

**Table 1: Included studies (n=47) and their use in the review**

**Key**

- ✓ **PT1** Supports/Refines Programme Theory 1: The place of care and the timing of transition to it is decided in consultation with the service user.
- ✓ **PT2** Supports/Refines Programme Theory 2: Health and social care professionals foster the self-care skills of service users and shape the environment so as to 're-enable' service users.
- ✓ **PT3** Supports/ Refines Programme Theory 3: Health and social care professionals work in an integrated fashion with each other and carers
- Links to an explanatory note.

**Typologies**

**CL** = Clinically led (multi-disciplinary case management)

**HW** = Housing Link Worker or Housing led (case management)

**SW** = Social Work led (multi-disciplinary case management)

**MR** = Medical Respite (residential)

*All studies relate to homeless service users unless stated otherwise.*

Authors [country]	Data Collection	Type	No. of Participants	PT1	PT2	PT3	Notes (e.g. significantly refines or surfaces new programme theory)
<b>Conceptually Rich</b>							
Herman et al. 2011[USA] & Tomita and Herman, 2012 [USA]	Randomised Control Trial	CL	150	✓	✓	✓	New PT 4: Health, housing and social care professionals proactively manage continuity
Medcalf and Russell, 2014 [UK]	Review of Homeless Health Initiatives	CL	N/A			✓	Note on PT3: Conceptualises IC integration within broader homeless health pathways
Whiteford and Simpson, 2015b [UK]	Exploratory case analysis	CL	18			✓	Refine PT3: Knot-working identified as useful theoretical concept for understanding process of integration
<b>Thick</b>							
Bauer et al., 2012 [US]	Retrospective Study	MR	860	✓		✓	Refines PT1: Draws attention to need for women-only spaces
Charles et al. 2015 [UK]	External Evaluation	HL	104	✓		✓	
Doran et al., 2013	Systematic Review	MR	13 (articles)		○	✓	Note on PT2: Only one scheme listed access to physiotherapy

Dorney-Smith, 2011 [UK]	Economic Evaluation	CL	34	✓		✓	Refines PT1: Work is needed to establish engagement before consultation. Refines PT3: Advocacy is key where no agency wants to take responsibility.
Dorney-Smith and Hewett, 2016 [UK] Dorney-Smith, Hewitt and Burridge 2016 [UK]	Feasibility Study	MR	53	✓	○	✓	Note on PT2: Highlights long term care needs often not being met. Refine PT1: Highlights potential of Psychologically Informed Environments (PIE)
Dorney-Smith et al. 2016 [UK]	Project Report	CL	N/A	✓	○	✓	Note on PT2: A recent development within Pathway Teams is to include access to occupational therapy
Drury, 2008 [USA]	Participant Observation	HL	60	✓		✓	Refines PT3: Advocacy is key where no agency wants to take responsibility.
Gillespie, 2014 [UK]	Project Report	HL	N/A	✓		✓	
Hendry, 2009 [UK]	Economic Evaluation	MR	34	✓		✓	Refines PT1 – Work is needed to establish engagement before consultation with service users can take place.
Hewett, Halligan and Boyce, 2012 [UK] & Halligan and Hewett, 2011 [UK]	Descriptive Case Study	CL	N/A	✓	○	✓	Refine PT3: Advocacy is key where no agency wants to take responsibility. Note on PT2: Highlights difficulties engaging adult social care - potentially accounting for why reablement overlooked.
Hochron, and Brown, 2013 [US]	Exploratory case analysis	CL	N/A			✓	
Homeless Link, 2015 & Albanese, Hurcombe and Mathie, 2016 [UK]	External Evaluation of HHDF Programme	All	52	✓	○	✓	Note on PT2: Highlights difficulties engaging adult social care - potentially accounting for why reablement overlooked.
Housing LIN & DH, 2009 [UK]	Case Studies x3	HL & CL		✓		✓	
Lane, 2005 [UK]	Feasibility Study & Literature Review	MR		✓	○	✓	Note on PT2 raises issues around accessibility to physical rehabilitation.
Lewis, 2015 [UK]	External Evaluation	HL	10	✓	○	✓	Note on PT2: Highlights difficulties engaging adult social care - potentially accounting for why reablement overlooked.

Lowson and Hex, 2014 [UK] & Lephard, 2015 [UK]	External Econ. Evaluation & Project Report	CL + MR	39+	✓	○	✓	Note on PT2: Highlights how resettlement can encompass aspects of reablement.
O'Carroll et al., 2006 [IRE]	Feasibility study	MR	N/A	✓	○	✓	Note PT2: notes many hostels exclude people with mobility issues
Parker-Radford, 2015 [UK]	Policy Review & Survey		184	✓	✓	✓	Advocates transition of care approach
Sadowski et al. 2009 [US]	RCT	SW+ MR	407	✓	○	✓	Note on PT2: Records an improvement in physical functioning from baseline for both intervention and control groups
Van Laere, Wit and Klazinga, 2009 [Holland]	Statistical case study	MR	629		○	✓	Note PT2: Notes that MR providing palliative care
Whiteford & Simpson 2015a [UK]	Exploratory case analysis	CL	18	✓	○	✓	Note on PT2 – Describes lack of access to physical rehabilitation/reablement services
<b>Thin</b>							
Buchanan et al. 2006 [US]	Cohort study	MR	225			○	Note PT3: Skilled nursing not provided, highlights role of 'volunteer health providers'
Danahay, 2014 [UK]	Project Report	HL	N/A			✓	
Doran et al., 2013 [USA]	Chart Review	MR	113	✓			
Doran et al, 2015 [USA]	Action Research	MR				✓	
Forchuk et al. 2008 [Canada]	RCT	HL	14			○	Refine PT3: Housing advocacy plus fast track income support seen as main mechanism
Gundlapalli et al. 2005 [US]	Descriptive case analysis	MR	N/A	○			Note PT1: Describes eligibility criteria linked to a range of MR provision in one county – consulting with service users not mentioned
Hewett et al., 2016 [UK]	Randomised Control Trial	CL	414				Effectiveness and cost effectiveness study
H3, 2015 [UK]	Project Report	HL	N/A			✓	
Kertesz et al., 2009 [US]	Retrospective Cohort study	MR	743	✓			
Lamb and Joels, 2014 [UK]	Case Study	CL	N/A	✓		✓	
Rae and Rees, 2015 [UK]	Phenomenological		14	○		○	Makes case for IC, focusing on importance of engagement and need for improved coordination

Poymow et al, 2005 [Canada]	Cohort Study	MR	140		✓		Note on PT2: One of few studies to list availability of physiotherapy on consultation
Redman, 2010 [UK]	Project Report	CL	N/A	✓	○	✓	Note on PT2: Highlights difficulties in meeting 'physical needs'
SERI, 2014 [UK] & Housing LIN (94), 2014, [UK]	External Evaluation	HL	Not given			✓	
Shelter and Coastline Housing, 2016 [UK]	Project Report	HL	N/A	✓		✓	
Wade, 2014 [UK]	External Evaluation	HL	8	✓		✓	
White, 2011 [UK]	External Economic Evaluation	HL	N/A				Provides evidence on cost effectiveness using HES data
National Health Care for the Homeless Council (2008)[US]	Policy and Practice Review	MR HL	N/A		✓	✓	