Supplemental Digital Appendix 1

Risk of Bias for 15 Included Studies Comparing Patient Outcomes for General Internal Medicine Teaching and Non-teaching Services, Published 1991–2011*

Study Author, year ^{ref}	Study type	Allocation sequence random?	Allocation concealed?	Baseline outcomes similar?	Baseline character- istics similar?	Plan for missing data/ incomplete measurement of primary outcome (outreach to find other site readmissions)?	Outcomes assessed blind to interven- tion?	No contami- nation?	Free of selective outcome reporting risk?	No other bias? (including whether study was from single institution)	EPOC Group Risk of Bias criteria total (9 max)
Simmer, 1991 ¹⁷	RCT	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	5
Dynan, 2009 ¹⁸	Cohort	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	3
Everett, 2007 ¹⁹	Retro cohort	No	No	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	2
Hackner, 2001 ²⁰	Retro cohort	No	No	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	2
Halasyamani, 2005 ²¹	Retro cohort	No	No	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	2
Horwitz, 2007 ²²	Retro cohort	No	No	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	2
Khaliq, 2007 ²³	Cohort	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	3
Myers, 2006 ²⁴	Cohort	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	3
O'Connor, 2009 ²⁵	Retro cohort	No	No	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	2
O'Connor, 2011 ²⁶	Cohort	No	No	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	2

Study Author, year ^{ref}	Study type	Allocation sequence random?	Allocation concealed?	Baseline outcomes similar?	Baseline character- istics similar?	Plan for missing data/ incomplete measurement of primary outcome (outreach to find other site readmissions)?	Outcomes assessed blind to interven- tion?	No contami- nation?	Free of selective outcome reporting risk?	No other bias? (including whether study was from single institution)	EPOC Group Risk of Bias criteria total (9 max)
Palacio, 2009 ²⁷	Retro cohort	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	3
Roy, 2008 ²⁸	Retro cohort	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	3
Singh, 2011 ²⁹	Retro cohort	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	4
Stein, 1998 ³⁰	Retro cohort	No	No	Unclear	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	2
Van Rhee, 2002 ³¹	Retro cohort	No	No	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	3

^{*}All studies were single institution except O'Connor 2009, which had data from two affiliated hospitals (both of which had teaching and non-teaching services). RCT indicates randomized controlled trial; retro, retrospective; EPOC, Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Group.

Supplemental Digital Appendix 2

Differences in Baseline Characteristics for Included Studies Comparing Patient Outcomes for General Internal Medicine Teaching and Non-teaching Services

	Age*		Gender: male		Ethn	icity	Insuran	ce status	Admis through er depart	nergency	Mean Ch comorbidi score	ty index	DRG ca	
Study	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching
Simmer, 1991 ¹⁷	61.7	61.2	51.4%	56.4%	24.1% white, 72.2% black	21.8% white, 75.8% black	Not reported (NR)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	1.09	1.18
Dynan, 2009 ¹⁸	53.1	53.6	51.9%	47.3%	43.0% white, 51.8% black	43.2% white, 52.3% black	39.5% Medicare 29.1% Medicaid	36.5% Medicare 29.4% Medicaid	85.1%	89.0%	NR	NR	NR	NR
Everett, 2007 ¹⁹	58.6	64.0	44.3%	42.1%	59.4% white, 34.1% black	59.3% white, 24.8% black	58.8% Medicare 7.7% Medicaid	67.9% Medicare 6.5% Medicaid	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Hackner, 2001 ²⁰	52.8	56.4	41.0%	50.2%	63.1% white, 28.3% black	62.2% white, 21.6% black	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Halasyamani, 2005 ²¹	62.6	68.2	46.4%	42.1%	NR	NR	53.6% Medicare 3.0% Medicaid	65.0% Medicare 11.8% Medicaid	86.6%	75.2%	NR	NR	NR	NR

	Age*		Gender: male Eth			Ethnicity Insurance status			Admissions through emergency department		Mean Charlson comorbidity index score**		DRG case-mix index	
Study Horwitz, 2007 ²²	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching
a: 2002– 2003 cohort	62.9	62.5	50.9%	47.0%	70.8% white, 19.6% black	67.7% white, 22.2% black	52.8% Medicare 12.4% Medicaid	53.3% Medicare 13.3% Medicaid	65.8%	87.0%	Deyo score: 0: 52.7% 1:25.0% 2:12.4% ≥3: 9.8%	Deyo score: 0: 55.1% 1: 24.6% 2: 10.7% ≥3: 9.5%	NR	NR
b: 2003– 2004 cohort	62.7	62.9	49.8%	43.6%	69.5% white, 20.4% black	67.8% white, 22.2% black	53.7% Medicare 12.9% Medicaid	53.9% Medicare 12.6% Medicaid	70.4%	91.0%	Deyo score: 0: 49.6% 1: 27.0% 2: 13.3% ≥3: 10.1%	Deyo score: 0: 50.6% 1: 26.9% 2: 12.7% ≥3: 9.8%	NR	NR
Khaliq, 2007 ²³	67.1	67.5	50.0%	46.4%	NR	NR	66.9% Medicare 4.7% Medicaid	67.8% Medicare 5.6% Medicaid	NR	NR	6.7	6.7	NR	NR
Myers, 2006 ²⁴	50.1	50.3	36.6%	42.5%	30.2% white, 65.3% black	15.9% white, 77.9% black	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

	Age*		Gender:	male	Ethni	icity	Insuran	ce status	Admis through er depart	nergency	Mean C comorbid scor	lity index		DRG case-mix index	
Study	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	Teaching	Non- teaching	
O'Connor, 2009 ²⁵	64.0 (49.0- 80.0)	69.0 (51.0- 82.0)	50.4%	44.2%	72.1% white, 23.2% black	74.3% white, 20.3% black	43.1% Medicare 13.0% Medicaid	44.4% Medicare 9.2% Medicaid	NR	NR	0: 23.7% 1-2: 24.3% 3-5: 27.3% >5: 24.7 % 9.0 (6.0- 12.0)†	0: 29.8% 1-2: 28.0% 3-5 :23.5% >5: 18.8% 8.0 (6.0- 11.0)†	NR	NR	
O'Connor, 2011 ²⁶															
a: 2007– 2008 cohort	61 (47- 76)	63 (48- 78)	50.6%	49.6%	NR	NR	39.0% Medicare 12.6% Medicaid	43.0% Medicare 11.7% Medicaid	NR	NR	4.0 (1.0- 7.0) [†]	3.0 (1.0- 7.0) [†]	NR	NR	
b: 2008– 2009 cohort	61 (46- 77)	63 (48- 78)	53.1%	48.8%	NR	NR	41.2% Medicare 13.0% Medicaid	44.4% Medicare 10.5% Medicaid	NR	NR	3.0 (1.0- 6.0) [†]	3.0 (1.0- 6.0) [†]	NR	NR	
Palacio, 2009 ²⁷	56.7	58.2	48.8%	45.6%	38.2% white, 58.4% black	41.4% white, 55.2% black	43.7% Medicare 15.8% Medicaid	48.5% Medicare 13.5% Medicaid	NR	NR	1.14 ± 1.02 [‡]	1.04 ± 0.94 [‡]	NR	NR	

	Age*		Gender:	male	Ethni	city	Insuran	ce status	Admiss through en depart	nergency	comorbio	Charlson lity index re**	DRG ca	
C4 J	T 1	Non-	Translation	Non-	T 1	Non-	Translation	Non-	T 1	Non-	T 1.1	Non-	T 1	Non-
Study Page 2009 ²⁸	Teaching	teaching 18–44:	Teaching	teaching	Teaching 59.3%	teaching	Teaching 43.8%	teaching	Teaching NR	teaching NR	Teaching 0.24 00/	0: 27.2%	Teaching 1.2	teaching
Roy, 2008 ²⁸	18–44: 18.2%;	18–44: 19.1%;	40.0%	42.3%	white,	57.3% white,	43.8% Medicare	41.9% Medicare	NK	NK	0: 24.9% 1: 21.1%	1: 22.6%	1.2	1.1
	18.2%, 45–64:	19.1%, 45–64:			23.5%	24.0%	11.7%	14.4%			2: 16.5%	2: 16.2%		
	43–64. 31.9%;	45–64. 35.5%;			black	black	Medicaid	Medicaid			2. 16.5% ≥3: 37.6%	2. 10.2% ≥3: 34.0%		
	51.970, 65+:	65+:			Ulack	Ulack	Medicaid	Medicaid			≥3.37.070	<i>≥</i> 3. 34.070		
	49.9%	45.5%												
	47.770	TJ.J/0												
Singh, 2011 ²⁹	57.0	56.8	44.9%	45.9%	58.9%	59.1%	47.8%	46.8%	80.7%	76.6%	0.38‡	0.39‡	NR	NR
υ,					white,	white,	Medicare	Medicare						
					36.7%	36.5%	33.0%	32.9%						
					black	black	Medicaid	Medicaid						
							/others	/others						
Stein, 1998 ³⁰	63	75	NR	NR	NR	NR	56.4%	74%	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
ŕ							Medicare	Medicare						
							Medicaid	Medicaid						
							NR	NR						
Van Rhee,	<65:	<65:	49.6%	56.7%	NR	NR	76.2%	72.9%	82.7%	83.1%	NR	NR	NR	NR
$2002^{31\S}$	25.3%;	29.8%;					Medicare	Medicare						
	65–79:	65–79:					Medicaid	Medicaid						
	41.8%;	40.1%;					NR	NR						
	≥ 80:	≥80:												
	32.9%	30.1												

^{*} Age reported as mean age, median age (interquartile range), or percentage by age group.

** Mean Charlson comorbidity index³⁵ score reported as mean score ± standard deviation (if reported in study). Deyo score is an adapted version of the Charlson comorbidity index; see Deyo RA, Cherkin DC, Ciol MA. Adapting a clinical comorbidity index for use with ICD-9-CM administrative databases. J Clin Epidemiol. 1992;45:613-619.

[†] Median number of comorbidities (interquartile range)

[‡] Median number of comorbidities

[§] Demographics are based on 923 patients as outliers (3 SDs from mean) were removed from analysis by that study's authors.