMD 0.32 SD higher (0.18 higher to 0.46 higher)
Time to oral feeding (oral stimulation studies) assessed with: days	409 (10 RCTs)[a]	Low[b,j]	The median time to oral feeding (oral stimulation studies) was 20 days	MD 7.63 days lower (10.5 lower to 4.75 lower)
Parental stress (short term) assessed with: PSI or PSI-SF	179 (2 RCTs)[k]	Low[b,l]	-	SMD 0.07 SD lower (0.37 lower to 0.22 higher)

Abbreviations. CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; SMD: standardised mean difference

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High certainty: we are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect.
Moderate certainty: we are moderately confident in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different.
Low certainty: our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect.
Very low certainty: we have very little confidence in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect.

Explanations
a. Greene 2023
b. Serious risk of bias as per ROB checklist
c. Rodovanski 2023
d. Unclear involvement of AHP in delivering the intervention
e. Serious heterogeneity
f. Lavallee 2021
g. Due to nature of the intervention, a majority of the studies did not blind the participants or personnel.
h. Confidence interval includes default MID
i. Orton 2024
j. Statistical heterogeneity - but all studies show the same direction of effect
k. Girabent-Farres 2021
l. Intervention delivered by team - role of AHP unclear

Length of stay

Moderate certainty evidence from 10 RCTs (Greene et al. 2023) indicates that length of stay is around 1 week shorter with oral stimulation provided by an AHP compared to standard care.

Low certainty evidence from 13 RCTs (Rodovanski et al. 2023) indicates that length of stay is around 2 days shorter with tactile-kinaesthetic stimulation compared to standard care.

Very low certainty evidence from 9 RCTs (Rodovanski et al. 2023) suggests no difference between length of stay with auditory-tactile-visual-vestibular intervention and with standard care.

Parental bonding and attachment

Moderate certainty evidence from 3 RCTs (Lavallée et al. 2021) shows a small beneficial effect of early interventions delivered by psychologists for parents of preterm babies during NICU stay compared to standard care, in terms of parental sensitivity.

General cognitive ability

Moderate certainty evidence from 7 RCTs (Orton et al. 2024) shows a small beneficial effect of early interventions delivered by AHPs compared to standard care, in terms of developmental quotient in infancy. The estimated improvement is around 3 points on the developmental quotient scale, where 100 is the score for a typically developing infant.

General gross motor ability

Moderate certainty evidence from 8 RCTs (Orton et al. 2024) shows a small beneficial effect of early interventions delivered by AHPs compared to standard care, in terms of developmental quotient in infancy. The estimated improvement is around 5 points on the developmental quotient scale, where 100 is the score for a typically developing infant.

Oral feeding

Moderate certainty evidence from 10 RCTs (Greene et al. 2023) indicates that time to oral feeding is around 1 week shorter with oral stimulation provided by an AHP than with standard care.

Parental stress

Low certainty evidence from 2 RCTs (Girabent-Farrés et al. 2021) found no important difference in short-term parental stress when comparing early interventions actively involving parents delivered by AHPs to standard care.

Bottom line results for review of early interventions provided by allied health professionals in neonatal units

Moderate certainty evidence from RCTs suggests that early interventions provided by AHPs in neonatal units are associated with shorter length of stay, better parental sensitivity and quicker oral feeding. These interventions are also associated with small improvements in general cognitive and general gross motor ability in infancy compared to standard care. There is low certainty evidence from RCTs that early interventions delivered by AHPs do not impact parental stress in the short-term. There was a lack of evidence on aspiration, cranial head shape, readmission rates, neonatal staff competencies and neonatal staff stress outcomes.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1 Summary of the findings

The aim of this rapid review was to summarise the effectiveness of neonatal services with embedded AHPs compared to neonatal services without embedded AHPs. While minimal directly relevant evidence was found—most of it concerned multidisciplinary team working—the available evidence did support the inclusion of embedded AHPs

The second review question provided indirect evidence to support the place of AHPs in neonatal services with 57 RCTs identified that largely supported the effectiveness of early interventions delivered by AHPs in neonatal units.

3.2 Strengths and limitations of the available evidence

Most of the studies of neonatal services with embedded AHPs were before-after designs. These are at high risk of biases such as trends over time, confounders and regression to the mean. This means that differences in outcomes between the before and after periods may not solely be due to the intervention.

The before-after studies of nutritional support MDTs with dieticians showed a great deal of heterogeneity in their results. This may be because they included somewhat different populations such as infants with gastroschisis, short bowel syndrome or with very low birthweight. In addition, these interventions were primarily aimed at nutritional outcomes such as weight gain. While these studies typically showed benefits for these nutritional outcomes these were not outcomes of interest in this review and so were not included in the evidence.

In the studies of neonatal units with and without MDTs, AHPs were part of the team with a range of other healthcare professionals so it is not possible to assess their individual impact on outcomes.

The majority of the included studies were conducted in neonatal intensive care units (level 3 neonatal units) and it is unclear how it applies to local level 1 or 2 neonatal units were infants may have less complex needs.

The included RCTs of early interventions provided by AHPs covered all types of AHPs in our review protocol (occupational therapists, physiotherapists, speech and language therapists and psychologists) – except for dieticians. This may be because trials of early interventions provided by dieticians did not specifically mention the involvement of the dietitian in the systematic review publication.

The early intervention evidence on cognitive and motor outcomes comes from RCTs that started in the neonatal unit, but the interventions carried on post-discharge. It is unclear how this might apply to the responsibilities of AHPs embedded in neonatal units and to what extent they are involved in the care of the infant post-discharge.

In the evidence on multisensory early interventions carried out in NICU it was difficult to identify exactly who carried out the intervention due to poor reporting. The evidence was downgraded for indirectness, as the interventions were likely delivered by nurses in some cases.

The focus of this review was the involvement of AHPs in services and early interventions rather than which specific early interventions are the most effective. For this reason different types of intervention have been pooled within general classes of intervention. This is likely to contribute to heterogeneity in some cases. A range of interventions were reported in the evidence but it is uncertain how many of these interventions are available in the UK setting. Three included trials were from the UK.

We had anticipated that relevant evidence would come from UK audits of neonatal services. While a national neonatal audit programme (RCPCH 2023) was identified it did not provide data on AHPs and no other relevant audits were found. We also looked for evidence about staffing numbers or AHP to cot ratios to inform the optimal number of AHPs in a neonatal unit, but no relevant evidence was found.

3.3 Strengths and limitations of this Rapid Review

One of the strengths of this review is the systematic and comprehensive search of the literature. This identified a dearth of evidence on the effectiveness of neonatal services with embedded allied health professionals. This is despite national policy and guidance which recognises the importance of AHPs in neonatal services and states AHPs should be embedded in these services.

This review likely underestimates the role of the AHP in neonatal services. Many of the interventions provided in neonatal units are provided using a team approach which becomes part of routine care, such as environmental light or sound modifications, massage, skin to skin care, use of maternal voice or positioning. While the AHP may support these approaches their role is not typically documented as a specific service in trials of these interventions so they would have been excluded from the evidence. Similarly, the Newborn Individualized Developmental Care and Assessment Program (NIDCAP) model of care is a team-based approach that is part of routine care and would be supported by AHPs – but NIDCAP trials typically describe the intervention as being delivered by nurses.

The evidence shows benefits of early interventions delivered by AHPs in neonatal services and if a large part of the AHP's time is spent in the neonatal unit it may be practical to embed them there. The benefit of AHPs in neonatal services can then extend beyond delivering early interventions themselves. For instance, their presence, advice and training can positively impact other neonatal staff and parents, contributing to a culture of developmental care. AHPs working in neonatal units are typically required to be neonatal specialists (APCP Neonatal Committee 2023, British Dietetic Association 2022, Royal College of Occupational Therapists 2022, Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists 2023), embedding AHPs within units enables them to reach these specialist levels.

3.4 Implications for policy and practice

The GIRFT neonatology workforce national report (GIRFT 2022) recommends "Embed allied health professionals, pharmacy and psychology services into neonatal units and networks, in line with professional standards to improve outcomes for babies." Clinical guidelines from NICE (NICE 2017, NICE 2020) indicate that AHPs are an essential part of care and follow-up for children born preterm that are being cared for in neonatal units.

National neonatal service and quality standards from BAPM (BAPM 2022) set out the staffing service standards for AHPs in neonatal units. UK AHP professional bodies and Royal Colleges (APCP Neonatal Committee 2023, Association of Clinical Psychologists 2022, British Dietetic Association 2022, Royal College of Occupational Therapists 2022, Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists 2023) have each made specific recommendations about the number of WTE AHP staff of each type needed for each level of neonatal unit (largely based on expert consensus). Findings of this rapid review support the idea that the involvement of AHPs neonatal units is likely to improve outcomes, but it does not inform the exact numbers of staff required.

Implementing the recommendations of BAPM, the AHP professional bodies and Royal Colleges in Welsh neonatal units is likely to be a major change in practice as no Welsh neonatal unit currently has the recommended WTE number of AHP staff. This may be related to a challenging climate in neonatal staffing – the National Neonatal Audit Programme (NNAP) 2022 audit (RCPCH 2023) found only 71% of neonatal nurse shifts were staffed according to recommended levels in England, Wales and Scotland. The GIRFT neonatology workforce national report (GIRFT 2022) found significant shortfall in AHP service provision in England with less than half of neonatal services having regular dietetics,

physiotherapy, speech and language therapy and occupational therapy services. In units with AHP services, adherence to staffing standards was very low – the highest being dietetics at only 54% adherence.

It is recognised that additional funding and planning are needed to meet the challenge of AHP staffing in neonatal services (NHSE & NHSI 2019). The 2019 NHS Long Term Plan committed to additional funding (up to 2024) to meet the action plan of the NHS England Neonatal Critical Care Review (NCCR). One of the Long Term Plan's key commitments was "Further developing the expert neonatal workforce required: extra neonatal nurses and expanded roles for some allied health professionals to support clinical care." To implement the AHP recommendations of the NCCR, NHS England (NHSE & NHSI 2019) advised "NHS Trusts should develop an AHP strategy as part of workforce planning which sets out the level and expertise of pharmacy and AHP required, the level currently available, and how any gaps will be filled."

In 2022 the Welsh Government asked Improvement Cymru undertake the Discovery Phase for a new Maternity and Neonatal Safety Support Programme (PHW 2023). This project identified adherence to national workforce standards as a key priority. It acknowledged that national workforce planning needs a strategy to ensure that AHPs are embedded within services in line with national standards. It also highlighted the role of AHP leads within the Maternity and Neonatal Network. HEIW (HEIW 2024) is developing a strategic perinatal workforce plan to recruit, retain, train and transform the current and future perinatal workforce in NHS Wales.

3.5 Implications for future research

Further research is needed on the effective organisation of AHPs within UK neonatal services, including staffing levels, expanding roles and service models.

3.6 Economic considerations*

Cost of neonatal units

- There is marked variability in the reporting of cost estimates for neonatal care units in the UK. With reporting differing due to study heterogeneity, differences in data sources, costing methodologies and care requirements for babies (Yang et al. 2023).

Directions for future research

- Future research should assess the costs of introducing AHPs in neonatal units. Evaluations should comprehensively consider the costs of AHP staff of each type and band, as defined in recommendations from AHP professional bodies and Royal Colleges. The latest unit costs for AHPs in the UK are presented in the Unit Costs of Health and Social Care 2023 (Jones et al. 2023).
- Future research should focus on the relative cost-effectiveness of neonatal units that embed AHPs within their operating model and those that do not. Consideration should be given to the impact of neonatal care not just on babies but upon the wider family including the mother.
- Subsequent economic evaluations could explore the Budget Impact to the NHS of increasing AHP presence in neonatal units to align with recommendations from AHP professional bodies and Royal Colleges.

**This section has been completed by the Centre for Health Economics & Medicines Evaluation (CHEME), Bangor University*

4. REFERENCES

APCP Neonatal Committee. (2023). Physiotherapy Staffing Recommendations for Neonatal Units in the United Kingdom. Available at: https://apcp.csp.org.uk/content/neonatal-staffing-recommendations [Accessed May 2024].

Association of Clinical Psychologists. (2022). Psychology Staffing on the Neonatal Unit: Recommendations for Psychological Provision. Available at: https://acpuk.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Psychology_Staffing_on_the_Neonatal_Unit.pdf [Accessed May 2024].

Balduzzi S, Rucker G, Schwarzer G. (2019). How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial. Evid Based Ment Health. 22(4): 153-60. doi: 10.1136/ebmental-2019-300117

BAPM. (2022). Service and Quality Standards for Provision of Neonatal Care in the UK. Available at: https://hubble-live-assets.s3.eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/bapm/file_asset/file/1494/BAPM_Service_Quality_Standards_FINAL.pdf [Accessed May 2024].

British Dietetic Association. (2022). Dietitian Staffing on Neonatal Units: Neonatal Sub-Group Recommendations for Commissioning. Available at: https://www.bda.uk.com/static/ab614d3e-e095-4e4f-96ae1458204e8810/391a27be-69a0-4b43-a52d54a731da7f01/BDA-Formatted-Staffing-Recc.pdf [Accessed May 2024].

EPOC. (2017). Suggested risk of bias criteria for EPOC reviews:. Available at: http://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/suggested_risk_of_bias_criteria_for_epoc_reviews.pdf [Accessed May 2024].

Furtado S, Ahmed N, Forget S, et al. (2016). Outcomes of Patients with Intestinal Failure after the Development and Implementation of a Multidisciplinary Team. Can J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2016: 9132134. doi: 10.1155/2016/9132134

Girabent-Farrés M, Jimenez-Gónzalez A, Romero-Galisteo RP, et al. (2021). Effects of early intervention on parenting stress after preterm birth: A meta-analysis. Child: Care, Health and Development. 47(3): 400-10. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12853

GIRFT. (2022). Neonatology - Workforce: GIRFT Programme National Specialty Report. Available at: https://gettingitrightfirsttime.co.uk/medical_specialties/neonatology/ [Accessed May 2024].

Gover A, Albersheim S, Sherlock R, et al. (2014). Outcome of patients with gastroschisis managed with and without multidisciplinary teams in Canada. Paediatr Child Health. 19(3): 128-32.

Greene Z, O'Donnell CP, Walshe M. (2023). Oral stimulation for promoting oral feeding in preterm infants. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 6(6): CD009720. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD009720.pub3

Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. (2008). GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ. 336(7650): 924-6. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD

HEIW. (2024). Strategic perinatal workforce plan. Available at: https://heiw.nhs.wales/workforce/strategic-perinatal-workforce-plan/ [Accessed June 2024].

Jeong E, Jung YH, Shin SH, et al. (2016). The successful accomplishment of nutritional and clinical outcomes via the implementation of a multidisciplinary nutrition support team in the neonatal intensive care unit. BMC Pediatr. 16: 113. doi: 10.1186/s12887-016-0648-0

Jones K, Weatherly H, Birch S, et al. (2023). Unit Costs of Health and Social Care 2022 Manual. Available at: https://kar.kent.ac.uk/100519/ [Accessed June 2024].

Lavallée A, De Clifford-Faugère G, Ballard A, et al. (2021). Parent–Infant Interventions to Promote Parental Sensitivity During NICU Hospitalization: Systematic Review and

Meta-Analysis. Journal of Early Intervention. 43(4): 361-82. doi: 10.1177/1053815121991928

Morioka Y, Nonogaki M, Kobayashi D, et al. (2024). Effects of increased physical therapy staffing in the neonatal intensive care unit on oral feeding maturation and neurodevelopment of extremely low birth weight infants. Brain Dev. doi: 10.1016/j.braindev.2024.03.005

Muirhead R, Bates A. (2023). Does the Implementation of Multidisciplinary Developmental Care Rounds Increase the Utilization of Developmental Caregiving Interventions in the Neonatal Unit? J Perinat Neonatal Nurs. 37(2): 153-63. doi: 10.1097/JPN.0000000000000725

NHSE, NHSI. (2019). Implementing the Recommendations of the Neonatal Critical Care Transformation Review. Available at: https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Implementing-the-Recommendations-of-the-Neonatal-Critical-Care-Transformation-Review-FINAL.pdf [Accessed May 2024].

NICE. (2017). NICE guideline NG72 : Developmental follow-up of children and young people born preterm. Available at: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng72 [Accessed.

NICE. (2020). NICE guideline NG154: Neonatal parenteral nutrition. Available at: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng154 [Accessed.

Orton J, Doyle LW, Tripathi T, et al. (2024). Early developmental intervention programmes provided post hospital discharge to prevent motor and cognitive impairment in preterm infants. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. (2). doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD005495.pub5

PHW. (2023). Improving Together for Wales: Maternity Neonatal Safety Support Programme Cymru Discovery Phase Report. Available at: https://phw.nhs.wales/services-and-teams/improvement-cymru/our-work1/matneossp/ [Accessed May 2024].

RCPCH. (2023). National Neonatal Audit Programme Summary report on 2022 data. Available at: https://www.rcpch.ac.uk/resources/national-neonatal-audit-programme-summary-report-2022-data [Accessed May 2024].

Rodovanski GP, Réus BAB, Neves dos Santos A. (2023). The effects of multisensory stimulation on the length of hospital stay and weight gain in hospitalized preterm infants: A systematic review with meta-analysis. Brazilian Journal of Physical Therapy. 27(1): 100468. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjpt.2022.100468

Royal College of Occupational Therapists. (2022). Occupational therapy in neonatal services and early intervention. Practice Guideline. Available at: https://www.rcot.co.uk/file/10660/download?token=YOQyzJup [Accessed May 2024].

Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. (2023). Speech and language therapy staffing recommendations for neonatal units. Available at: https://www.rcslt.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Neonatal-staffing-levels-2023.pdf [Accessed May 2024].

Sneve J, Kattelmann K, Ren C, et al. (2008). Implementation of a multidisciplinary team that includes a registered dietitian in a neonatal intensive care unit improved nutrition outcomes. Nutr Clin Pract. 23(6): 630-4. doi: 10.1177/0884533608326140

Sterne JA, Hernan MA, Reeves BC, et al. (2016). ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. BMJ. 355: i4919. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i4919

Welch CD, Check J, O'Shea TM. (2017). Improving care collaboration for NICU patients to decrease length of stay and readmission rate. BMJ Open Qual. 6(2): e000130. doi: 10.1136/bmjoq-2017-000130

Whiting P, Savovic J, Higgins JP, et al. (2016). ROBIS: A new tool to assess risk of bias in systematic reviews was developed. J Clin Epidemiol. 69: 225-34. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.06.005

Yang M, Campbell H, Pillay T, et al. (2023). Neonatal health care costs of very preterm babies in England: a retrospective analysis of a national birth cohort. BMJ Paediatr Open. 7(1). doi: 10.1136/bmjpo-2022-001818

5. RAPID REVIEW METHODS

5.1 Eligibility criteria

Table 5: Eligibility Criteria for review question 1: what is the effectiveness of neonatal services with embedded allied health professionals compared to neonatal services without embedded allied health professionals?

	Inclusion criteria
Population	Babies admitted to neonatal units and their parents/carers
Intervention	Neonatal units with the following embedded AHPs: • Physiotherapists • Dieticians • Occupational therapists • Speech and language therapists • Psychologists
Control or counter intervention	• Neonatal units without embedded AHPs • Neonatal units with different ratios of embedded AHPs to babies cared for • Neonatal units with different types of embedded AHPs
Outcome measures	Primary outcomes: • Mortality • General gross motor ability • General cognitive ability Secondary outcomes: • Quality of life • Length of stay • Visual impairment • Hearing impairment • Parental confidence • Parental bonding and attachment • Parental mental health and mood
Setting / Context	Neonatal units (levels 1 to 3)
Study design	Systematic reviews of comparative studies Randomised controlled trials Comparative observational studies
Countries	We will prioritise papers that include data from countries where evidence is most relevant to UK neonatal services. We will classify this as studies from UK, Europe, Australia, New Zealand and Canada. Evidence from other settings, may be included but will be downgraded for indirectness.
Language of publication	English
Publication date	1995 onwards
Publication type	Published and preprint. Audits and other grey literature may be included if they are publicly available.

Table 6: Eligibility Criteria for review question 2: What is the effectiveness of early interventions provided by allied health professionals in neonatal units?

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Population	Babies admitted to neonatal units and their parents/carers	

Intervention	Early interventions provided in neonatal units by AHPs such as:
	• Physiotherapist
	  ○ Handling
	  ○ Head moulding/shaping
	  ○ Neonatal massage
	  ○ Early Therapy in Perinatal Stroke (eTIPS)
	• Dietician
	  ○ Introduction of enteral feeds
	  ○ Optimisation of nutrition
	  ○ Introduction of nutrition protocols
	  ○ Introduction of breast milk fortifier
	• Speech and language therapist
	  ○ feeding / pre-feeding strategies
	  ▪ cue-based feeding/infant-driven feeding
	  ▪ pacing
	  ▪ slow flow teat
	  ▪ elevated side-lying
	  ○ neonatal communication focused interventions
	• Occupational therapist
	  ○ Infant occupations
	  ○ Parent occupations
	  ○ Parent/infant co-occupations
	• Psychologist
	  ○ Emotional / cognitive support interventions:
	  ▪ Emotional grounding
	  ▪ Normalising
	  ▪ Active listening
	  ▪ Emotional stabilisation
	  ▪ Mindfulness
	  ▪ Sharing formulations
	  ▪ Early sensitivity training
	  ○ Specific therapeutic interventions:
	  ▪ Eye Movement Desensitisation and Reprocessing (EMDR)
	  ▪ Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT)
	  ○ Attachment and Relationships based interventions
	• Interventions not exclusive to a single type of AHP:
	  ○ Developmentally supportive care
	  ○ Positioning
	  ○ Education (of parents and neonatal staff)
	  ○ Coaching of parents
	  ○ Sensory stimulation
	  ○ Non-pharmacological pain relief
	  ○ Specialist assessments
		Interventions where the involvement of an AHP is unclear

Control or counter intervention	• Standard care • No early intervention	

Outcome measures	Primary outcomes: • Length of stay • Parental confidence • Parental bonding and attachment • General gross motor ability • General cognitive ability Secondary outcomes (some are profession specific): • Aspiration • Oral feeding • Cranial head shape • Readmission rates • Parental mental health and mood • Neonatal staff competencies • Neonatal staff stress	
Setting / Context	Neonatal units (levels 1 to 3)	
Study design	Systematic reviews of randomised controlled trials Randomised controlled trials	
Countries	We will prioritise papers that include data from countries where evidence is most relevant to UK neonatal services. We will classify this as studies from UK, Europe, Australia, New Zealand and Canada. Evidence from other settings, may be included but will be downgraded for indirectness.	
Language of publication	English	
Publication date	1995 onwards	
Publication type	Published and preprint	

5.2 Incorporating data from existing reviews

For review question 2 we used included systematic reviews:
As a source of study characteristics/patient demographics.
As a source of outcome and risk of bias data.

5.3 Literature search

Medline, Ovid EMCARE, AMED, CINAHL and Cochrane were searched for review question 1. For review question 2 Ovid EMCARE, AMED, CINAHL and Cochrane were searched. Studies published after 1995 were included due to major advances in neonatal care since that date. Searches were done between 7th and 11th March 2024. See Appendix 2 for search strategy. Websites were also searched for audits of neonatal services, see Appendix 3.

5.4 Study selection process

Using the Covidence systematic reviewing platform, two reviewers dual-screened 10% of titles and abstracts independently. After this, the level of agreement was assessed with disagreements settled by discussion and consensus. Both reviewers had to achieve at least 80% agreement on screened records before progressing to the next stage. The remaining titles and abstracts were screened by the primary reviewer alone. Ten percent of all full texts were screened by both reviewers, with the same agreement threshold (80%) as before, which was necessary before the remaining records could be screened by the primary reviewer alone. During independent screening, the primary reviewer consulted with the secondary reviewer in the case of any uncertainties.

5.5 Data extraction

The following data were extracted where available:
Study information (author, year, country, type of neonatal unit)
Population characteristics
Intervention and comparison characteristics
Data on relative effectiveness for example odds ratios, or risk ratios for dichotomous variables and mean differences for continuous variables.
Data were extracted by a single reviewer and quality assured by a second reviewer.

5.6 Study design classification

The included studies were classified as systematic reviews, RCTs, cohort studies or before-after studies.

5.7 Quality appraisal

Different critical appraisal checklists were used to assess risk of bias depending on study design. For systematic reviews we used ROBIS (Whiting et al. 2016). For observational cohort studies the ROBINS-I checklist (Sterne et al. 2016) was used. ROBINS-I was not appropriate for before-after studies so in these cases we used the EPOC risk of bias criteria (EPOC 2017). We used the included systematic reviews as a source of risk of bias data for trials in review question 2. These reviews had used Cochrane RoB 1, Cochrane RoB 2 and the PEDro scale to assess risk of bias in RCTs trials.

5.8 Synthesis

Studies were grouped by intervention and outcome for synthesis. When studies were sufficiently similar in their populations, interventions, comparisons and outcomes we combined their results in meta-analysis using the meta package in R (Balduzzi et al. 2019). Otherwise, the data were synthesised using narrative synthesis. Published meta-analyses of the included systematic reviews were redone, excluding any studies not meeting our inclusion criteria.

5.9 Assessment of body of evidence

Certainty in the overall body of evidence was assessed using GRADE (Guyatt et al. 2008). The GRADE approach provides a formal system to categorises the certainty of (or confidence in) the evidence for each outcome or effect into one of four levels: high, moderate, low and very low. The system for assessing the certainty of evidence includes five domains relating to: risk of bias across the studies, inconsistency (heterogeneity) of the results between studies, indirectness (including subgroup analyses and applicability of the outcome measure), imprecision of the result (number of events, and width of the confidence intervals), and publication bias. At the start it is assumed that randomised controlled trials (RCTs) provide high level evidence and observational studies low, but this evidence is then downgraded or upgraded based on the assessment of the different criteria. A summary of the GRADE ratings and their interpretation is provided in Table 7.

Table 7 GRADE ratings and their interpretation

Grade (evidence quality)	Definition
High	We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect
Moderate	We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different
Low	Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect.
Very low	We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

6. EVIDENCE

6.1 Search results and study selection

Figure 1: PRISMA flow diagram



6.2 Data extraction

Studies included for question 1 are summarised in Table 8, all were primary studies. Studies included for question 2 are summarised in Table 9, all were systematic reviews.

Table 8: Summary of included studies for Q1

Citation Country) Aim url/doi	Study Details	Participants & setting and intervention	Key findings
Furtado, 2016 (Canada)	**Study design:** before/after study **Dates of data collection:** 2007-2009 and 2010-2012 **Data collection methods:** medical records **Outcome measures:** Mortality, length of NICU stay, time to enteral feeding, **Follow up:** to hospital discharge **Quality rating:** high risk of bias (EPOC criteria)	**Sample size:** 55 **Participants:** infants with short bowel syndrome and intestinal failure. **Setting:** neonatal intensive care unit **Intervention:** implementation of monthly intestinal failure MDT including gastroenterology, neonatology, general surgery, nursing, dietetics, pharmacy, social work, and occupational therapy. **Comparator intervention or control:** pre-implementation period.	*Mortality*[1] MDT 2/27, Control 4/27. OR (95% CI) : 0.48 (0.08 to 2.87) *Length of NICU stay (days; mean ± SD)* MDT 115.80±87.60, Control 125.80±60.80. MD (95% CI) -10.00 (-49.99 to 29.99) *Time to enteral feeding (days; mean ± SD)* MDT 158.50±85.30, Control 100.80±68.60. MD (95% CI) 57.70 (16.70 to 98.70)
Gover, 2014 (Canada)	**Study design:** cohort study **Dates of data collection:** 2005 to 2009 **Data collection methods:** medical records **Outcome measures:** Mortality, length of NICU stay, time to enteral feeding, **Follow up:** to hospital discharge	**Sample size:** 396 (in 16 centres) **Participants:** infants with gastroschisis **Setting:** neonatal intensive care unit **Intervention:** MDT involved in management of gastroschisis - including at least 3 disciplines (gastroenterology, neonatology, surgery, dietetics)	*Mortality*[1] MDT 5/204, Control 10/192. OR (95% CI) : 0.46 (0.15 to 1.36) *Length of stay (days; mean ± SD)* MDT 57.00±59.00, Control 44.00±.49.00. MD (95% CI) 13.00 (2.34 to 23.66) *Time to enteral feeding (days; mean ± SD)* MDT 47.00±51.00, Control 34.00±33.00. MD (95% CI) 13.00 (4.59 to 21.41)

Citation Country) Aim url/doi	Study Details	Participants & setting and intervention	Key findings
	Quality rating: high risk of bias (ROBINS-I)	**Comparator intervention or control:** no MDT involved in management of gastroschisis	
Jeong, 2016 (South Korea)	**Study design:** before/after study **Dates of data collection:** 2009-2010 and 2012-2013 **Data collection methods:** medical records **Outcome measures:** Mortality, length of NICU stay, time to full enteral feeding, **Follow up:** to hospital discharge **Quality rating:** high risk of bias (EPOC criteria)	**Sample size:** 229 **Participants:** preterm infants (< 30 weeks gestational age or birth weight < 1250g). Excluded those with major congenital abnormality or survival < 1 week. **Setting:** neonatal intensive care unit **Intervention:** multidisciplinary nutritional support team (physicians, dietitians, nurses, pharmacists). **Comparator intervention or control:** no MDT involved in management	*Mortality*[1] MDT 7/122, Control 6/107. OR (95% CI) : 1.02 (0.33 to 3.15) *Length of stay (days; mean ± SD)* MDT 72.21 ±32.89, Control 81.72±.36.56. MD (95% CI) -9.51 (-18.57 to -0.45) *Time to full oral feeding (days; mean ± SD)* MDT 18.80±16.20, Control 23.50±16.20. MD (95% CI) -4.70 (-8.91 to -0.49)
Morioka, 2024 (Japan)	**Study design:** before/after study **Dates of data collection:** 2016 to 2018 **Data collection methods:** medical records **Outcome measures:** Length of stay, time to oral feeding, neurodevelopment (Hammersmith Neonatal Neurological Examination) **Follow up:** to hospital discharge **Quality rating:** high risk of bias (EPOC criteria)	**Sample size:** 90 **Participants:** preterm infants receiving physiotherapy. Excluded those with severe disorders or congenital malformations. **Setting:** neonatal intensive care unit **Intervention:** NICU with dedicated physiotherapy staff devoted to care of neonates **Comparator intervention or control:** NICU without dedicated physiotherapy staff. Physiotherapists covered NICU, paediatric ward and outpatients concurrently.	*Length of stay (days; mean ± SD)* Embedded physiotherapist 121.5±24.7, Control 121.2±36.1. MD (95% CI) 0.30 (-12.35 to 12.95) *PMA at discharge from hospital (weeks; mean ± SD)* Embedded physiotherapist 43.14±2.57, Control 44.14±3.57. MD (95% CI) -1.00 (-2.27 to 0.27) *General gross motor ability (measured with Hammersmith Neonatal Neurological Examination total points at around 39 weeks PMA; mean ± SD)* Embedded physiotherapist 28.0±2.4, Control 26.8±2.7. MD (95% CI) 1.20 (0.15 to 2.25) *Time to full oral feeding (weeks PMA; mean ± SD)* Embedded physiotherapist 39.57±1.57, Control 41.0±2.5. MD (95% CI) -1.43 weeks (-2.28 to -0.58)

Citation Country) Aim url/doi	Study Details	Participants & setting and intervention	Key findings
Muirhead, 2023 (Australia)	**Study design:** before/after study **Dates of data collection:** 2019 to 2020 **Data collection methods:** staff survey **Outcome measures:** use of family centered developmental care interventions **Follow up:** survey covered 6-month period **Quality rating:** high risk of bias (EPOC criteria)	**Sample size:** 97 survey responses (pre & post MDT response rates were 15% and 17% respectively) **Participants:** all healthcare professionals working in the neonatal intensive care unit **Setting:** neonatal intensive care unit **Intervention:** implementation of multidisciplinary developmental care rounds. Core team included an advanced practice nurse, an occupational therapist, a physiotherapist, and a speech therapist. **Comparator intervention or control:** pre-implementation time period	Staff reported use of developmental care interventions (figures are measured from graph) *Skin to skin for analgesia*[1] Pre MDT: About 22% Post MDT: About 40% *Consideration of sleep state*[1] Pre MDT: About 34% Post MDT: About 54% *Side lying nappy changes*[1] Pre MDT: About 4% Post MDT: About 20% *Swaddled bathing*[1] Pre MDT: About 20% Post MDT: About 38% *Developmental care plan evident*[1] Pre MDT: About 20% Post MDT: About 46% *Parents contribute to care planning*[1] Pre MDT: About 42% Post MDT: About 66% *Use of 5 step dialogue*[1] Pre MDT: About 9% Post MDT About 30% *Parental confidence (Parents contribute to care planning)*[1] Relative effect calculated from survey results. Post MDT 34/51, Pre MDT 19/46. RR (95% CI) 1.61 (1.09 to 2.40)
Sneve, 2008	**Study design:** before/after study	**Sample size:** 105	*Mortality*[1]

Citation Country) Aim url/doi	Study Details	Participants & setting and intervention	Key findings
(USA)	**Dates of data collection:** 2001 and 2004 **Data collection methods:** medical records **Outcome measures:** length of hospital stay, time to enteral feeding **Follow up:** to hospital discharge **Quality rating:** high risk of bias (EPOC criteria)	**Participants:** **Setting:** neonatal intensive care unit **Intervention:** implementation of a multidisciplinary nutritional support team including a registered dietitian **Comparator intervention or control:** pre-implementation time period	MDT 13/63, Control 2/42. OR (95% CI) : 5.20 (1.11 to 24.39) *Length of stay (days; mean ± SD)* MDT 72.00±9.67, Control 65.00±.8.67. MD (95% CI) 7.00 (3.45 to 10.55) *Time to full enteral feeds (days; mean ± SD)* Cannot calculate – insufficient data reported.
Welch, 2017 (USA)	**Study design:** before/after study **Dates of data collection:** 2001 and 2004 **Data collection methods:** medical records **Outcome measures:** length of hospital stay **Follow up:** 1 year pre-implementation and 1 year post implementation **Quality rating:** high risk of bias (EPOC criteria)	**Sample size:** 71 **Participants**: medically complex infants in neonatal intensive care (such as chronic lung disease, oral feeding difficulties or 3 or more sub-specialties involved in care) **Setting:** neonatal intensive care unit **Intervention:** implementation of a 1-hour multidisciplinary meeting including: neonatologist, paediatric surgeon or surgery nurse practitioner, social worker, palliative care nurse specialist, ICN nurse specialist and an occupational, speech or physiotherapist. **Comparator intervention or control:** pre-implementation time period	*Length of stay (days; mean ± SD)* MDT 21.70±NR, Control 28.20±NR. Cannot calculate MD as SDs not reported. Pre-MDT sample size not reported.

Abbreviations: CI: confidence interval; EPOC: effective practice and organisation of care; MD: mean difference; MDT: multidisciplinary team; NR: not reported; OR: odds ratio; PMA: post menstrual age; SD: standard deviation

1. Statistic calculated from values reported in paper.

Table 9: Summary of included studies for Q2

All studies included for question 2 were systematic reviews.

<table>
<tr><th>Citation (Country)</th><th>Review details</th><th>Included studies</th><th>Key findings</th></tr>
<tr>
<td>Girabent-Farres, 2021 (Spain)</td>
<td>Review period: studies published before September 2020

Review purpose: to evaluate the effect of early intervention programmes on stress in parents of preterm babies

Included study designs: RCTs

Included populations: parents of infants born preterm (<37 weeks gestation)

Included interventions: early intervention programmes supervised by health professionals which actively involved parents in the treatment,

Included outcome measures: parental stress

RoB tool used in review: PEDro scale</td>
<td>Included and excluded trials:
Some of the trials included in the review did not meet our inclusion criteria because they were not delivered by an AHP or were started post discharge from the neonatal unit. These were excluded from the current analysis (grey cells).

<table>
<tr><th>Intervention delivered by</th><th>Intervention started in NICU</th><th>Intervention started post discharge†</th></tr>
<tr><td>Psychologists</td><td>Castel 2016; Borghini 2014</td><td>Meijssen 2011; Schappin 2013</td></tr>
<tr><td>Team including an AHP</td><td>Als 2003; Feeley 2012‡;</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Nurses†</td><td>Glazebrook 2007; Kaaresen 2008, Kaaresen 2006, Landsem 2014, Newnham 2009, Ravn 2012; Van der Pal 2007, 2008</td><td></td></tr>
</table>
†Trials excluded from this analysis
‡Trial could not be included in meta-analysis

Interventions
<table>
<tr><th>Intervention</th><th>Trials</th></tr>
<tr><td>Early intervention program actively involving parents</td><td>Als 2003; Borghini 2014; Castel 2016; Feeley 2012;</td></tr>
</table>
Outcomes included in meta-analysis
<table>
<tr><th>Outcome</th><th>Trials</th><th>N</th><th>Countries</th></tr>
<tr><td>Parental stress</td><td>Als 2003; Borghini 2014; Castel 2016</td><td>179</td><td>France, USA</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td>The meta-analyses of Girabent-Farres 2021 were redone, excluding the irrelevant trials and irrelevant outcomes. See Appendix 1 figure 11.</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Citation (Country)</th><th>Review details</th><th>Included studies</th><th>Key findings</th></tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene, 2023 (Ireland)</td>
<td>Review period: studies published before March 2022

Review purpose: to evaluate the effectiveness of oral stimulation interventions for attainment of oral feeding in preterm infants

Included study designs: RCTs or quasi RCTs

Included populations: infants born preterm (<37 weeks gestation)

Included interventions: oral stimulation in any clinical setting delivered by a trained person or team, including nurse, occupational therapist, speech and language therapist, other developmental specialist or parent (supported by therapist).

Included outcome measures: time to oral feeding, time in NICU, length of hospital stay, duration of parenteral feeding

RoB tool used in review: Cochrane ROB1</td>
<td>Included and excluded trials:
Some of the trials included in the review did not meet our inclusion criteria because they were not delivered by an AHP. These were excluded from the current analysis (grey cells).

<table>
<tr><th>Intervention delivered by</th><th>Trials</th></tr>
<tr><td>Physiotherapists</td><td>Aguilar Rodriguez 2020*‡, Gaebler 1996*, Thakkar 2018</td></tr>
<tr><td>Speech and language therapists</td><td>Aguilar Rodriguez 2020*‡, Asadollahpour 2015, Da Rosa Pereira 2020, Harding 2006, Harding 2014‡*, Pimenta 2008, Rocha 2007, Younesian 2015</td></tr>
<tr><td>Occupational therapists</td><td>Arora 2018, Fucile 2002, Fucile 2010, Fucile 2012, Fucile 2018, Gaebler 1996*, Skaaning 2020‡</td></tr>
<tr><td>Therapist (not specified)</td><td>Boiron 2007, Ghomi 2019</td></tr>
<tr><td>Other or not reported†</td><td>Bala 2016, Harding 2014*, Lessen 2011, Lessen Knoll 2019, Li 2020, Lyu 2014, Maheswari 2018, Mahmoodi 2019, Neiva 2006, Noori 2018, Zhang 2014</td></tr>
</table>
†Trials excluded from this analysis
*more than 1 role delivered intervention
‡Trial could not be included in meta-analysis

Intervention details
<table>
<tr><th>Intervention</th><th>Trials</th></tr>
<tr><td>Oral stimulation – 15 minute finger stimulation protocol of Fucile 2002</td><td>Aguilar Rodriguez 2020; Asadollahpour 2015; Da Rosa Pereira 2020; Fucile 2002; Fucile 2010; Fucile 2012; Fucile 2018; Harding 2014; Li 2020; Lyu 2014; Pimenta 2008; Rocha 2007; Younesian 2015;</td></tr>
<tr><td>Oral stimulation – 5 minute finger stimulation protocol of Lessen 2011</td><td>Arora 2018; Ghomi 2019; Skaaning 2020; Thakkar 2018</td></tr>
<tr><td>Oral stimulation – other protocols</td><td>Boiron 2007; Gaebler 1996; Harding 2006</td></tr>
</table>
<u>Outcomes included in meta-analysis</u>
<table>
<tr><th>Outcome</th><th>Trials</th><th>N</th><th>Countries</th></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td>The meta-analyses of Greene 2023 were redone, excluding the irrelevant trials and irrelevant outcomes. See Appendix 1 figures 5 and 10.</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Citation (Country)</th><th>Review details</th><th>Included studies</th><th>Key findings</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Time (days) to achieve exclusive oral feeding</td><td>Arora 2018, Asadollahpour 2015, Boiron 2007, Fucile 2002, Fucile 2010, Fucile 2018, Gaebler 1996, Ghomi 2019, Rocha 2007, Younesian 2015</td><td>409</td><td>Brazil, Canada, France, India, Iran, USA</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total hospital stay (days)</td><td>Asadollahpour 2015, Fucile 2002, Fucile 2010, Fucile 2018, Gaebler 1996, Ghomi 2019, Pimenta 2008, Rocha 2007, Thakkar 2018, Younesian 2015</td><td>534</td><td>Brazil, Canada, India, Iran, USA</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Lavallee, 2021 (Canada)</td><td>Review period: studies published before February 2020

Review purpose: to evaluate the effect of early interventions for parents of preterm babies during NICU stay

Included study designs: RCTs

Included populations: parents of infants born preterm (<37 weeks gestation)

Included interventions: early interventions for parents of preterm babies during NICU stay

Included outcome measures: parental sensitivity, parental stress , neurodevelopment of the infant</td><td>Included and excluded trials:
Some of the trials included in the review did not meet our inclusion criteria because they were not delivered by an AHP. These were excluded from the current analysis (grey cells).

<table>
<tr><th>Intervention delivered by</th><th>RCTs</th></tr>
<tr><td>Psychologists</td><td>Borghini 2014; Evans 2017; Milgrom 2013; Meyer 1994‡; Zelkowitz 2011‡*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Nurses†</td><td>Glazebrook 2007; Melnyk 2006; Hane 2015; Hoffenkamp 2015; Ravn 2011; Sahlen Helmer 2019; White-Traut et al., 2013; Zelkowitz 2011*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Other or not reported†</td><td>Browne 2005; Chiu 2009; Nelson 2001; Newnham 2009; Teti 2009; Twohig 2019</td></tr>
</table>
†Trials excluded from this analysis
*More than 1 role delivered intervention
‡Trial could not be included in meta-analysis

Intervention details
<table>
<tr><th>Intervention</th><th>Trials</th></tr>
<tr><td>Guided interaction and video feedback</td><td>Borghini 2014</td></tr>
<tr><td>Educational intervention</td><td>Evans 2017</td></tr>
<tr><td>Enhanced MITP intervention (PremieStart)</td><td>Milgrom 2013</td></tr>
</table>
Outcomes included in meta-analysis
<table>
<tr><th>Outcome</th><th>Trials</th><th>N</th><th>Countries</th></tr>
</table>
</td><td>The meta-analyses of Lavallee 2021 were redone, excluding the irrelevant trials and irrelevant outcomes. See Appendix 1 figure 7.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Citation (Country)</th><th>Review details</th><th>Included studies</th><th>Key findings</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>RoB tool used in review: Cochrane ROB1</td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Parent sensitivity (short to mid term)</td><td>Borghini 2014, Evans 2017, Milgrom 201</td><td>247</td><td>Australia, Switzerland</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Orton, 2024 (Australia)</td><td>Review period: studies published before July 2023

Review purpose: to evaluate the effectiveness of early developmental interventions for preterm infants, which continue post-discharge from hospital

Included study designs: RCTs, quasi-RCTs and cluster RCTs

Included populations: infants born preterm (<37 weeks gestation)

Included interventions: early developmental intervention programmes to improve cognitive or motor outcomes. Carried out by a health professional such as a physiotherapist, a doctor, a psychologist, an occupational therapist, rehabilitation specialist, or a nurse.

Included outcome measures: motor or cognitive impairment

RoB tool used in review: Cochrane ROB1</td><td>
Included and excluded trials:
Some of the trials included in the review did not meet our inclusion criteria because they were not delivered by an AHP or were started post discharge from the neonatal unit. These were excluded from the current analysis (grey cells).
<table>
<tr><th>Intervention delivered by</th><th>Intervention started in the NICU</th><th>Intervention started post discharge†</th></tr>
<tr><td>Physiotherapists</td><td>Cameron 2005‡; Dusing 2015; Dusing 2018; Koldewijn 2009; Ochandorena-Acha 2022‡; Wu 2014;</td><td>Apaydin 2023; Campbell 2012; Goodman 1985; Kara 2019; Lekskulchai 2001; Spittle 2009*; Youn 2021*; Yigit 2002; Ziegler 2021</td></tr>
<tr><td>Occupational therapists</td><td>Finlayson 2020*;</td><td>Barrera 1986;* Leucona 2017*; Sajaniemi 2001</td></tr>
<tr><td>Psychologists</td><td>Castel 2016; Colditz 2019; Finlayson 2020*; Milgrom 2019;</td><td>Barrera 1986;* Gianni 2006; Leucona 2017*; Sajaniemi 2001; Spittle 2009*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Doctors†</td><td></td><td>Bao 1999</td></tr>
<tr><td>Nurses†</td><td>Johnson 2009; Kaaresen 2006; Kyno 2012; Nurcombe 1984; Resnick 1988;</td><td>APIP 1998; Rice 1979; Youn 2021*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Rehab or educational staff†</td><td></td><td>Alberge 2023; Fan 2021; I.H.D.P. 1990</td></tr>
<tr><td>Unclear or not reported†</td><td>Melnyk 2001; Nelson 2001; Ohgi 2004; Shafaroodi 2022; Zhang 2023</td><td>Field 1980; Pascoali Rodovanski 2021; Teti 2009; Treyvaud 2022</td></tr>
</table>
†Trials excluded from this analysis
*more than 1 role delivered intervention
‡Trial could not be included in meta-analysis

Intervention details
<table>
<tr><th>Intervention</th><th>Trials</th></tr>
</table>
</td><td>The meta-analyses of Orton 2024 were redone, excluding the irrelevant trials and irrelevant outcomes. See Appendix 1 figures 8 and 9.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Citation (Country)</th><th>Review details</th><th>Included studies</th><th>Key findings</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Early developmental intervention programmes to improve cognitive or motor outcomes: components varied widely from parental education to infant stimulation</td><td>Cameron 2005, Castel 2016, Colditz 2019, Dusing 2015, Dusing 2018, Finlayson 2020, Koldewijn 2009, Milgrom 2019, Ochandorena-Acha 2022, Wu 2014</td></tr>
</table>
Outcomes included in meta-analysis
<table>
<tr><th>Outcome</th><th>Trials</th><th>N</th><th>Countries</th></tr>
<tr><td>Cognitive outcome in infancy - Developmental Quotient</td><td>Colditz 2019, Dusing 2015, Dusing 2018, Finlayson 2020, Koldewijn 2009, Milgrom 2019, Wu 2014</td><td>751</td><td>Australia, Netherlands, Taiwan, USA</td></tr>
<tr><td>Motor outcome in infancy - Developmental Quotient</td><td>Castel 2016, Colditz 2019, Dusing 2015, Dusing 2018, Finlayson 2020, Koldewijn 2009, Milgrom 2019, Wu 2014</td><td>786</td><td>Australia, France, Netherlands, Taiwan, USA</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Rodovanski, 2023 (Country)</td><td>Review period: studies published before May 2022.

Review purpose: to evaluate the effectiveness of multisensory stimulation in preterm infants

Included study designs: RCTs

Included populations: hospitalised preterm infants

Included interventions: auditory-tactile-visual-vestibular intervention, tactile-kinaesthetic</td><td>Included and excluded trials:
Some of the interventions (Kangaroo mother care or skin-to-skin contact) included in the review did not meet our inclusion criteria because they are not are typically delivered by an AHP. These were excluded from the current analysis (grey cells). The other interventions auditory-tactile-visual-vestibular stimulation and tactile-kinaesthetic stimulation can be delivered by AHPs or nurses – but who delivered the intervention was not reported in the review.

<table>
<tr><th>Intervention</th><th>Trials</th></tr>
<tr><td>Auditory-tactile-visual-vestibular intervention</td><td>Brown 1980; Kanagassabai 2013; Nasimi 2016; Resnick 1987; Vairve-Douret 2009; Walworth 2012; White-Traut 1986; White-Traut 2015; Zeraati 2018</td></tr>
<tr><td>Tactile-kinaesthetic stimulation</td><td>Ang 2012; Diego 2005; Diego 2007; Dieter 2003; Field 1986; Field 2008; Freitas 2010; Hernandez-Reif 2007; Lee 2005; Matricardi 2013; Scafidi 1986; Scafidi 1990; White 1976</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>The meta-analyses of Rodovanski 2023 were redone, excluding where possible the irrelevant trials and irrelevant outcomes. See Appendix 1 figure 6.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Citation (Country)</th><th>Review details</th><th>Included studies</th><th>Key findings</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>stimulation, and kangaroo mother care

Included outcome measures: length of hospital stay

RoB tool used in review: Cochrane ROB2</td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Kangaroo mother care or skin-to-skin contact†</td><td>Acharya 2014; Bier 1996; Chwo 2002; Edraki 2015; Gathwala 2008; Ghavane 2012; Kadam 2005; Miltersteiner 2005; Mwendwa 2012; Neu 2013; Roberts 2000; Rojas 2003; Samra 2015; Sharma 2016; Sharma 2016b; Sharma 2017; Tessier 1998; Welch 2013</td></tr>
</table>
†Interventions excluded from this analysis – not typically delivered by an AHP

Outcomes included in meta-analysis
<table>
<tr><th>Outcome</th><th>Trials</th><th>N</th><th>Countries</th></tr>
<tr><td>Length of stay (days)</td><td>Ang 2012, Brown 1980, Diego 2005, Diego 2007, Dieter 2003, Field 1986, Field 2008, Freitas 2010, Hernandez-Reif 2007, Kanagassabai 2013, Lee 2005, Matricardi 2013, Nasimi 2016, Resnick 1987, Scafidi 1986, Scafidi 1990, Vairve-Douret 2009, Walworth 2012, White 1976, White-Traut 1986, White-Traut 2015, Zeraati 2018</td><td>1493</td><td>Brazil, France, India, Iran, Italy, South Korea, USA</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Abbreviations: PDMI: parent-delivered motor intervention; TDPCI: therapist-delivered postural control intervention; MITP: Mother Infant Transaction Program ; NICU: neonatal intensive care unit; PEDro : physiotherapy evidence database; RCT: randomised controlled trials; RoB: risk of bias

6.3 Quality appraisal

Summary quality appraisal tables

Table 10: Quality appraisal results for cohort studies

Study	ROBINS-I domain level risk of bias judgements							Overall risk of bias
	Bias due to confounding	Bias in selection of participants into the study	Bias in classification of interventions	Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	Bias due to missing data	Bias in measurement of outcomes	Bias in selection of the reported result	
Gover 2014	Unclear (confounders adjusted for in analysis, but reporting unclear)	Low	Moderate (flexible definition of MDT)	Low	Low	Low	No information (no protocol)	Serious

Table 11: Quality appraisal results for before/after studies

Study	Risk of bias judgements for EPOC criteria									Overall risk of bias
	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Baseline outcome measurements similar	Baseline characteristics similar	Incomplete outcome data	Knowledge of intervention adequately prevented	Protection against contamination	Selective outcome reporting	Other risks of bias	
Furtado 2016	High (before-after study)	High (before-after study)	Not applicable	High (some significant differences)	Low	High (not blinded)	Low	Unclear (no protocol)	High (analysis not adjusted for confounders)	High
Jeong 2016	High (before-after study)	High (before-after study)	Not applicable	High (some significant differences)	Low	High (not blinded)	Low	Unclear (no protocol)	Unclear (only length of stay analysis	High

Study	Risk of bias judgements for EPOC criteria									Overall risk of bias
	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Baseline outcome measurements similar	Baseline characteristics similar	Incomplete outcome data	Knowledge of intervention adequately prevented	Protection against contamination	Selective outcome reporting	Other risks of bias	
									was adjusted for confounders)	
Morioka 2024	High (before-after study)	High (before-after study)	Not applicable	Low	Low	High (not blinded)	Low	Unclear (no protocol)	High (analysis not adjusted for confounders)	High
Muirhead 2023	High (before-after study)	High (before-after study)	Not applicable	Unclear (not reported)	High (survey response rates <17%)	High (not blinded)	Low	Unclear (no protocol)	High (analysis not adjusted for confounders)	High
Sneve 2008	High (before-after study)	High (before-after study)	Not applicable	Unclear (not reported)	Low	High (not blinded)	Low	Unclear (no protocol)	High (analysis not adjusted for confounders)	High
Welch 2017	High (before-after study)	High (before-after study)	Not applicable	Unclear (not reported)	Low	High (not blinded)	Low	Unclear (no protocol)	High (analysis not adjusted for confounders)	High

Table 12: Quality appraisal results for systematic reviews

Study	ROBIS domain judgements				
	Study eligibility criteria	Identification and selection of studies	Data collection and study appraisal	Synthesis and findings	Risk of bias in the review
Girabent-Farres 2021	Low	Unclear (search terms simplistic)	Low	Unclear (cannot access protocol to check planned analyses)	Unclear
Greene 2023	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Lavallee 2021	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Orton 2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Rodovanski 2023	Low	Low	Low	Unclear (no pre-registered protocol to check planned analyses)	Unclear

6.4 GRADE profiles

Table 13: GRADE profile for Q1 - neonatal services with embedded allied health professionals

Certainty assessment							Summary of findings				
							Study event rates (%)			Anticipated absolute effects	
Participants (studies)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall certainty of evidence	With standard care	With Neonatal services with embedded AHPs	Relative effect (95% CI)	Risk with standard care	Risk difference with Neonatal services with embedded AHPs
Length of stay (assessed with: days)											
90 (1 non-randomised study)[a]	very serious[b]	not serious	serious[c]	very serious[e]	none	Very low	48	42	-	The mean length of stay was 121.2 days	MD 0.3 days higher (12.35 lower to 12.95 higher)
General gross motor ability (follow-up: mean 39 weeks PMA; assessed with: Hammersmith Neonatal Neurological Examination (total points), range 0 – 78, higher better)											
90 (1 non-randomised study)[a]	very serious[b]	not serious	very serious[c,d]	not serious	none	Very low	48	42	-	The mean HNNE total was 26.8 points	MD 1.2 points higher (0.15 higher to 2.25 higher)
Time to full oral feeding (assessed with: weeks PMA)											
90 (1 non-randomised study)[a]	very serious[b]	not serious	serious[c]	not serious	none	Very low	48	42	-	The mean time to full oral feeding was 41.0 weeks PMA	MD 1.43 weeks PMA fewer (2.28 fewer to 0.58 fewer)

CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; PMA: post menstrual age

Explanations

a. Morioka 2024
b. Very serious risk of bias per EPOC criteria
c. Study not from UK, Europe, Australia, New Zealand or Canada
d. HNNE is a surrogate measure of general gross motor ability
e. Confidence interval includes both positive and negative clinically important differences

Table 14: GRADE profile for Q1 – multidisciplinary teams with allied health professionals

Certainty assessment							Summary of findings				
							Study event rates (%)			Anticipated absolute effects	
Participants (studies)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall certainty of evidence	With standard care	With MDTs with AHPs in neonatal services	Relative effect (95% CI)	Risk with standard care	Risk difference with MDTs with AHPs in neonatal services
Mortality											
785 (4 non-randomised studies)[a]	very serious[b]	very serious[c]	serious[d]	serious[j]	none	Very low	22/369 (6.0%)	27/416 (6.5%)	OR ranged from 0.46 to 5.20	22/369 (6.0%)	Ranges from 31 fewer per 1000 to 188 more
Length of stay (assessed with: days)											
785 (4 non-randomised studies)[a]	very serious[b]	very serious[c]	serious[d]	serious[j]	none	Very low	369	416	-	The median length of stay was 73.4 days	MD ranged from 10 days fewer to 13 days more
Parental confidence (assessed with: staff think parents contribute to care planning)											
51 (1 non-randomised study)[f]	very serious[b]	not serious	serious[d]	serious[k]	none	Very low	19/46 (41.3%)	34/51 (66.7%)	RR 1.61 (1.09 to 2.40)	413 per 1,000	252 more per 1,000 (from 37 more to 578 more)
Time to oral or enteral feeding (assessed with: days)											
680 (3 non-randomised studies)[e]	very serious[b]	very serious[c]	serious[d]	serious[j]	none	Very low	369	353	-	The median time to oral feeding was 34 days	MD ranged from 5 days fewer to 58 days more

CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; OR: odds ratio; RR: risk ratio

Explanations

a. Furtado 2016, Gover 2014, Jeong 2016, Sneve 2008
b. Very serious risk of bias as per ROBINS-I and EPOC criteria
c. Very serious heterogeneity - effect estimates ranged from favouring MDTs to favouring standard care
d. Intervention is indirectly applicable (neonatal MDT with AHPs is not the same as AHP embedded in neonatal unit)
e. Furtado 2016, Gover 2014, Jeong 2016
f. Muirhead 2023
j. Serious uncertainty about the effect estimate
k. Confidence interval includes 1 default minimal important difference (0.8, 1.25)

Table 15: GRADE profile for Q2 - early interventions provided by allied health professionals in neonatal units

Certainty assessment							Summary of findings				
							Study event rates (%)			Anticipated absolute effects	
Participants (studies)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall certainty of evidence	With standard care	With AHP delivered or supported early intervention	Relative effect (95% CI)	Risk with standard care	Risk difference with AHP delivered or supported intervention
Length of hospital stay (oral stimulation studies) (assessed with: days)											
534 (10 RCTs)[a]	serious[b]	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	Moderate	245	289	-	The median length of hospital stay (oral stimulation studies) was 45 days	MD 6.61 days lower (8.52 lower to 4.71 lower)
Length of hospital stay (TKS studies) (assessed with: days)											
570 (13 RCTs)[c]	serious[b]	not serious	serious[l]	not serious	none	Low	287	283	-	The median length of hospital stay (TKS studies) was 25.5 days	MD 1.73 days lower (3.22 lower to 0.25 lower)
Length of hospital stay (ATVV studies) (assessed with: days)											

Certainty assessment							Summary of findings				
							Study event rates (%)			Anticipated absolute effects	
Participants (studies)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall certainty of evidence	With standard care	With AHP delivered or supported early intervention	Relative effect (95% CI)	Risk with standard care	Risk difference with AHP delivered or supported intervention
923 (9 RCTs)[c]	serious[b]	serious[d]	serious[l]	not serious	none	Very low	468	455	-	The median length of hospital stay (ATVV studies) was 30.1 days	MD 0.06 days lower (1.85 lower to 1.73 higher)
Parental bonding and attachment (assessed with: Parental Sensitivity, higher = better)											
247 (3 RCTs)[e]	not serious[f]	not serious	not serious	serious[g]	none	Moderate	113	134	-	-	SMD 0.32 SD higher (0.07 higher to 0.57 higher)
General cognitive ability (assessed with: developmental quotient; follow-up: 0 – 3 years; higher = better)											
743 (7 RCTs)[h]	serious[b]	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	Moderate	343	400	-	-	SMD 0.22 SD higher (0.07 higher to 0.36 higher)
General gross motor ability (assessed with: developmental quotient; follow-up: 0 – 3 years; higher = better)											
786 (8 RCTs)[h]	serious[b]	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	Moderate	360	426	-	-	SMD 0.32 SD higher (0.18 higher to 0.46 higher)
Time to oral feeding (oral stimulation studies) (assessed with: days)											

Certainty assessment							Summary of findings				
							Study event rates (%)			Anticipated absolute effects	
Participants (studies)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall certainty of evidence	With standard care	With AHP delivered or supported early intervention	Relative effect (95% CI)	Risk with standard care	Risk difference with AHP delivered or supported intervention
409 (10 RCTs)[a]	serious[b]	serious[i]	not serious	not serious	none	Low	170	239	-	170	MD 7.63 days fewer (10.5 fewer to 4.75 fewer)
Parental stress (follow-up 0.5 to 3 months; assessed with: PSI or PSI-SF; lower = better)											
179 (2 RCTs)[j]	serious[b]	not serious	serious[k]	not serious	none	Low	85	94	-	-	SMD 0.07 SD lower (0.37 lower to 0.22 higher)

ATVV: Auditory-tactile-visual-vestibular intervention; CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; PSI: parenting stress index; PSI-SF: parenting stress index – short form; SD: standard deviation; SMD: standardised mean difference; TKS: Tactile-kinaesthetic stimulation

Explanations

a. Greene 2023
b. Serious risk of bias as per ROB checklist
c. Rodovanski 2023
d. Serious heterogeneity
e. Lavallee 2021
f. Due to nature of the intervention, a majority of the studies did not blind the participants or personnel.
g. Confidence interval includes default minimal important difference (±0.5 SMD)
h. Orton 2024
i. Statistical heterogeneity - but all studies show the same direction of effect
j. Girabent-Farres 2021
k. Intervention delivered by team - role of AHP unclear
l. Unclear involvement of AHP in delivering the intervention

6.5 Information available on request

Protocol, search strategies, and excluded studies.

7. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

7.1 Conflicts of interest

The authors declare they have no conflicts of interest to report.

7.2 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Amanda Lawes, Beti-jane Ingram, Bethan Phillips, Catherine Pape, Catriona Matthews, Ceri Selman, Debbie Paris, Elen Elias, Fiona Luff, Leah Watson, Louise Leach, Margaret Manton, and Stephanie Griffiths for their expertise in guiding the review question, and helpful comments on draft versions of the review protocol and rapid review report.

8. APPENDICES

8.1 APPENDIX 1: Forest plots

Forest plots for review question 1: What is the effectiveness of neonatal services with embedded AHPs compared to neonatal services without embedded AHPs?

Figure 2. After versus before implementation of an MDT with a dietician: mortality



AHP: allied health professional; CI: confidence interval; OR: odds ratio; MDT: multidisciplinary team; ROB: risk of bias

Figure 3. After versus before implementation of an MDT with a dietician: length of NICU stay (days)



AHP: allied health professional; CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; MDT: multidisciplinary team; ROB: risk of bias; SD: standard deviation

Figure 4. After versus before implementation of an MDT with a dietician: time to oral or enteral feeding (days)



AHP: allied health professional; CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; MDT: multidisciplinary team; ROB: risk of bias; SD: standard deviation

Forest plots for review question 2: What is the effectiveness of early interventions provided by AHPs in neonatal units?

Figure 5. Early intervention (oral stimulation) provided by AHP versus standard care or sham stimulation: length of stay (days)



AHP: allied health professional; CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; SD: standard deviation

Figure 6. Early intervention (multisensory stimulation) provided by AHP versus standard care: length of stay (days)



AHP: allied health professional; ATVV: auditory-tactile-visual-vestibular intervention; CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; SD: standard deviation; TKS: tactile-kinaesthetic stimulation

Figure 7. Early interventions provided by AHP for parents versus standard care. Parental bonding and attachment: measured with parental sensitivity (higher = better)



AHP: allied health professional; CI: confidence interval; SD: standard deviation; SMD: standardized mean difference

Figure 8. Early interventions provided by AHP versus standard care. General gross motor ability measured with developmental quotient in infancy (higher = better)



AHP: allied health professional; CI: confidence interval; SD: standard deviation; SMD: standardized mean difference

Figure 9. Early interventions provided by AHP versus standard care. General cognitive ability measured with developmental quotient in infancy (higher = better)



AHP: allied health professional; CI: confidence interval; SD: standard deviation; SMD: standardized mean difference

Figure 10. Oral stimulation provided by AHP versus standard care or sham intervention. Oral feeding measured by time to oral feeding (days)



AHP: allied health professional; CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; SD: standard deviation

Figure 11. Early intervention provided by AHP versus standard care. Parental mental health and mood measured by parental stress (lower = better)



AHP: allied health professional; CI: confidence interval; SD: standard deviation; SMD: standardized mean difference

8.2 APPENDIX 2: Search strategy

Table 16 Summary of searches

Database	Search 1	Search 2	Overlap
Emcare	525	1206	14
Medline	428	*(4208 (2039 SRS, 2669 RCTS))*	NA
AMED	39	25	3
CINAHL	316	1628	14
Central	188	1446	31

Table 17 Ovid Emcare <1995 to 2024 Week 09>

1	exp prematurity/	33267
2	exp premature labor/	12270
3	exp neonatal intensive care unit/	4042
4	exp low birth weight/	18619
5	(neonat* or NICU).tw.	104216
6	((preterm or pre-term or prematur*) adj3 (baby or babies or birth or newborn or infant* or child* or young person or young people)).tw.	42047
7	1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6	149941
8	exp early intervention/	12210
9	(early adj3 (intervent* or treat* or recogni* or detect* or therap* or program*)).tw.	108474
10	8 or 9	111711
11	exp randomized controlled trial/	178963
12	controlled clinical trial.pt.	0
13	randomized.ab.	283401
14	placebo.ab.	88200
15	randomly.ab.	183678
16	trial.ab.	290516
17	groups.ab.	894245
18	11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17	1307444
19	exp animals/ not humans.sh.	4555370
20	18 not 19	542023
21	exp Systematic review/	127051
22	exp meta-analysis/	61004
23	exp Systematic reviews as Topic/	8701
24	exp Meta-Analysis as Topic/	10554
25	(systematic review* or meta-analysis or review*).pt.	874554
26	(systematic adj3 (review* or overview*)).ti,ab,kf.	173240
27	(quantitative adj3 (review* or overview* or synthes*)).ti,ab,kf.	4625
28	(meta-analy* or metaanaly* or meta-synthes#s or metasynthes#s).tw.	133469
29	rapid review*.ti,ab,kf.	1381
30	21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28	1011864
31	exp physiotherapy/	36798
32	exp physiotherapist/	12337
33	exp occupational therapy/	13531
34	exp occupational therapist/	7524
35	exp speech therapy/	6053
36	exp speech language pathologist/	3591
37	exp "speech and language rehabilitation"/	7925
38	exp speech rehabilitation/	7133

39	exp diet therapy/	83375
40	exp dietitian/	5915
41	exp psychology/	100126
42	exp psychologist/	9760
43	exp pediatric rehabilitation/	647
44	(allied health profession* or AHP* or physiotherap* or physical therap* or occupational therap* or dietician* or dietetics or psycholog* or p?ediatric rehabilitation or therapist*).tw.	311781
45	(speech adj1 language).tw.	8944
46	31 or 32 or 33 or 34 or 35 or 36 or 37 or 38 or 39 or 40 or 41 or 42 or 43 or 44 or 45	493715
47	exp multidisciplinary team/	4316
48	exp interdisciplinary communication/	2282
49	exp integrated health care system/	2388
50	(multidisciplinary or multi-disciplinary or multiprofessional* or multi-professional* or interdisciplinary or inter-disciplinary or interprofession* or transdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary or transprofessional or trans-professional or multimodal or multi-modal or multiprofessional or multi-professional).tw.	124928
51	((integrated or cooperat* or co-operat* or coordinat* or co-ordinat* or collaborat* or continuity) adj3 (care or therap* or restor* or organi#ation or staff* or approach* or communic* or program* or practice* or manag* or service* or system*)).tw.	87653
52	team*.tw.	149082
53	47 or 48 or 49 or 50 or 51 or 52	309153
54	7 and 10	4366
55	20 or 30	1491031
56	54 and 55	1206
57	7 and 46 and 53	525
58	56 and 57	14

Table 18 Ovid MEDLINE(R) ALL <1946 to March 06, 2024>

1	exp Infant, Premature/	66379
2	exp premature labor/	35366
3	exp neonatal intensive care unit/	18604
4	exp low birth weight/	39423
5	(neonat* or NICU).tw.	319233
6	((preterm or pre-term or prematur*) adj3 (baby or babies or birth or newborn or infant* or child* or young person or young people)).tw.	95860
7	1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6	421313
8	(early adj3 (intervent* or treat* or recogni* or detect* or therap* or program*)).tw.	304165
9	exp randomized controlled trial/	611067
10	controlled clinical trial.pt.	95569
11	randomized.ab.	637248
12	placebo.ab.	246295
13	randomly.ab.	428549
14	trial.ab.	687932
15	groups.ab.	2646060
16	drug therapy.fs.	2672696
17	9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16	5898306
18	exp animals/ not humans.sh.	5200474
19	17 not 18	5157595
20	exp "systematic review"/	254108
21	exp Meta-Analysis/	196169
22	exp Systematic Reviews as Topic/	12790
23	exp Meta-Analysis as Topic/	29223
24	(systematic review* or meta-analysis or review*).pt.	3468972
25	(systematic adj3 (review* or overview*)).ti,ab,kf.	339775
26	(quantitative adj3 (review* or overview* or synthes*)).ti,ab,kf.	9023
27	(meta-analy* or metaanaly* or meta-synthes#s or metasynthes#s).tw.	299345
28	rapid review*.ti,ab,kf.	2238
29	20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28	3574907
30	exp physiotherapist/	3363
31	exp Physical Therapy Modalities/	182480
32	exp occupational therapy/	15208
33	exp occupational therapist/	783
34	exp speech therapy/	6961
35	exp diet therapy/	63331
36	exp dietitian/	1837
37	exp psychology/	70844
38	exp psychologist/	70844
39	(allied health profession* or AHP* or physiotherap* or physical therap* or occupational therap* or dietician* or dietetics or psycholog* or p?ediatric rehabilitation or therapist*).tw.	467107
40	(speech adj1 language).tw.	7575
41	exp Allied Health Personnel/	54845
42	30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 or 35 or 36 or 37 or 38 or 39 or 40 or 41	799081
43	exp interdisciplinary communication/	18153
44	exp integrated health care system/	14601
45	(multidisciplinary or multi-disciplinary or multiprofessional* or multi-professional* or interdisciplinary or inter-disciplinary or interprofession* or transdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary or transprofessional or trans-	258788

	professional or multimodal or multi-modal or multiprofessional or multi-professional).tw.	
46	((integrated or cooperat* or co-operat* or coordinat* or co-ordinat* or collaborat* or continuity) adj3 (care or therap* or restor* or organi#ation or staff* or approach* or communic* or program* or practice* or manag* or service* or system*)).tw.	171031
47	43 or 44 or 45 or 46	430759
48	7 and 42 and 47	428
49	19 or 29	8002010
50	7 and 8 and 49	4208

Table 19 AMED (Allied and Complementary Medicine) <1985 to October 2023>

1	exp Infant, Premature/	212
2	exp intensive care neonatal/	78
3	exp infant newborn/ or infant low birth weight/ or infant premature/	802
4	(neonat* or NICU).tw.	646
5	((preterm or pre-term or prematur*) adj3 (baby or babies or birth or newborn or infant* or child* or young person or young people)).tw.	420
6	1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5	1308
7	(early adj3 (intervent* or treat* or recogni* or detect* or therap* or program*)).tw.	2638
8	exp randomized controlled trial/	3211
9	controlled clinical trial.pt.	70
10	randomized.ab.	12648
11	placebo.ab.	3575
12	randomly.ab.	8323
13	trial.ab.	11221
14	groups.ab.	31019
15	8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14	46002
16	exp animals/ not humans.sh.	16334
17	15 not 16	42827
18	exp meta-analysis/	427
19	(systematic review* or meta-analysis or review*).pt.	14041
20	(systematic adj3 (review* or overview*)).ti,ab.	7324
21	(quantitative adj3 (review* or overview* or synthes*)).ti,ab.	210
22	(meta-analy* or metaanaly* or meta-synthes#s or metasynthes#s).tw.	3925
23	rapid review*.ti,ab.	40
24	18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23	16824
25	exp Physical Therapy Modalities/	32670
26	exp Physiotherapists/	1713
27	exp occupational therapists/	1197
28	exp Speech therapy/	1143
29	exp diet therapy/	2229
30	exp psychology/	37093
31	(allied health profession* or AHP* or physiotherap* or physical therap* or occupational therap* or dietician* or dietetics or psycholog* or p?ediatric rehabilitation or therapist*).tw.	83670
32	(speech adj1 language).tw.	1003
33	exp Allied Health Personnel/	693
34	25 or 26 or 27 or 28 or 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33	106315
35	exp patient care team/	1829
36	(multidisciplinary or multi-disciplinary or multiprofessional* or multi-professional* or interdisciplinary or inter-disciplinary or interprofession* or transdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary or transprofessional or trans-professional or multimodal or multi-modal or multiprofessional or multi-professional).tw.	6294
37	((integrated or cooperat* or co-operat* or coordinat* or co-ordinat* or collaborat* or continuity) adj3 (care or therap* or restor* or organi#ation or staff* or approach* or communic* or program* or practice* or manag* or service* or system*)).tw.	4224
38	team*.tw.	6675
39	35 or 36 or 37 or 38	14025
40	6 and 34 and 39	39

41	17 or 24	55513
42	6 and 7 and 41	25
43	40 and 42	3

Table 20 CINAHL Plus with Full Text 07/03/2024

S69	S67 AND S68	14
S68	S10 AND S59 AND S64	316
S67	S65 AND S66	1,628
S66	S36 OR S44	1,735,989
S65	S10 AND S13	3,705
S64	S60 OR S61 OR S62 OR S63	214,303
S63	TI ((integrated or cooperat* or co-operat* or coordinat* or co-ordinat* or collaborat* or continuity) N3 (care or therap* or restor* or organi?ation or staff* or approach* or communic* or program* or practice* or manag* or service* or system*)) OR AB ((integrated or cooperat* or co-operat* or coordinat* or co-ordinat* or collaborat* or continuity) N3 (care or therap* or restor* or organi?ation or staff* or approach* or communic* or program* or practice* or manag* or service* or system*))	90,964
S62	TI (multidisciplinary or "multi-disciplinary" or multiprofessional* or "multi-professional*" or interdisciplinary or "inter-disciplinary" or interprofession* or transdisciplinary or "trans-disciplinary" or transprofessional or "trans-professional" or multimodal or "multi-modal" or multiprofessional or "multi-professional") OR AB (multidisciplinary or "multi-disciplinary" or multiprofessional* or "multi-professional*" or interdisciplinary or "inter-disciplinary" or interprofession* or transdisciplinary or "trans-disciplinary" or transprofessional or "trans-professional" or multimodal or "multi-modal" or multiprofessional or "multi-professional")	97,197
S61	(MH "Health Care Delivery, Integrated")	15,410
S60	(MH "Multidisciplinary Care Team+")	52,983
S59	S45 OR S46 OR S47 OR S48 OR S49 OR S50 OR S51 OR S52 OR S53 OR S54 OR S55 OR S56 OR S57 OR S58	488,209
S58	TI speech W1 language OR AB speech W1 language	10,634
S57	TI ("allied health profession*" or AHP* or physiotherap* or "physical therap*" or "occupational therap*" or dietician* or dietetics or psycholog* or "p#ediatric rehabilitation" or therapist*) OR AB ("allied health profession*" or AHP* or physiotherap* or "physical therap*" or "occupational therap*" or dietician* or dietetics or psycholog* or "p#ediatric rehabilitation" or therapist*)	250,555
S56	(MH "Rehabilitation, Pediatric")	1,535
S55	(MH "Psychologists")	5,499
S54	(MH "Psychology+")	29,623
S53	(MH "Dietitians")	6,041
S52	(MH "Diet Therapy+")	36,850
S51	(MH "Rehabilitation, Speech and Language+")	10,165
S50	(MH "Speech-Language Pathologists")	8,179
S49	(MH "Speech Therapy+")	4,701
S48	(MH "Occupational Therapists+")	10,106
S47	(MH "Occupational Therapy+")	27,986
S46	(MH "Physical Therapists+")	14,748
S45	(MH "Physical Therapy+")	163,150
S44	S37 OR S38 OR S39 OR S40 OR S41 OR S42 OR S43	890,633

S43	TI "rapid review*" OR AB "rapid review*"	1,030
S42	TI ("meta-analy*" or metaanaly* or "meta-synthes?s" or "metasynthes?s") OR AB ("meta-analy*" or metaanaly* or "meta-synthes?s" or "metasynthes?s")	116,878
S41	TI (quantitative W3 (review* OR overview* OR synthes*)) OR AB (quantitative W3 (review* OR overview* OR synthes*))	2,015
S40	TI (systematic W3 (review* or overview*)) OR AB (systematic W3 (review* or overview*))	159,537
S39	PT "systematic review* OR "meta-analysis" or review*	856,564
S38	(MH "Meta Analysis")	73,343
S37	(MH "Systematic Review")	132,458
S36	S35 NOT S34	1,000,304
S35	S14 OR S15 OR S16 OR S17 OR S18 OR S19 OR S20 OR S21 OR S22 OR S23 OR S24 OR S25 OR S26 OR S27 OR S28	1,049,134
S34	S32 NOT S33	217,888
S33	(MH "Human")	2,789,633
S32	S29 OR S30 OR S31	252,648
S31	TI animal model*	3,888
S30	(MH "Animal Studies")	157,266
S29	(MH "Animals+")	104,506
S28	AB cluster W3 RCT	507
S27	MH crossover design OR MH comparative studies	497,100
S26	AB control W5 group	148,188
S25	PT randomized controlled trial	156,702
S24	(MH "Placebos")	14,379
S23	MH sample size* AND AB (assigned OR allocated OR control)	5,057
S22	TI trial*	192,858
S21	AB random*	401,312
S20	TI randomised OR randomized	148,574
S19	(MH "Cluster Sample+")	6,553
S18	(MH "Pretest-Posttest Design+")	56,933
S17	(MH "Random Assignment")	84,110
S16	(MH "Single-Blind Studies")	16,183
S15	(MH "Double-Blind Studies")	54,814
S14	(MH "Randomized Controlled Trials+")	143,272
S13	S11 OR S12	100,304
S12	TI (early N3 (intervent* or treat* or recogni* or detect* or therap* or program*)) OR AB (early N3 (intervent* or treat* or recogni* or detect* or therap* or program*))	86,428
S11	(MH "Early Intervention+")	21,271
S10	S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 OR S5 OR S6 OR S7 OR S8 OR S9	131,356
S9	TI ((preterm or pre-term or prematur*) N3 (baby or babies or birth or newborn or infant* or child* or "young person" or "young people")) OR AB ((preterm or pre-term or prematur*) N3 (baby or babies or birth or newborn or infant* or child* or "young person" or "young people"))	39,542
S8	TI (neonat* OR NICU) OR AB (neonat* OR NICU)	85,880
S7	(MH "Infant, Very Low Birth Weight")	5,656
S6	(MH "Infant, Low Birth Weight+")	16,721
S5	(MH "Intensive Care, Neonatal+")	6,721
S4	(MH "Intensive Care Units, Neonatal")	16,800
S3	(MH "Labor, Premature")	3,681
S2	(MH "Childbirth, Premature")	13,645
S1	(MH "Infant, Premature")	27,519

Table 21 Cochrane

1	MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Premature] explode all trees	5789
2	MeSH descriptor: [Obstetric Labor, Premature] explode all trees	3305
3	MeSH descriptor: [Intensive Care, Neonatal] explode all trees	428
4	MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Low Birth Weight] explode all trees	3025
5	(neonat* or NICU):ti,ab,kw	29449
6	(preterm or pre-term or prematur*) NEAR/3 (baby or babies or birth or newborn or infant* or child* or “young person” or “young people”):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched)	18880
7	OR 1-6	40165
8	MeSH descriptor: [Early Intervention, Educational] explode all trees	699
9	(early NEAR/3 (intervent* or treat* or recogni* or detect* or therap* or program*):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched)	35696
10	8 OR 9	35696
11	7 AND 10	1447
12	MeSH descriptor: [Physical Therapists] explode all trees	261
13	MeSH descriptor: [Physical Therapy Modalities] explode all trees	39290
14	MeSH descriptor: [Occupational Therapists] explode all trees	21
15	MeSH descriptor: [Occupational Therapy] explode all trees	1013
16	MeSH descriptor: [Speech Therapy] explode all trees	417
17	MeSH descriptor: [Speech-Language Pathology] explode all trees	127
18	MeSH descriptor: [Nutritionists] explode all trees	82
19	MeSH descriptor: [Diet Therapy] explode all trees	8203
20	MeSH descriptor: [Psychology] explode all trees	1452
21	("allied health profession" or "allied health professions" or "allied health professional" or "allied health professionals" or AHP* or physiotherap* or "physical therapy" or "physical therapist" or "physical therapists" or "occupational therapy" or "occupational therapist" or "occupational therapists" or dietician* or dietetics or psycholog* or "pediatric rehabilitation" or "paediatric rehabilitation" or therapist*):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched)	177,105
22	(speech NEAR/1 language):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched)	7575
23	MeSH descriptor: [Allied Health Personnel] explode all trees	1755
24	OR 12-23	212,004
25	MeSH descriptor: [Patient Care Team] explode all trees	2292
26	MeSH descriptor: [Delivery of Health Care, Integrated] explode all trees	589
27	((multidisciplinary or multi-disciplinary or multiprofessional* or multi-professional* or interdisciplinary or inter-disciplinary or interprofession* or transdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary or transprofessional or trans-professional or multimodal or multi-modal or multiprofessional or multi-professional)):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched)	23,221
28	((integrated or cooperat* or co-operat* or coordinat* or co-ordinat* or collaborat* or continuity) NEAR/3 (care or therap* or restor* or organi?ation or staff* or approach* or communic* or program* or practice* or manag* or service* or system*)):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched)	171031
29	OR 25-28	53,217
30	7 AND 24 AND 29	188
31	11 AND 30	31

8.3 APPENDIX 3: Websites searched for neonatal audits

1. Audit Commission (up to 2015)
2. Audit Wales
3. Audit Scotland
4. National Audit Office
5. Guidelines and Audit Implementation Network N.I. (up to 2015).
6. Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority (N.I.)
7. https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/clinical-audits-and-registries
8. https://www.england.nhs.uk/clinaudit/
9. https://www.hqip.org.uk/a-z-of-nca/
10. https://www.hdruk.ac.uk/access-to-health-data/health-data-research-innovation-gateway/

Health and Care Research Wales Evidence Centre

Canolfan Dystiolaeth Ymchwil Iechyd a Gofal Cymru

The Health and Care Research Wales Evidence Centre

Our dedicated team works together with Welsh Government, the NHS, social care, research institutions and the public to deliver vital research to tackle health and social care challenges facing Wales.

Funded by Welsh Government, through Health and Care Research Wales, the Evidence Centre answers key questions to improve health and social care policy and provision across Wales.

Along with our collaborating partners, we conduct reviews of existing evidence and new research, to inform policy and practice needs, with a focus on ensuring real-world impact and public benefit that reaches everyone.

Director: Professor Adrian Edwards

Associate Directors: Dr Alison Cooper, Dr Natalie Joseph-Williams, Dr Ruth Lewis

@EvidenceWales @tystiolaethcym

healthandcareevidence@cardiff.ac.uk

www.researchwalesevidencecentre.co.uk