Table 2.0 Summary of Outcomes from Individual Articles

Study Author	30-day readmission	60-day readmission	90-day	30-day Mortality	ER Visits
1 2011			readmission		
Adams, et al., 2014 ⁴	n = 336				
Intervention: After	28/336 (8%)	5/28 (17.8%)			
Hospital Care Plan,	27% reduction pre-				
multiple interventions	intervention				
including appointment with	44% reduction overall				
provider and follow-up	from baseline				
phone call					
Commonicant II1 C-	Not see out of				
Comparison: Usual Care	Not reported				
Altfeld, et al., 2012 ¹⁷	n = 720			05 111 050	
Intervention: Telephone	70/360 (19.5%)			OR = 1.11; 95%	
Follow-up at 30 and 60				CI, 0.76 – 1.62	
days					
Comparison: Usual Care	66/360 (18.3%)				
Amin, et al., 2014 ⁹	n = 1474				
Intervention: Service	151/1444 (10.49%)				
Based Care Model	All cause readmission				
	p = 0.056				
	80/1444 (4.58%)				
	Related readmission				
	p = 0.02				
	160/1474 (11 400/)				
Comparison: Usual Care	168/1474 (11.42%)				
	All cause readmission				
18	80/1474 (5.43%)				
Bisiani, et al., 2015 ¹⁸	n = 978				
Intervention: Discharge	37/543 (6.8%)				

Study Author	30-day readmission	60-day readmission	90-day readmission	30-day Mortality	ER Visits
Decision Support System	p = 0.03 (2-tailed) Independent <i>t</i> -test 17/435 (3.9%)				
Comparison: Usual Care	17/433 (3.9%)				
Coleman, et al., 2006 ¹	n = 750				
Intervention:	31/379 (8.3%) Readmission group		63/379 (16.7%)		
Comparison: Usual Care	44/371 (11.9%) Related readmission		83/371 (22.5%)		
Goldman, et al., 2014 ²	n = 700	HD 1 41 050/ CI	HD 11.050/ CL		110 17 1 20
Intervention: Enhanced discharge planning	26/347 (7.5%) HR = 1.17; 95% CI, 0.79 -1.74	HR = 1.41; 95% CI, 0.97-2.06	HR = 1.1; 95% CI, 0.79 - 1.56		112 Visits at 30 days 238 Visits at 90 days 30-day HR = 1.41; 95% CI, 0.81 – 2.44 89 Visits at 30 days
Comparison: Usual Care	17/353 (4.8%)				203 Visits at 90 days 90-day HR = 1.41; 95% CI, 0.88 – 2.24
Grafft, et al., 2010 ¹² Intervention: Care transition follow-up appointment post discharge	n = 4989 341/867 (39.3%) related readmission HR = 0.99; 95% CI, 0.80-1.24)			HR = 0.67, p = .20; and 1.04	HR = 1.11, p = 0.36 115/331 (34.7%) ER visits related readmission HR = 0.84; 95% CI, 0.58-1.23

Study Author	30-day readmission	60-day readmission	90-day	30-day Mortality	ER Visits
-		-	readmission		
Comparison: Usual Care	Not reported				
Harrison, et al., 2011 ⁷	n = 30, 272				
Intervention: Discharge	420/6773 (6.2%)				
phone call within 14 days					
post hospitalization					
Comparison: No discharge	2304/23,499 (9.8%)				
follow-up call	OR = 1.259, 95% CI				
_	1.007, p = 0.043				
Hitch, et al., 2016 ³	n = 322				
Intervention: Transition of	10/188 (5.3%)				
Care Intervention					
Comparison: Usual Care	19/134 (14.2%)				
Jack, et al., 2009 ⁶	n = 749				
Intervention: Enhanced	55/370 (14.9%)				61/370 (16.5%)
Discharge Planning					
Comparison: Usual Care	76/368 (20.07%)				90/368 (24.4%)
Kashiwagi, et al., 2012 ¹⁰	n = 1044				
Intervention: Timing of	59/518 (11%) < 14				
Follow-up visits	days				
_	8/52 (15%) > 14 days				
	215/474 (45.4%)				
	No follow-up				
Comparison: Usual Care	Not reported				
Mabire, et al., 2015 ¹¹	n = 235				
Intervention: Enhanced	29/235 (12.4%)				

Study Author	30-day readmission	60-day readmission	90-day readmission	30-day Mortality	ER Visits
Discharge Planning					
Comparison: none	No comparison data				
Misky, et al., 2010 ⁵ Intervention: Timing of primary care follow-up appointment	n = 65 1/32 (3.10%) Related readmission 5/32 (15.6%) All cause readmission				2/32 (6.3%)
Comparison: no timely follow-up	7/33 (21.2%) Related readmission 9/33 (28.1%) All cause readmission				9/32 (28.1%)

Definitions: MD = Mean Difference, NR = Not Reported, HR = Hazard Ratio, ED = Emergency Department, OR = Odds Ratio, IRR = Incident Rate Ratio, NA = Not Available