

Additional tables [posted as supplied by author]

Table A1. Factors determining selection of practices as intervention practices: probit regression model

	Full model				Propensity score model			
	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>z	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>z
Average growth in admissions	0.486	0.130	3.73	0.00	0.532	0.121	4.39	0.00
Total practice list	6.69E-05	1.88E-05	3.56	0.00	3.90E-05	9.21E-06	4.24	0.00
IMD health deprivation	0.171	0.071	2.42	0.02	0.181	0.050	3.6	0.00
65+ emergency admission rate	0.646	1.007	0.64	0.52				
65+ proportion	2.112	1.335	1.58	0.11				
Female proportion of 65+	1.214	1.302	0.93	0.35				
High risk population	-6.61E-03	4.35E-03	-1.52	0.13				
High risk population proportion	6.172	7.550	0.82	0.41				
List per wte GP	6.81E-05	8.26E-05	0.82	0.41				
LISI	5.21E-04	9.46E-03	0.06	0.96				
Constant	-4.246	0.858	-4.95	0.00	-2.765	0.095	-28.97	0.00
n = 7589								

The propensity score model was obtained from the full model by backward stepwise regression. Robust standard errors

Table A2. Effect of intervention on 65+ high risk cohort: per person years at risk basis.

	Regression based estimate			Propensity score matched estimate.		
	Estimated effect per person per year (CI)	Percentage effect (CI)	p value	Estimated effect per person per year (CI)	Percentage effect (CI)	p value
Outcome						
Emergency admissions	0.112 (-0.067, 0.290)	14.8% (-8.9%, 38.5%)	0.22	0.110 (-0.068, 0.288)	14.6% (-9.0%, 38.1%)	0.225
Emergency bed days	1.387 (-1.127, 3.900)	19.9% (16.2%, 56.0%)	0.28	1.183 (-1.285, 3.561)	17.0% (-18.5%, 52.5%)	0.35
HES mortality	0.044 (-0.005, 0.094)	35.4% (-4.4%, 75.2%)	0.08	0.058 (-0.001, 0.1152)	46.8% (-0.9%, 92.5%)	0.07

Estimated effect is estimated change in mean outcome measure post intervention (period 6) and pre intervention (period 3) for intervention practices minus estimated change in mean outcome measure post intervention (period 6) and pre intervention (period 3) for control practices. Period 3 is the six months from October 2002, period 6 is the six months from October 2004. Percentage effect is 100*estimated effect/mean outcome rate for Evercare practices in period 3. The p value is for the two sided test of the null hypothesis of no effect. Regression estimates from fixed effect panel regression, allowing for clustering within practices and heteroscedasticity. Matched estimates from matching by propensity score and stratification. Minimum n = 6960 controls and n = 62 intervention practices.

Table A3. Effect of intervention on growth in outcomes for 65+ high risk cohort

	Estimates from panel regression model		Estimates from propensity score matching	
	Estimated effect on growth rate (CI)	p value	Estimated effect on growth rate (CI)	p value
Outcome				
Emergency admissions	0.030 (-0.135, 0.195)	0.72	0.036 (-0.122, 0.194)	0.66
Emergency bed days	1.117 (-2.183, 4.417)	0.51	0.923 (-2.341, 4.187)	0.58
HES mortality	0.041 (-0.007, 0.089)	0.10	0.058 (0.001, 0.115)	0.05

Effect on growth rate is calculated as the change in the mean of (period 6 outcome level - period 5 outcome level) –(period 3 outcome level – period 2 outcome level) for intervention practices minus mean of (period 6 outcome level - period 5 outcome level) –(period 3 outcome level – period 2 outcome level) for control practices. n = 64 for intervention practices, minimum n for controls 6960.

