

SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Mapping Hospital in the Home Models of Care: A Systematic Review

Natalie J. Bransgrove¹  | Joanne E. Porter¹ | Blake Peck² | Jaclyn Bishop³

¹Collaborative Evaluation & Research Centre (CERC), Federation University Australia, Churchill, Victoria, Australia | ²Collaborative Evaluation & Research Centre (CERC), Federation University Australia, Mt Helen, Victoria, Australia | ³East Grampians Health Service, Ararat, Victoria, Australia

Correspondence: Natalie J. Bransgrove (n.bransgrove@federation.edu.au)

Received: 17 June 2024 | **Revised:** 29 October 2024 | **Accepted:** 8 November 2024

Funding: This work was supported by the Commonwealth funded MRFF Rapid Applied Research Translation Grant (RARUR000072). Natalie Bransgrove is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP) Stipend and RTP Fee-Offset Scholarship through Federation University Australia.

Keywords: home-based care | Hospital in the Home | model of care | rural health

ABSTRACT

Aim: This systematic review aims to describe and compare the characteristics of Hospital in the Home (HITH) models of care within Australia.

Design: A systematic review of peer-reviewed Australian literature.

Data Sources: Seven databases were searched in January 2024, followed by citation searching. Articles were included if they were described the HITH model of care and were published between 1994 and 2024.

Review Methods: Covidence was used to facilitate the removal of duplicates, independent total and abstract screening and full text review. The Critical Appraisal Skills Program (CASP) was used to assess the quality of evidence, and title and abstract screening and full text review were completed by multiple authors. This ensured that all articles met the inclusion criteria and were then assessed, and the final articles were assessed using matrix analysis, and results were presented using narrative synthesis.

Results: Ten articles met the inclusion criteria, highlighting three models care; the medical model, the nursing model and the brokerage model.

Conclusions: There is limited research available that includes the model of care and patient outcomes. Future research needs to consider the differences between HITH programs, such as the model of care, admission pathway, utilisation of telehealth and geography of the population.

Implications for the Profession: This review may assist Australian HITH health professionals to improve the efficacy of the HITH model of care delivered within their health service and increase translatability of future HITH research.

Impact: This study highlighted for the first time the models of HITH care utilised within Australia. Three models of care are currently utilised within Australia, this knowledge may assist health services seeking to enhance their HITH model of care and policy writers.

Reporting Method: This review adhered to the EQUATOR guidelines, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis.

Patient or Public Contribution: No patient or public contribution.

Trial Registration: Registered with the international prospective register for protocols of systematic reviews in health social care CRD42024500950