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Abstract

Context: End of life care (EoLC) communication skills training for generalist palliative care providers is recommended in policy guidance globally. Whilst many training programmes now exist, there has been no comprehensive evidence synthesis to inform future training delivery and evaluation.

Objectives: To identify and appraise how EoLC communication skills training interventions for generalist palliative care providers are developed, delivered, evaluated, and reported.

Methods: Systematic review. Ten electronic databases (inception to December 2015) and five relevant journals (January 2004 to December 2015) were searched. Studies testing the effectiveness of EoLC communication skills training for generalists were included. Two independent authors assessed study quality. Descriptive statistics and narrative synthesis are used to summarise the findings.

Results: From 11,441 unique records, 170 reports were identified (157 published, 13 unpublished), representing 160 evaluation studies of 153 training interventions. Of published papers, eight were low quality, 108 medium, and 41 high. Few interventions were developed with service user involvement (n=7), and most were taught using a mixture of didactics (n=123), reflection and discussion (n=105), and roleplay (n=86). Evaluation designs were weak: <30% were controlled, <15% randomised participants. Over half (n=85) relied on staff self-reported outcomes to assess effectiveness, and 49% did not cite psychometrically validated measures. Key information (e.g. training duration, participant flow) was poorly reported.

Conclusions: Despite a proliferation of EoLC communication skills training interventions in the literature, evidence is limited by poor reporting and weak methodology. Based on our findings we present a CONSORT statement supplement to improve future reporting and encourage more rigorous testing.

Registration number: CRD42014014777

Key Words: Education, Communication, Review, Terminal Care, Palliative Care

Running title: Review of EoLC communication skills training
Introduction

Global demographic ageing means providing end of life care (EoLC) is now increasingly the responsibility of generalist as well as specialist palliative care providers (1-3). This includes communication with patients facing the end of life, which many healthcare providers find challenging (4-9). Absent or poor quality communication results in confusion, reduced satisfaction, poor quality of life, and inadequate symptom relief for service users (10). Furthermore, health and social care professionals who feel insufficiently trained in communication skills are more likely to report depersonalised care and burnout (11, 12). Consequently, training in communication is advocated internationally as essential for all those working in EoLC (13-18).

Following Maguire’s work in the field of communication skills training (19-21), and Fallowfield et al.’s (22-26) pioneering workshops teaching communication skills to oncologists, research in this field has been increasing. This includes teaching and evaluating communication skills specific to EoLC (27-29). Reasons for this include recognition of the specific difficulties faced in EoLC communication, including discussing imminent mortality, limited treatment options, and EoLC preferences (8). However, there remains little consensus regarding optimal training strategies, the most effective teaching methods, and what constitutes an adequate ‘dose’ of training. Although there has been some evidence synthesis in relation to EoLC communication training interventions for specific staff groups (e.g. oncology (30-33), non-cancer care in acute settings (27)), there has been no comprehensive consideration of the evidence regarding training interventions for all those involved in the delivery of generalist palliative care. This is required not just as a resource for clinical educators and researchers, but also to enable research in this field to progress.

The aim of this systematic review was therefore to identify and appraise the development, delivery, evaluation, and reporting of EoLC communication skills training interventions for generalist palliative care providers. Specifically, our objectives were to: (1) identify and describe existing training interventions in relation to their development, content, duration, and teaching methods, (2) appraise
how these interventions have been evaluated for effectiveness, and (3) assess the quality of reporting of interventions and their evaluation.

Methods

The protocol for this systematic review was prospectively registered with PROSPERO (CRD42014014777)(34). The methods are summarised below, and reported in full in a partner paper in which we synthesise data from randomised controlled trials (RCTs) assessing the effect of communication skills training for generalists on patient outcomes and staff behaviour (35).

Search Strategy

The following 10 databases were searched from inception until December 2015: MEDLINE, EMBASE, and PsycINFO (via Ovid), CENTRAL (via Wiley), Web of Science (Science Citation Index Expanded, Social Sciences Citation Index, Arts & Humanities Citation Index, Conference Proceedings Citation Index: Science, Social Science & Humanities), ERIC and CINAHL (via Ebscohost), WHO International Clinical Trials registry, CORDIS, and Open Grey. Free text terms for searching titles, abstracts, and key words were combined with database-specific subject heading terms, following the structure of [end of life care] AND [communication skills] AND [training](see online supplementary material Box S1 for the full search strategy). Reference lists of six relevant published reviews (28, 32, 33, 36-38), and five relevant journals (Journal of Palliative Medicine, American Journal of Hospice and Palliative Medicine, Palliative Medicine, Journal of Cancer Education, and Palliative and Supportive Care) were hand searched from January 2004 to December 2015. Where only conference abstracts were available, emails were sent to at least two authors requesting recently published or unpublished reports of the research.
Study Selection

Titles and abstracts were screened for inclusion by one author [LB/AH]. To be included, reports had to test the effectiveness of a training intervention designed to improve EoLC communications skills. Training was defined as any planned, systematic effort to develop knowledge, skills or attitudes through a learning experience (39). Interventions included EoLC training with communication skills training components, and communication skills training with EoLC components. EoLC communication was defined broadly to include the range of issues related to progressive, incurable illness and end of life care, for example: advance care planning, discussing transition to palliative care, and/or talking about dying. Training participants could not have (or be in the process of obtaining) specialist palliative care qualifications, but must work or expect to work with patients with advanced, progressive, incurable illness. Generalist providers of palliative care include, for example: general practitioners, oncologists, social workers, and hospital volunteers.

Studies were not excluded by language, year, publication status, design, or outcomes measured. Studies were excluded if the training intervention:

- was not assessed for effectiveness
- did not include EoLC communication skills
- had >20% participants with (or undertaking) specialist palliative care qualifications AND generalist course participant results could not be separated
- was aimed at paediatrics
- focused on communication with individuals other than the patient
- was for patients or family members themselves
- was a ‘train the trainer’ intervention
- occurred alongside extensive system intervention (e.g. change in clinic structure and patient records), meaning the effect of training alone was unclear.
Full papers were obtained for studies that could not be excluded based on the information in the title and abstract. Each paper was then assessed for eligibility by two authors [LB, AH, CM, SO], with disagreements resolved through discussion with a third author [LS/JK].

**Data Extraction and Analysis**

Data were extracted to a digital form and double-checked by a second author [LB, AH, CM, SO]. A full list of extracted information can be found in the review protocol (34). Quality was assessed independently by two authors [LB, AH, CM, SO] using the ‘Checklist for both Randomised and Non-Randomised Studies’ (40). Statistical power was scored 0 or 1 (rather than 0-5), where 1 point is awarded for presence of power calculation and 0 for no evidence of power calculations (41, 42). This gives a total possible score of 28, grouped into low (<33.3%), medium (33.4-66.6%), and high (>66.7%)(42). Total scores were not calculated for unpublished work due to the substantial reporting component in the criteria (11/28 points). Descriptive statistics and narrative synthesis were used to summarise training development, delivery, evaluation, and reporting quality.

**Results**

**Study selection:** 11,441 unique records were identified. Of these, 845 full texts were screened and 170 judged eligible for inclusion (Figure 1). The majority (n=89, 52%) reported studies in the USA, followed by the UK (n=28, 17%), Germany (n=8, 5%) and Japan (n=8, 5%). There were 166 papers available in English, three in German and one in Spanish. Out of the 170 papers, 157 were published and 13 were unpublished, submitted or in-press. A summary of all training and study details can be found in the online supplementary material, Table S1.

[INSERT 1: PRISMA flow chart (43)]
Risk of bias: The mean total quality score for the 157 published papers was 16.88 (SD 3.88). There were eight low quality, 108 medium quality, and 41 high quality papers.

Developing and Delivering Training

Training development: Of the 153 unique training interventions 110 (72%) indicated how the course was developed. This most commonly included reference to existing literature (n=87), particularly training interventions reported by others (n=29) or specific theories (n=27). Integration of staff or ‘expert’ views was also common (n=54), including local needs assessments (n=11). Other authors referred to their own previous work or pilot projects (n=19). Few (n=7) reported including patient or family views in their development. The reporting of development strategies varied widely, from single sentences to entire papers describing training development. For 43 (28%) training interventions, no information regarding training development was reported.

Training content: Most (n=63) training interventions were palliative/EoLC courses with a communication skills component, followed by courses focused on palliative/EoLC communication skills (n=33), cancer-specific courses with a palliative/EoLC communication skills component (n=28), and communication skills courses with a palliative/EoLC component (n=10). The remaining courses were specialism- or condition-focused courses (see Table S1, Supplementary Material).

Teaching methods: Information on the teaching methods used were available for 148 (97%) of the training interventions, with the number of methods reported ranging from one to 10 (median 4; n=112 (73%) reported 3-5). The most common teaching methods reported were didactics (i.e. lectures, presentations; n=123), reflection and discussion (n=105), roleplay (n=86), and group work (n=66). Many also used case studies (n=52), self-study (n=44), clinical experiences or visits (n=31; e.g. to hospices), e-learning (n=22), and personalised audio and/or video feedback (n=12). A minority reported using a communication model (e.g. SPIKES (44), PREPARED (45); n=27). No clear information on teaching methods was available for five interventions (3%).
**Duration and training hours:** Course duration ranged from 40 minutes (46) to 16 months (47). This included seven interventions with a total training time of an hour or less, 51 lasting 2-10 hours, 27 lasting 11-20 hours, 16 lasting 21-30 hours, and 11 lasting 31 hours or more. Information on duration and/or total training hours was missing or unclear for 57 (37%) training interventions.

**Staff group:** Seventy-five percent of interventions focused on teaching one staff group (n=115): most often junior doctors (i.e. interns, residents, registrars, fellows, n=32), medical students (n=32), nurses (n=22) and doctors (n=16). Multidisciplinary groups were taught in 33 courses, and members of the same discipline but with different levels of training were taught in five courses.

**Cost:** For almost all interventions, there was no clear information on the costs associated with running the training (97%, n=148). Those that did specify cost generally provided costs in terms of hours and resources needed to run the course. One study specified a monetary cost (48).

**Evaluating Training Effectiveness**

**Design:** The included reports represented 160 unique studies. The majority relied on weak study designs subject to bias: the most common were quasi-experimental pre-post studies, without (n=96) and with (n=16) control groups, followed by cross-sectional post-only studies (without control, n=13; with control, n=6). A minority were randomised controlled trials (RCTs; n=21). Three studies used post-course and retrospective pre-course measurements (no control group), and five studies used a combination of designs (e.g. pre-post, use of a control group for selected outcomes only). Some papers (n=2) reporting a previously published study did not present results in line with the original study design (e.g. reporting pre-post data for the intervention group, although the original study was an RCT).
Outcomes: Subjective staff self-reported outcomes (e.g. confidence, attitudes, burnout) were the most frequently measured across studies (n=150, 94%), and in most studies (n=85, 53%) were the only type of outcome measured. Objective knowledge (n=42, 26%), observed behaviours (including researcher- and colleague- rated behaviours; n=32, 20%) and process outcomes (n=6, 4%) were assessed less frequently. Few studies assessed the impact of staff training on patient or family outcomes (n=10, 6%). Seventy-nine studies (49%) did not appear to use any measures that had been psychometrically tested (or this information was missing/unclear). Most studies (n=96, 60%) measured outcomes within one month post-intervention.

Study participants: Staff sample sizes (based on number of trainees and controls reflected in the primary analyses) ranged from six to 487. Some studies with fewer trainees/controls had a greater number of patient participants (e.g. Fukui et al., 2008 (49): eight staff, represented by 89 patients). Papers differed greatly in which Ns were reported (e.g. started the course, completed the course, completed the outcome measures), and often failed to distinguish between attrition due to missing data or participants having not completing the training. For the majority of studies (61%, n=97) the flow of study participants was unclear, due to unexplained attrition, or inability to determine the number of dropouts.

Reporting quality

Reporting quality across the 157 published papers as rated using the Downs and Black Checklist ranged from one to 11, with a median of eight. In 52 papers (31%) the characteristics of study participants were inadequately described, and in 53 papers no estimates of random variability were provided for their main outcomes (31%). Nearly all (n=154, 91%) papers failed to report monitoring for adverse events in relation to training (e.g. dropouts due to emotional content of the courses). The data extraction process also highlighted the variability in reporting a number of variables that are critical when interpreting results; for example, training duration and participant flow (see Table 1).

[INSERT TABLE 1: Reporting quality from data extraction across training and study variables]
Discussion

This is the first comprehensive systematic review of EoLC communication skills training for generalist palliative care providers. We identified a wide range of training interventions for this population. Most were based on existing literature, ranging from published evidence and guidance to broader theoretical approaches. However, patient and family involvement in training development was rare. EoLC communication was most commonly taught in the context of broader palliative or EoLC training courses, using a mixture of didactics, reflection and discussion, and roleplay. Three-quarters of the training courses were focused on teaching a single staff group, particularly medics at various stages in their careers. In testing the effectiveness of training interventions, methodologically weaker designs (e.g. lacking control groups) were common. Outcome assessment was usually subjective and self-reported by staff, and used unvalidated measures and short-term follow-up. Few studies assessed how training impacted patients and/or families. Poor reporting hindered data extraction in relation to the specifics of both interventions and study design; for example, training hours, training costs, and study participant recruitment and attrition.

Our findings build on those of previous reviews. Pulsford et al.’s (37) review of EoLC training for health and social care staff noted the lack of patient and family input in training development and few multidisciplinary learning groups. More recently, Walczak et al.’s (28) review of EoLC communication interventions, Lord et al.’s (27) review of EoLC communication training in non-cancer acute settings, and Chung et al.’s (29) review of EoLC communication skills training specific to decision making commented on the methodological weakness of studies evaluating training interventions. This weakness related to the use of uncontrolled, non-randomised study designs and a wide range of self-reported outcome measures, many of which were unvalidated. It is noteworthy that Fallowfield et al.’s (22-26) workshop for oncologists still remains one of a small number of training interventions evaluated using a randomised controlled design and both staff- and patient-reported outcomes. Developing and evaluating training is challenging, but recommendations for developing
and evaluating complex interventions (50), including those with an EoLC focus (51), should inform research in this field. These recommendations include guidance for involving service users. Considering the patient-focused drivers of these initiatives, patients and family members are still infrequently involved from training development through to evaluation. International expert consultation may also be useful to develop more specific guidance on consistent outcome measurement using validated tools. However, investment of funders in more rigorous (and often more lengthy and therefore costly) research studies will also be essential to improve the state of the science.

While poor reporting of outcome measurement (27) and study results (32) have previously been identified in this field, our comprehensive data-extraction process across 170 unique records identified inadequate reporting of interventions and their evaluations (Table 1). Lack of transparency in reporting is problematic, hindering progression in the field in two ways. First, poor reporting of evaluation studies prevents critical appraisal of training effectiveness. For example, claims to effectiveness evidenced by increased staff confidence and improved staff behaviours are misleading when measured by outcome tools lacking adequate psychometric properties, or when only 50% of trainees completed the full course. Second, poor reporting hinders identification of the ‘active ingredients’ of complex interventions that contribute to their effectiveness (50); for example, the number of contact hours, whether the course is taught by palliative care specialists, or whether the intervention is delivered off-site on a retreat. If clinical educators and researchers are to provide evidence-based, effective training in EoLC communication skills, the quality of reporting must be improved. In response to this crucial issue and on the basis of our findings, we recommend a supplement to the CONSORT reporting guidance (52), specifically for training interventions (Box 1). We suggest further face-to-face expert consultation on this supplement (as recommended by members of the EQUATOR network and CONSORT executive when developing reporting guidelines (53)), and that authors of all studies evaluating training interventions, regardless of design, complete this checklist to ensure comprehensive reporting.

[INSERT BOX 1: Reporting checklist for training interventions]
Internationally, government initiatives and national reports continue to promote the importance of communication skills training interventions when providing palliative and EoLC (13-18). The large numbers of training interventions across the globe demonstrate a commitment to this goal. However, without rigorous and comparable evaluations it will be impossible to identify the optimal ‘dose’, structure, and methods for delivering teaching in these skills. This review, including our partner paper synthesising data on effectiveness (35), provides a consolidated resource for clinician educators and researchers who are seeking to source evidence-based training, or examine the current levels of evidence for different types of EoLC communication skills training interventions. Going forward, however, it is clear that development of additional training interventions with weak levels of evidence will not help advance this field. While an RCT might not always be feasible, employing a non-randomised controlled design would have improved many of the studies we identified. Although not without its challenges (54), more rigorous testing of training effectiveness using patient- and family-reported outcome measures must also become the priority for clinical educators, researchers, and funders. Whilst doubts have been cast over the ability to measure the impact of training using untrained patients and families (55), there are examples that show this is possible (e.g. Fukui et al. and Tulsky et al. (56, 57)). Crucial here is the selection of measurable outcomes relevant to the aims and content of the intervention. Such evidence is essential to provide consensus on what works best not only for trainees, but also for recipients of their care. Researchers also have a responsibility to ensure such training and study findings are reported with detail, clarity, and transparency.

This systematic review has both strengths and limitations. The review was inclusive in terms of study design, outcomes, language and publication status. Although the unpublished studies included may not have been subjected to peer review, we considered it important to capture relevant grey literature. Firstly, not all educational initiatives seek academic publication, and secondly, this allowed inclusion of recent projects that had not yet reached publication stage. However, as our search strategy focused on academic resources, we may have missed grey literature outside of these areas (e.g. reports on medical education websites). Initial screening was carried out by one author in the first instance due to
Based on our findings it is clear that testing of communication skills training effectiveness using stronger research designs and validated outcome measures must be the priority for clinical educators, researchers, and funders. Our review also highlights the need for improved clarity and consistency regarding the reporting of training interventions focusing on EoLC communication and their effectiveness. Our synthesis of the evidence and suggested guidelines for reporting are intended to contribute to future improvements in this field.
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Figure 1: PRISMA flow chart

Database records identified = 19,231

- CENTRAL 269
- CINAHL 3015
- CORDIS 137
- EMBASE 5996
- ERIC 277
- MEDLINE 3705
- OpenGrey 1504
- PsycInfo 1360
- EMBASE 5996
- Web of Science 2951

Other sources = 193

- Journal hand-search 107
- Review hand-search 43
- Follow-up of abstracts 43

Records after duplicates removed (n = 11,441)

Records screened (n = 11,441)

Records excluded (n = 10,596)

Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = 845)

Articles included in review (n = 170)

Full-text articles excluded (n = 675)

- Not a training intervention 54
- Not tested for effectiveness 176
- Not EoLC communication skills training 175
- >20% trainees PC specialists 24
- Specific to paediatrics 10
- Communication with non-patient 31
- Review paper 11
- Training for patients/families 5
- Train the trainer interventions 12
- Confounding system intervention 13
- Abstract only available 164

Unique studies represented (n = 160)

Unique training interventions represented (n = 153)

Articles included in review (n = 170)
Table 1: Reporting quality from data extraction across training and study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Studies for which item reporting is unclear/ missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training intervention details (n=153)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development strategies</td>
<td>43 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of training (start to completion)</td>
<td>37 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total training hours</td>
<td>41 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training location</td>
<td>87 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher qualifications</td>
<td>54 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study details (n=160)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of trainees</td>
<td>35 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number/nature of dropouts</td>
<td>97 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>155 (97%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Box 1: Reporting checklist for training interventions (Recommended as a supplement to CONSORT statement Item 5: Interventions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Checklist Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>How was the training intervention developed? E.g. based on a literature review, focus groups with stakeholders, published guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>Intended trainees</td>
<td>Who is the training intervention intended for? E.g. for student nurses in their final year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>How were trainees recruited? E.g. mandatory part of medical degree, advertised online to approx. 2,000 nursing staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>What topics are covered? E.g. theories, symptoms, communication, teamwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>What teaching methods are used? E.g. presentations, roleplay, group work. Mention any specific equipment needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>How long is the training? State total number hours of training, across how many sessions, and over what time period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Who taught the course? Specifically, what were their qualifications, and were they the same for each course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Where was the course run? E.g. university building, teaching room at the hospital, hotel retreat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>Adverse events</td>
<td>How were adverse events considered and monitored? E.g. dropouts due to sensitive topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>How much did the course cost to run? This should consider materials and staffing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Box S1: Example Search Strategy (MEDLINE)

1. Palliative care/ or Hospice care/ or Hospices/ or Terminal care/ or Terminally ill/
2. (Pallia* or Hospice*).ab,ti,kw.
3. (Supportive and (care or caring or team or ill*)).ab,ti,kw.
4. (Terminal* and (care or caring or ill*)).ab,ti,kw.
5. "respite care".ab,ti,kw.
6. ("Advanced disease*" or "Advanced illness*" or "Advanced cancer*").ab,ti,kw.
7. ("critical illness" or "critical illnesses" or "critically ill" or "critical care").ab,ti,kw.
8. ("Imminent death" or dying).ab,ti,kw.
9. ("Limited life expectanc*" or "Limited life span*" or "Limited lifespan*").ab,ti,kw.
10. ("End of Life" or "End-of-Life" or "Last year of life" or "End Stage" or "End-stage").ab,ti,kw.
11. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10
12. Communication/ or Clinical Competence/
13. (Communicat* or "Interpersonal skill*").ab,ti,kw.
14. "Bad news".ab,ti,kw.
15. ("Advance Care Plan*" or "Advance clinical decision*").ab,ti,kw.
16. "psychosocial care".ab,ti,kw.
17. ("living will" or "withholding treatment").ab,ti,kw.
18. 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17
19. Education/
20. (Train* or Educat* or Course* or Workshop*).ab,ti,kw.
21. 19 or 20
22. 11 and 18 and 21
Table S1. Descriptive Information on all studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training ID</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Staff views</th>
<th>Patient/Family views</th>
<th>Own work/Piloting</th>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>Training Hours</th>
<th>Teaching methods</th>
<th>E-learning</th>
<th>Study ID, if multiple</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study Quality*</th>
<th>Paper ID, if multiple</th>
<th>Outcome Types</th>
<th>Patient/Family Behaviours</th>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Self Assessment</th>
<th>Objective Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betcher (2010)¹ USA</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>√ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield² (2014) UK</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>≤1 hour</td>
<td>√ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmargo (unpub)³ USA</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>√ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton (1993)⁴ New Zealand</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>√ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton (2012)⁵ Australia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>√ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppeard (unpub)⁶ UK</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>√ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis et al (2013-14)⁷ ³⁹ USA</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>21-30 hours</td>
<td>√ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Randomised, controlled</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Curtis (2013)⁷</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PC/EOL communication skills:

- Bays (2014)⁵ 100-149 ✓
- Brown, C. (unpub)⁸ 200+ ✓
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training ID</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Staff views</th>
<th>Patient/Family views</th>
<th>Previous literature</th>
<th>Own work/piloting</th>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>Training Hours</th>
<th>Teaching methods</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study ID, if multiple</th>
<th>Study Quality^a</th>
<th>Paper ID, if multiple</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Outcome Types</th>
<th>Patient/Family</th>
<th>Behaviours</th>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Self Assessment</th>
<th>Objective Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denham (2006)(^{10}) USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Healthcare assistants</td>
<td>≤1 hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detering (2014)(^{11}) Australia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Doctors &amp; junior doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke (unpub)(^{12}) UK</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multidisciplinary group (inc. non-reg)</td>
<td>≤1 hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efstafthiou (2014)(^{13}) UK</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multidisciplinary Students</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer (2007)(^{14}) USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman (2006)(^{15}) USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg (1993)(^{16}) USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Randomised, controlled</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffiths (2015)(^{17}) UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han (2005)(^{18}) USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>≤1 hour</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahn (2001)(^{19}) USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerai (2013)(^{20}) USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Controlled, post-test only</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training ID</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Staff View(s)</td>
<td>Patient/Family View(s)</td>
<td>Previous Literature</td>
<td>Own Work/Piloting</td>
<td>Staff Group</td>
<td>Training Hours</td>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Quality</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Outcome Types</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Patient/Family</td>
<td>Behaviours</td>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Self-Assessment</td>
<td>Objective Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiley (unpub)21 USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopp (unpub)22 USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Nursing students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Controlled, post-test only</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCallister (2015)23 USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Controlled, pre- and post-test</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekmezaris (2011)26 USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Controlled, pre- and post-test</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>150-199</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runkle (2008)27 USA</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Mixed designs</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>150-199</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schildmann (2011)28 Germany</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmeling (1980)29 Germany</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary group (inc. non-reg)</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Mixed designs</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith (2013)30 USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szmuilowicz (2010)31 USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Randomised, controlled</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training ID</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Staff/Views</td>
<td>Previous Literature</td>
<td>Own work/Piloting</td>
<td>Staff Group</td>
<td>Training Hours</td>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study/Quality</td>
<td>Paper ID, if multiple</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Outcome Types</td>
<td>Behaviours</td>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Self Assessment</td>
<td>Objective Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szmuiłowicz et al (2012)(^{32, 33}) USA</td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Randomised, controlled</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Szmuiłowicz (2012)(^{32})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber (2003)(^{34}) Germany</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Wayne (2012)(^{33})</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittenberg (2012)(^{35}) USA</td>
<td>Nursing students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittenberg (2014)(^{36}) USA</td>
<td>Nurses &amp; doctors ≤1 hour</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Post-test only, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PC/EOL inc. communication skills**

<p>| Adriaansen (2005)(^{37}) Netherlands | Nurses | 21-30 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Controlled, pre- and post-test | M | 50-99 | ✓ |
| Alexander (2006)(^{38}) USA | Junior doctors | 11-20 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Controlled, pre- and post-test | H | 0-49 | ✓ |
| Byrne (unpub)(^{39}) Ireland | Nurses | 2-10 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Post-test only, no control | M | 100-149 | ✓ |
| Claxton-Oldfield (2007)(^{40}) Canada | Volunteers | 21-30 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 0-49 | ✓ |
| Claxton (2011)(^{41}) USA | Junior doctors | M/U | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Randomised, controlled | M | 50-99 | ✓ |
| Conner (2014)(^{42}) USA | Nursing students | M/U | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Controlled, pre- and post-test | M | 100-149 | ✓ |
| Training ID | Development | Staff views | Patient/Family views | Previous literature | Own work/piloting | Staff Group | Training Hours | Teaching methods | Study Design | Study/Quality | Paper ID, if multiple | N | Outcome Types | Patient/Family | Behaviours | Processes | Self Assessment | Objective Knowledge |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|---|----------------|----------------|-----------|---------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| Day (2015) | USA         | ✓           | ✓✓✓✓                |                     |                   | Medical students | 2-10 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Randomised, controlled | H | 100-149 | ✓ ✓ ✓                        |   |                |                |           |         |                |                  |                |
| De La Cruz  | USA         | ✓           | ✓✓✓✓                |                     |                   | Medical students | M/U           | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Post-test only, no control | M | 100-149 | ✓ ✓ ✓                        |   |                |                |           |         |                |                  |                |
| De La Cruz  | USA         | ✓           | ✓✓✓✓                |                     |                   | Medical students | M/U           | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Randomised, controlled | H | 100-149 | ✓ ✓ ✓                        |   |                |                |           |         |                |                  |                |
| Delgado     | Colombia    | ✓           | ✓✓✓✓                |                     |                   | Medical students | M/U           | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre-retrospective and post-test, no control | M | 50-99  | ✓                           |   |                |                |           |         |                |                  |                |
| DeVader     | USA         | ✓           | ✓✓✓✓                |                     |                   | Junior doctors   | 2-10 hours  | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 0-49   | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓                       |   |                |                |           |         |                |                  |                |
| Ellman      | USA         | ✓           | ✓✓✓✓                |                     |                   | Medical students | M/U           | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Controlled, post-test only | M | 200+   | ✓                           |   |                |                |           |         |                |                  |                |
| Ellman      | USA         | ✓           | ✓✓✓✓                |                     |                   | Medical students | 31+ hours    | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Controlled, post-test only | 200+ |         | ✓                           |   |                |                |           |         |                |                  |                |
| Ersek       | USA         | ✓           | ✓✓✓✓                |                     |                   | Nurses &amp; healthcare assistants | 31+ hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 150-199 | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓                       |   |                |                |           |         |                |                  |                |
| Farrington  | UK          | ✓           | ✓✓✓✓                |                     |                   | Healthcare assistants | 11-20 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 0-49   | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓                       |   |                |                |           |         |                |                  |                |
| Ferrell     | USA         | ✓           | ✓✓✓✓                |                     |                   | Nurses &amp; healthcare assistants | 2-10 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 50-99  | ✓                           |   |                |                |           |         |                |                  |                |
| Training ID | Development | Staff vs | Patient/Family views | Previous literature | Own work/piloting | Staff Group | Training Hours | Teaching methods | Role Play | Group Work | Case Studies | Com. Model | Didactics | Reflection/Discussion | Group Study | Clinical Exp. | E-learning | Self-Study | Study ID, if multiple | Study Design | Study Quality | Paper ID, if multiple | N | Outcome Types | Patient/Family Behaviours | Processes | Self Assessment Knowledge | Objective Knowledge |
|-------------|-------------|---------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|---|---------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------------------|
| Fischer (2003) | USA | ✔ | | | | Junior doctors | 2-10 hours | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | | | | | | | Controlled, pre- and post-test | M | 50-99 | | | | | |
| Fluharty (2012) | USA | | | | | Nurses | M/U | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | | | | | | | Pre/post-test, no control | H | 200+ | | | | | |
| Gerlach (2015) | Germany | | | | | Medical students | 11-20 hours | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | | | | | | | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 150-199 | | | | | |
| Hainsworth (1996) | USA | ✔ | ✔ | | | Nurses | 2-10 hours | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | | | | | | Randomised, controlled | M | 0-49 | | | | | |
| Hayes (unpub) | USA | | | | | Medical students | 31+ hours | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | | | | | | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 50-99 | | | | | |
| Hughes (2006) | UK | ✔ | ✔ | | | Nurses | M/U | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | | | | | | | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 0-49 | | | | | |
| Hussainy (2010) | Australia | ✔ | ✔ | | | Pharmacists | 21-30 hours | ✔ | | | | | | | | | | Post-test only, no control | M | 0-49 | | | | | |
| Kitzes (2009) | USA | | | | | Medical students | M/U | | | | | | | | | | Mixed designs | L | 150-199 | | | | | |
| Klaristenfeld (2007) | USA | ✔ | | | | Junior doctors | 2-10 hours | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | | | | | | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 0-49 | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training ID</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Staff Views</th>
<th>Patient/Family Views</th>
<th>Previous Literature</th>
<th>Own Work/Piloting</th>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>Training Hours</th>
<th>Teaching Methods</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study Quality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Outcome Types</th>
<th>Patient/Family Behaviours</th>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Self Assessment</th>
<th>Objective Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kruse (2008)*64 USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Randomised, controlled</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnani (2002)*65 USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Post-test only, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason (2008-10)*66, 67 UK</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>31+ hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mason (2008)*66</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick (unpub)*68</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mason (2010)*67</td>
<td>Controlled, pre- and post-test</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFarland (2006)*69 USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulder (2009)*70 Netherlands</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullins (1983)*71 USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Nurses &amp; healthcare assistants</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Randomised, controlled</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutto (2014)*72 Argentina</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>21-30 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Controlled, pre- and post-test</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash (1993)*73 UK</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Nurses &amp; doctors</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okon (2004)*74 USA</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Controlled, pre- and post-test</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training ID</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Patient/Family views</td>
<td>Previous literature</td>
<td>Own work/piloting</td>
<td>Staff Group</td>
<td>Training Hours</td>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>Didactics</td>
<td>Reflection/Discussion</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Com. Model</td>
<td>Role Play</td>
<td>Personal Vid/Aud</td>
<td>Clinical Exp, or Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimple (2003) 79 USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurses &amp; Nursing Students</td>
<td>31+ hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Post-test only, no control</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>#NU</td>
<td>LL!</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter-Williamson (2004) 76 USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>21-30 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinn (2008) 77 Australia</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary group</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray (2014) 78 Australia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary group</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schulz (2013) 79 Germany</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>21-30 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Controlled, pre- and post-test</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz (2005) 80 USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Mixed designs</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>150-199</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoane (2012) 81 USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shih (2012) 82 Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunkwiler (2005) 84 USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk (2009) 85 USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Controlled, pre- and post-test</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training ID</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Patient/Family views</td>
<td>Previous literature</td>
<td>Own work/piloting</td>
<td>Staff Group</td>
<td>Training Hours</td>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Quality</td>
<td>Paper ID, if multiple</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Outcome Types</td>
<td>Patient/Family</td>
<td>Behaviours</td>
<td>Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stecho (2012)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Controlled, pre- and post-test</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven (2014)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeney (2014)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>21-30 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchorz (2013)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Post-test only, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torke (2004)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Post-test only, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Gunten (2005)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Gunten (2012)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>21-30 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Controlled, pre- and post-test</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warnke (2014)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetcher (2013)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen (2012)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Nurses &amp; healthcare assistants</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training ID</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Patient/Family views</td>
<td>Previous literature</td>
<td>Own work/piloting</td>
<td>Staff Group</td>
<td>Training Hours</td>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>Didactics</td>
<td>Reflection/Discussion</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Com. Model</td>
<td>Role Play</td>
<td>Personal Vid/Aud</td>
<td>Clinical Exp, or Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamamoto (2015)²⁹</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang (2013)²⁸</td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Controlled, pre- and post-test</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yardley (2013)²⁹</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Post-test only, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>150-199</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoshioka (2013)¹⁰</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baile (2013)¹⁰¹</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary group</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Post-test only, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikici (2009)¹⁰²</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson (2014)¹⁰³</td>
<td>Nursing &amp; Medical Students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiluk (2012)¹⁰⁴</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConville (2006)¹⁰⁷</td>
<td>Nursing students</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communication Skills Inc. PC/EOL**

- **Yamamoto (2015)²⁹**
  - Japan
  - Didactics
  - Reflection/Discussion
  - Group Work
  - Case Studies
  - Com. Model
  - Role Play
  - Clinical Exp, or Visit
  - E-learning
  - Self-Study
  - Study ID, if multiple
  - Study Design
  - Study Quality
  - Paper ID, if multiple
  - N
  - Outcome Types
  - Patient/Family Behaviours
  - Processes
  - Self Assessment
  - Objective Knowledge

- **Yang (2013)²⁸**
  - USA
  - Didactics
  - Reflection/Discussion
  - Group Work
  - Case Studies
  - Com. Model
  - Role Play
  - Clinical Exp, or Visit
  - E-learning
  - Self-Study
  - Study ID, if multiple
  - Study Design
  - Study Quality
  - Paper ID, if multiple
  - N
  - Outcome Types
  - Patient/Family Behaviours
  - Processes
  - Self Assessment
  - Objective Knowledge

- **Yardley (2013)²⁹**
  - UK
  - Didactics
  - Reflection/Discussion
  - Group Work
  - Case Studies
  - Com. Model
  - Role Play
  - Clinical Exp, or Visit
  - E-learning
  - Self-Study
  - Study ID, if multiple
  - Study Design
  - Study Quality
  - Paper ID, if multiple
  - N
  - Outcome Types
  - Patient/Family Behaviours
  - Processes
  - Self Assessment
  - Objective Knowledge

- **Yoshioka (2013)¹⁰**
  - Japan
  - Didactics
  - Reflection/Discussion
  - Group Work
  - Case Studies
  - Com. Model
  - Role Play
  - Clinical Exp, or Visit
  - E-learning
  - Self-Study
  - Study ID, if multiple
  - Study Design
  - Study Quality
  - Paper ID, if multiple
  - N
  - Outcome Types
  - Patient/Family Behaviours
  - Processes
  - Self Assessment
  - Objective Knowledge

- **Baile (2013)¹⁰¹**
  - USA
  - Didactics
  - Reflection/Discussion
  - Group Work
  - Case Studies
  - Com. Model
  - Role Play
  - Clinical Exp, or Visit
  - E-learning
  - Self-Study
  - Study ID, if multiple
  - Study Design
  - Study Quality
  - Paper ID, if multiple
  - N
  - Outcome Types
  - Patient/Family Behaviours
  - Processes
  - Self Assessment
  - Objective Knowledge

- **Dikici (2009)¹⁰²**
  - Turkey
  - Didactics
  - Reflection/Discussion
  - Group Work
  - Case Studies
  - Com. Model
  - Role Play
  - Clinical Exp, or Visit
  - E-learning
  - Self-Study
  - Study ID, if multiple
  - Study Design
  - Study Quality
  - Paper ID, if multiple
  - N
  - Outcome Types
  - Patient/Family Behaviours
  - Processes
  - Self Assessment
  - Objective Knowledge

- **Erickson (2014)¹⁰³**
  - USA
  - Didactics
  - Reflection/Discussion
  - Group Work
  - Case Studies
  - Com. Model
  - Role Play
  - Clinical Exp, or Visit
  - E-learning
  - Self-Study
  - Study ID, if multiple
  - Study Design
  - Study Quality
  - Paper ID, if multiple
  - N
  - Outcome Types
  - Patient/Family Behaviours
  - Processes
  - Self Assessment
  - Objective Knowledge

- **Kiluk (2012)¹⁰⁴**
  - USA
  - Didactics
  - Reflection/Discussion
  - Group Work
  - Case Studies
  - Com. Model
  - Role Play
  - Clinical Exp, or Visit
  - E-learning
  - Self-Study
  - Study ID, if multiple
  - Study Design
  - Study Quality
  - Paper ID, if multiple
  - N
  - Outcome Types
  - Patient/Family Behaviours
  - Processes
  - Self Assessment
  - Objective Knowledge

- **Lienard (2010)¹⁰⁵, ¹⁰⁶**
  - Belgium
  - Didactics
  - Reflection/Discussion
  - Group Work
  - Case Studies
  - Com. Model
  - Role Play
  - Clinical Exp, or Visit
  - E-learning
  - Self-Study
  - Study ID, if multiple
  - Study Design
  - Study Quality
  - Paper ID, if multiple
  - N
  - Outcome Types
  - Patient/Family Behaviours
  - Processes
  - Self Assessment
  - Objective Knowledge

- **McConville (2006)¹⁰⁷**
  - UK
  - Didactics
  - Reflection/Discussion
  - Group Work
  - Case Studies
  - Com. Model
  - Role Play
  - Clinical Exp, or Visit
  - E-learning
  - Self-Study
  - Study ID, if multiple
  - Study Design
  - Study Quality
  - Paper ID, if multiple
  - N
  - Outcome Types
  - Patient/Family Behaviours
  - Processes
  - Self Assessment
  - Objective Knowledge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training ID</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Staff views</th>
<th>Previous literature</th>
<th>Own work/piloting</th>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>Training Hours</th>
<th>Teaching methods</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study Quality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Outcome Types</th>
<th>Patient/Family Behaviours</th>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Self Assessment</th>
<th>Objective Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosenbaum (2002)(^{108}) USA</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skye (2014)(^{109}) USA</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Post-test only, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tang (2014)(^{110}) Taiwan</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary group</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner/Johnson (2011/2013)(^{111},^{112}) UK</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary group</td>
<td>21-30 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Johnson (2013)(^{111}) Controlled, post-test only</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner (2011)(^{112})</td>
<td>Turner (2011)(^{112}) Controlled, post-test only</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specialism (Cancer) inc. PC/EOL communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training ID</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Staff views</th>
<th>Previous literature</th>
<th>Own work/piloting</th>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>Training Hours</th>
<th>Teaching methods</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study Quality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Outcome Types</th>
<th>Patient/Family Behaviours</th>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Self Assessment</th>
<th>Objective Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspegren et al (1996-2003)(^{113},^{114}) Nordic Countries (multiple)</td>
<td>Doctors &amp; junior doctors</td>
<td>31+ hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspegren (1996)(^{113})</td>
<td>Aspegren (1996)(^{113}) Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finset (2003)(^{114})</td>
<td>Finset (2003)(^{114}) Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>150-199</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back (2007)(^{115}) USA</td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>31+ hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baile (1997)(^{116}) USA</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baile (1999)(^{117}) USA</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training ID</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Previous literature</td>
<td>Own work/piloting</td>
<td>Staff Group</td>
<td>Training Hours</td>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>Study ID, if multiple</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study/Quality</td>
<td>Paper ID, if multiple</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Outcome Types</td>
<td>Patient/Family</td>
<td>Behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylund et al (2011-15) USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Nurses &amp; Junior Doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Didactics, Reflection/Discussion, Group Work</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Didactics, Reflection/Discussion, Group Work</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training ID</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Patient/Family views</td>
<td>Previous literature</td>
<td>Own work/Piloting</td>
<td>Staff Group</td>
<td>Training Hours</td>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>Didactics</td>
<td>Reflection/Discussion</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Com. Model</td>
<td>Role Play</td>
<td>Personal Vid/Aud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukui (2008-10) 130, 131 Japan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Fujui (2008) 130 Randomised, controlled</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grainger (2010) 133 Australia</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary group</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Randomised, controlled</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gueguen (2009) 134 USA</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary group</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre-(retrospective) and post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head (2015) 135 USA</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary Students</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulsman (2002) 136 Netherlands</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruijver (2001) 137 Netherlands</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Randomised, controlled</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenzi (2005) 138 USA</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Junior doctors</td>
<td>21-30 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table continues with additional rows.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training ID</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>Training Hours</th>
<th>Teaching methods</th>
<th>Paper ID, if multiple</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study/Quality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Outcome Types</th>
<th>Patient/Family</th>
<th>Behaviours</th>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Self Assessment</th>
<th>Objective Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lenzi (2011)</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>21-30 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Patient/Family, Behaviours, Processes, Self Assessment</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupo (2012)</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>31+ hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Patient/Family, Behaviours, Processes, Self Assessment</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morita (2007)</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Patient/Family, Behaviours, Processes, Self Assessment</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsky (2011)</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Randomised, controlled</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Patient/Family, Behaviours, Processes, Self Assessment</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udo (2014)</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>M/U</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Randomised, controlled</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Patient/Family, Behaviours, Processes, Self Assessment</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson (2003)</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>21-30 hours</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Patient/Family, Behaviours, Processes, Self Assessment</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training ID</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Patient/Family views</td>
<td>Previous literature</td>
<td>Own work/Piloting</td>
<td>Staff Group</td>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>Training Hours</td>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Quality</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Outcome Types</td>
<td>Paper ID, if multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuerstlein/Ulbach (unpub)</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary group</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>Didactics, Reflection/Discussion, Group Work, Case Studies, Com. Model, Personal Vid/Aud</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>Ulbach (unpub)</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialism (AIDS) inc. PC/EOL communication</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary group</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>Didactics, Reflection/Discussion, Group Work, Case Studies, Com. Model, Personal Vid/Aud</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialism (Primary Care) inc. PC/EOL communication</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary group</td>
<td>2-10 hours</td>
<td>Didactics, Reflection/Discussion, Group Work, Case Studies, Com. Model, Personal Vid/Aud</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Pre/post-test, no control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training ID</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Staff views</td>
<td>Previous literature</td>
<td>Own work/piloting</td>
<td>Staff Group</td>
<td>Training Hours</td>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>Study ID, if multiple</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study/Quality*</td>
<td>Paper ID, if multiple</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Outcome Types</td>
<td>Patient/Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mehdi (2014)¹⁵⁸  
UK | ✓ | Nurses & Junior Doctors | 2-10 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 0-49 | ✓ |
| Sanchez-Reilly (2007)¹⁵⁹  
USA | ✓ | Medical students | 2-10 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 0-49 | ✓ |
| Zapka (2006a)¹⁶⁰  
USA | ✓ ✓ | Nurses & healthcare assistants | ≤1 hour | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | H | 50-99 | ✓ |
| Zapka (2006b)¹⁶¹  
USA | ✓ ✓ | Nurses & social workers | 2-10 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 50-99 | ✓ |
| Schuh (2007)¹⁶²  
USA | ✓ | Junior doctors | 11-20 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Controlled, pre- and post-test | M | 0-49 | ✓ |
| Watling (2007)¹⁶³  
Canada | ✓ | Junior doctors | 11-20 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 0-49 | ✓ |
| Goldsmith (2015)¹⁶⁴  
USA | ✓ ✓ | Physiotherapists | 2-10 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | H | 50-99 | ✓ |
| Eastaugh (1998)¹⁶⁵  
UK | ✓ | Nurses & doctors | 11-20 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Post-test only, no control | M | 0-49 | ✓ |
| Kadlec (2015)¹⁶⁶  
Canada | ✓ | Doctors | 11-20 hours | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | M | 200+ | ✓ |

**Specialism (Heart Failure) inc. PC/EOL communication**

**Specialism (Neurology) inc. PC/EOL communication**

**Specialism (Physiotherapy) inc. PC/EOL communication**

**Specialism (Primary Care) inc. PC/EOL communication**
| Training ID | Development | Staff views | Patient/Family views | Previous literature | Own work/piloting | Staff Group | Training Hours | Teaching methods | Didactics | Reflection/Discussion | Group Work | Case Studies | Com. Model | Role Play | Personal Vid/Aud | Clinical Exp. or Visit | E-learning | Self-Study | Study ID, if multiple | Study Design | Study Quality* | Paper ID, if multiple | N | Outcome Types | Patient/Family | Behaviours | Processes | Self Assessment | Objective Knowledge |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|----------|---------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------------|---------|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Slort (2013)\(^{169}\) Netherlands | ✓ ✓ ✓ | Doctors | M/U | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ | Controlled, pre- and post-test | H | Pelayo-Alvarez (2013)\(^{168}\) | 50-99 | ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| Ward (2009)\(^{170}\) UK | ✓ ✓ | Doctors | M/U | ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ | Pre/post-test, no control | M | | 0-49 | ✓ ✓ |

*H=High, M=Medium, L=Low; \(^{a}\) Com. Model = Communication skills model, e.g. SPIKES, SHARE; \(^{b}\) Personal Vid/Aud = Personalised video/audio materials; \(^{c}\) Clinical Exp. Or Visit = Clinical experiences (e.g. spending time with palliative care team) or visits (e.g. to hospice)
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