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1. Introduction

Rapid response systems (RRSs) were developed in the early 2000s with the aim of reducing major adverse events and improving patient outcomes. Major adverse events include in-hospital cardiac arrest, unplanned admission to the intensive care unit (ICU), and unexpected death. The term RRS is used to describe the whole system responsible for detecting and responding to deteriorating patients regardless of location. There are two limbs to the RRS: an afferent (detection) limb, which normally has a track and trigger component to help clinicians identify patient deterioration, and an efferent (response) limb, which provides an escalation response to the deteriorating patient. Within the efferent limb of the RRS, the terms rapid response team (RRT), medical emergency team (MET), and critical care outreach are often used interchangeably, yet formal definitions exist. Lyon et al. describe...
an MET as commonly led by a physician, who can “prescribe critical care interventions, obtain central access and facilitate airway management” (p 3). Devita et al.⁴ describe an RRT as a team that provides an intermediate or ‘ramp up’ approach and a critical care outreach service (CCOS) as a system that includes an RRS component and a focus on prevention. More recently, Lyon et al.⁵ describe an RRT as usually being a nurse-led team, acknowledging that whether a team is physician led or nurse led may not affect mortality. This study uses the term CCOS to describe a nurse-led team.

The literature uses multiple terms to describe nurses working within a CCOS including critical care outreach nurses (CCONs),⁶ intensive care outreach nurses, intensive care liaison nurses,⁷ patient-at-risk team nurses,¹⁰ or in some hospitals, the after-hours clinical team co-ordinator. The composition of CCOSs also vary, ranging from typically critical care registered nurse responders through to advanced practice providers (APPs), such as nurse practitioners and nurse consultants.⁵,¹¹,¹² Increasingly APPs are working within CCOSs and add value to the team by providing diagnostic and treatment expertise, facilitating transfer to the ICU, and improving team communication and education.¹³

Internationally, established CCOSs improve patient outcomes. Whilst methodological flaws exist in many studies,¹⁴⁻¹⁶ research suggests CCONs reduce admission to the ICU, ward cardiac arrests, and hospital mortality.³⁶,²⁰,¹⁰ Delays in activation of the CCOS is associated with increased mortality¹⁷,¹⁸ and an increased likelihood of ICU admission.¹⁷ Allen et al.¹⁹ highlight CCON’s knowledge and experience, CCONs require good communication, problem-solving, clinical judgement.

The key objectives of a CCOS are to avert ICU admission, enable timely ICU admission, facilitate ICU discharge, and share ICU skills to another throughout a workday as well as being broadly skilled and experienced to respond appropriately to the wide variety of cases, ages, comorbidities, presenting symptoms, and ward staff’s experience levels on each occasion. In addition to clinical skill and experience, CCONs require good communication, problem-solving, and a rapid review of the literature was undertaken by the second author (AP) to ensure appropriate evidence, if available, was considered and supported by the panel, an important process in undertaking a rapid review.¹⁵ Whilst systematic reviews are regarded as the gold standard,²⁵⁻²⁷ rapid reviews are a pragmatic and manageable way to synthesise research findings within a short timeframe, unlike systematic reviews that take a lot longer.²⁵,²⁷,²⁸

Whilst a single reviewer performing the rapid review introduces bias, an expert panel ensures the evidence is appropriate to the topic and relevant literature is not missed during the rapid review process.²⁵ As rapid reviews are not as broad as systematic reviews,²⁵ only two data bases were searched (Scopus and Web of Science) using the key words “critical care outreach”, “intensive care outreach”, intensive care liaison nurse”, and “patient at risk team”. Qualitative and quantitative articles, mixed-methods research, and discussion articles written in English and published between 2012 and 2021 (inclusive) were reviewed; no grey publications were included. References lists were reviewed to provide links to earlier studies that were relevant to the topic. Quality tools were not used to review the studies, which is not uncommon for rapid reviews owing to time restraints.²⁵

The Delphi methodology is commonly used to create formal consensus statements and has also been used to describe numerous important nursing practices.²⁹,³⁰ The Delphi methodology uses a structured process and is a scientific method for achieving expert consensus.³¹ Common to all Delphi variations is the recruitment of a panel of informed experts. We used modified online Delphi technique to obtain expert panel consensus. Online methods reduce expense related to travel and possible biases related to panel member status or personality and enabled members to participate at a convenient time to them.²³

All panel members reviewed the final manuscript to agree on the important elements necessary to provide a practice approach to establishing a CCOS. This process enabled knowledge translation, which aims to reduce the gap between evidence generated and decisions being made in the clinical practice setting.²⁶,³²

3. Findings

The literature search identified 502 publications; 104 publications were relevant to the study and reviewed. The expert panel identified five components needed to establish a CCOS. These included the following: (i) approaches to service delivery, (ii) education and training, (iii) organisational engagement, (iv) clinical governance, and (v) monitoring and evaluation.

3.1. Approaches to service delivery

The key objectives of a CCOS are to avert ICU admission, enable timely ICU admission, facilitate ICU discharge, and share ICU skills with the ward interdisciplinary team.¹²,¹³,¹⁴ Roles of nurses within a CCOS may be proactive, reactive, or a combination of both.²³ Proactive teams are often stand-alone teams that may use a variety of surveillance techniques to identify and prevent clinical deterioration, such as continuous vital sign monitoring and electronic risk stratification, or through other markers, such as reviewing patients after ICU discharge and proactive rounding.²³,²⁵,²⁶,²⁷ Reactive teams, such as the MET, requires the patient to deteriorate before the team is activated.³³ In both models, CCONs need to have the ability to flex rapidly from one stressful situation to another throughout a workday as well as being broadly skilled and experienced to respond appropriately to the wide variety of cases, ages, comorbidities, presenting symptoms, and ward staff’s experience levels on each occasion. In addition to clinical skill and experience, CCONs require good communication, problem-solving,
and bedside teaching skills.\textsuperscript{8,37} Our experience suggests CCOSs have incorporated different approaches to achieving these objectives dependent on the current needs within each organisation and the maturity of the CCOS. Approaches include implementing an early warning scoring system (EWS), a nurse concern trigger, ICU discharge follow-up, patient and family activated call for concern, and proactive rounding, each of which will be briefly described.

3.1. Early warning scoring system

Commonly, an afferent limb (sensation limb) uses an early warning score (EWS) to identify patients requiring a CCOS review or MET.\textsuperscript{10,38} Although various EWSs exist internationally, the United Kingdom National Early Warning Score (NEWS) has been extensively researched and is mandated as a standard of care by the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence.\textsuperscript{39,40} An EWS is recommended in all hospitals to help guide bedside nurses to know when and how to escalate care to others, such as the CCOS.\textsuperscript{41}

An EWS has an associated escalation strategy (often referred to as a track-and-trigger system) and uses numerical scores to multiple vital sign parameters to trigger an alert. Vital signs commonly included are heart rate, blood pressure, respiratory rate, level of consciousness, and oxygen saturation. The more deranged the vital sign is, the higher the score becomes, leading to a graded escalation response (efferent limb of the EWS).\textsuperscript{10,18} Lack of an international EWS is likely related to the view that an EWS in one hospital may not be applicable in another owing to different patient characteristics, which suggests one single EWS may not meet the needs of unique patient populations.\textsuperscript{40,42} This is reflected in hospitals that have developed their own EWSs, such as a paediatric EWS,\textsuperscript{43} or a modified EWS.\textsuperscript{44}

3.1.2. Nurse concern

Nurse concern or ‘worry factor’ is an indication of clinical deterioration;\textsuperscript{45} hence, a concern criterion is commonly added to an EWS to enable nurses to escalate their concerns or intuition irrespective of vital signs.\textsuperscript{46} Nurse concern is a subjective reason for concern irrespective of vital signs. Nurse concern increases with clinical experience,\textsuperscript{47} which means inexperienced nurses have difficulty using this criterion to escalate deteriorating patients.\textsuperscript{47}

Packaging information enables nurses to use more convincing language when escalating patients\textsuperscript{48} and is more effective than an isolated vital sign.\textsuperscript{49} However, the ability to ‘package’ clinical deterioration effectively to justify escalation depends on nurses’ knowledge, confidence, and experience,\textsuperscript{48,49} all factors that take time to develop. Douw et al.\textsuperscript{50} identified nine indicators of concern that assist nurses with communicating concerns of patient deterioration to medical staff members. The Dutch-Early-Nurse-Worry Indicator Score combined with the EWS improved unplanned ICU admissions and unexpected mortality and was more predictive than the EWS or ‘nurse worry’ criteria alone.\textsuperscript{51} Although “nurse concern” is recognised as an important factor in any escalation process, more studies are required to quantify the value nurse worry indicators add to an EWS.

3.1.3. ICU patient discharge follow-up

Jones et al.\textsuperscript{52} and more recently McIntyre et al.\textsuperscript{8} suggest a proactive and pre-emptive approach to clinical deterioration, such as follow-up of patients discharging from the ICU. For some CCOSs, ICU discharge is the most common reason for referral.\textsuperscript{52–55} Discharging patients from the ICU to the ward is a vulnerable time for patients, exposing them to anxiety\textsuperscript{56,57} and risk of adverse events,\textsuperscript{58–60} including ICU readmission and death.\textsuperscript{56,61} The CCOS plays a key role in advanced assessment, technical support, and communication by ensuring written transfer information is available and understood by the ward medical and nursing staff, and by being physically present to guide the ward staff after patient transfer to the ward.\textsuperscript{62,63} All factors that reduce ward nurses’ anxiety associated with receiving ICU patients.\textsuperscript{54} Follow-up of patients discharged prematurely or out of hours during ICU bed demand may also play a role in reducing patient anxiety\textsuperscript{62} and mortality.\textsuperscript{62} Three systematic reviews and meta-analyses show ICU discharge follow-up with or without transition programmes reduce the risk of ICU readmission.\textsuperscript{65–69} Although a recent systematic review suggests diverging evidence for other benefits of ICU discharge follow-up,\textsuperscript{69} Nates et al.\textsuperscript{70} in their evidence-based recommendations suggest ICU discharge follow-up reduces ICU discharge delays, ward adverse events, mortality, and ICU readmission.

3.1.4. Patient and family activated call for concern

Although an EWS is useful for detecting and escalating deteriorating patients, it is not always acted upon.\textsuperscript{71} This has led to an increasing emphasis on enabling patients and families to escalate their concerns to the CCOS based on the premise that patients and families recognise their deterioration before the ward staff.\textsuperscript{72,73} Dwyer et al.\textsuperscript{74} identified an average of 2.5 activations per month over a 2-year period, with 35% resolved by communication alone, nearly half requiring some clinical intervention, and 15% needing transfer to a high level of care. While these services have improved service delivery to patients,\textsuperscript{75} there are concerns the service may be used to respond to issues that are not related to deterioration.\textsuperscript{73,74,76} Hence, more research is needed on the impact of this type of service on patient safety.

3.1.5. Proactive rounding

Proactive rounding may be a useful strategy when first establishing a CCOS or if the service is being underutilised.\textsuperscript{77} It has been used as a tool to facilitate the ‘worry factor’ and escalate to the CCOS.\textsuperscript{78} Identifying ward patients who are at high risk of deteriorating enables earlier intervention and prevents further deterioration.\textsuperscript{78} Proactive rounding practices continue to evolve as automated artificial intelligence predictive models are developed.\textsuperscript{79}

3.2. Education and training

Establishing a CCOS provides an opportunity to further develop clinical and interpersonal expertise that fosters support, teamwork, and collaboration.\textsuperscript{1,17} Building trust and establishing a positive relationship with the ward team is key to the success of a CCOS.\textsuperscript{80} The CCN must balance their clinical care expertise with the immediate needs of the ward environment, working in collaboration with ward staff to navigate the approach taken to monitor and manage the patient. Being accessible, approachable,\textsuperscript{10,11,12} friendly, and knowledgeable\textsuperscript{16} enables CCN to have key roles in supporting nurses’ and junior doctors’ decision-making by sharing their knowledge and skills,\textsuperscript{72,82} and building ward nurses’ confidence in managing deteriorating patients.\textsuperscript{1,83} Many interventions performed by the CCOS relate to communication and education,\textsuperscript{36} and include patient and family advocacy, which may comprise of assisting the team with early decision-making regarding patient treatment limitations and transition to end-of-life care.\textsuperscript{84–87} Cross et al.\textsuperscript{88} identified nurses new to CCOS need clinical supervision, role clarification, understanding how to deal with personal issues, dedicated time for reflection, and debriefing. Debriefing, managing emotional wellbeing and valuing individuals are identified as factors that reduce CCNs’ moral distress and burnout.\textsuperscript{89}

Identifying CCOS roles and responsibilities needs a structured approach. As CCOS often combine proactive and reactive responsibilities in one role.\textsuperscript{77} Table 1 provides a decision guide for CCOS when facing competing priorities whilst functioning in a combined role. The CCOS can rapidly provide support to bedside
staff reactively in clinical emergencies and also prevent emergencies through proactive clinical review, detection, and referral.

A specific competency programme based on the Competences for Recognising and Responding to Acutely Ill Patients in Hospital92 and knowledge outlined in critical care nursing standards have been used to develop nurses new to CCOS roles.10 Legislation and/or local policy may define CCON’s scope of practice; therefore, it is necessary to also include what needs escalating to a critical care physician or APP.

An Australian study surveying a convenience sample of participants at an RSS conference showed CCONs attending MET calls considered interprofessional training, including clinical deterioration theory and skills, RSS governance, professionalism, and teamwork important.35 An American before-and-after study demonstrated that a performance improvement-based inpatient resuscitation programme that included concepts of early recognition of clinical deterioration and closed-loop feedback communication decreased hospital mortality and increased survival to discharge.92

Planned study sessions provided to staff to fill knowledge gaps related to detecting, responding, and managing deterioration have been used successfully in some CCOS models.10,36 Currey et al.93 identified CCONs’ theoretical knowledge, advanced assessment skills, and professional attributes as important in their role development.93 Hence, sound clinical judgement, experience, and knowledge are an essential element of a CCOS.37,94

When implementing a CCOS, organisations need to determine which areas within the hospital will be supported by the CCOS, to better understand skillsets required. A CCON has specialist knowledge although it may be limited for some specialties.95 There may be areas within the hospital, such as paediatric, obstetric,96 or mental health, that may require the CCON to work outside their standard knowledge and skillset. It is therefore essential that the CCOS considers how they can contribute to patients in these specialty areas and consider knowledge and skill gaps that may need addressing.91

3.3. Organisational engagement

The period preceding the implementation of a CCOS can be used to engage and prepare key stakeholders. Failure to do this can result in nursing and medical staff resistance to the CCOS and no improved patient outcomes.98 Engagement activities will likely focus on ward-based registered nurses (RNs) as they frequently escalate to the CCOS99 and junior medical staff who may also refer to the service.100

Initially, it may be preferable for the CCOS lead to deliver a more comprehensive presentation that provides ward staff with a detailed overview of the service. These presentations could be delivered at events such as ward meetings or grand rounds. If several CCOS members are responsible for delivering the information, a standardised presentation may ensure that key messages are consistent. Suggested content for this initial presentation is summarised in Table 2.

Many nurses favour approaching colleagues for information ‘daunting’;91 therefore, distributing simple-to-read materials with clear and concise information about the CCOS may be helpful. This information could be delivered using a range of media such as fliers, posters, and lanyard cards. Hand delivering these resources to the ward areas potentially provides further opportunities to deliver information ‘bursts’ about the service. The success of the service may be partly contingent on the beliefs that ward staff members hold about the consequences (positive or negative) of referring to the CCOS.102 Hence, every interaction with ward staff prior to and after implementation should be an opportunity to increase credibility, build relationships, and establish trust. Digital information sources in the days immediately preceding the service can be used as prompts and cues for referral to the CCOS; this may be through computer screensavers, the staff intranet, or as part of the organisation’s daily/weekly electronic bulletins.

As junior members of the patient’s primary medical team respond to a deteriorating patient alongside an external responder, such as the CCOS,103 establishing relationships with ward-based physicians is important. Building these relationships can be helpful for the CCOS when they are assisting junior medical staff to navigate the often complex hierarchies that can exist within hospitals.104

An international study of RRTs showed more than 25% of patients reviewed by a CCOS have new limitations of treatment initiated, such as a do not attempt cardiopulmonary resuscitation.105 Consequently, engaging with the organisation’s palliative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Critical care outreach nurse responsibilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priorities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to ward emergencies takes immediate priority over all other CCOS activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ward emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table is based on the work of Winterbottom et al.111 and has been used with permission of the lead author.

CCOS, critical care outreach service; BiPAP, Bi-level positive airway pressure.
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Care clinicians to agree on referral pathways for patients who initially trigger a CCOS review but whose ongoing needs are best served through palliative care may be useful.

### 3.4. Clinical governance

There are limited studies describing or testing clinical governance models to oversee CCOS implementation, despite the need for administration and governance of RRS being identified as important factors. Nevertheless, building a coalition of key leaders to guide change is necessary to get the CCOS strategy approved and implemented. When planning for a CCOS, a strong rationale including good data demonstrating the magnitude and impact of the current problem and how a CCOS may solve this problem is needed. Data commonly used to support the need for a CCOS include the numbers of ward cardiac arrests, ICU readmissions, MIE escalations, and patient events related to failure to escalate. Other relevant measures could include a staff survey to identify the perceived benefits of a CCOS.

Establishing a steering committee to lead and provide oversight of the RRS is recommended. This steering committee could include a nursing and medical lead for the hospital, an ICU medical and nursing lead, members of the CCOS, and nursing/medical education department representatives. Expertise from other departments could be seconded as needed, such as the hospital communication department to develop a communication strategy, the hospital informatics department to assist with a data/information strategy, or the after-hours nursing supervisor team to assist with aligning and supporting the service.

A written draft CCOS model, ideally as part of a multidisciplinary team approach, is recommended. Significant consultation and debate during this development are critical to ensure the model is fit for purpose, robust, and accepted. The model must meet the needs of the organisation; hence, there will be some variation of models between organisations, for instance, not all CCOSs come from the ICU, and in some organisations, a two-tiered approach is more desirable. Major activities, action plans, responsible person, and timelines in a Gantt chart format are useful to ensure disciplined and transparent project management. Finally, a communication plan is essential including a written draft summary of the model and expectations of the CCOS and how staff will access and utilise the service. Included in the draft model will be how the CCOSs escalate their concerns to the parent team or critical care APP or physician and how adverse events are managed. Following establishment of the service, CCOS representation at a hospital-wide deteriorating patient forum would ensure the CCOS is embedded as part of the organisation's permanent RRS.

### 3.5. Monitoring and evaluation

RRSs have a comprehensive set of measures to evaluate the effectiveness of the services that have been developed and tested over time by various organisations and professional groups. Before establishing a CCOS, there needs to be clear objectives as to what the service is aiming to achieve. Using national or international recommendations to establish an RRS may not be enough to convince individual organisations; hence, local data can be instrumental in supporting business cases and service development requests. Point prevalence surveys of vital sign recording practice may be used to highlight gaps in patient care and make the case for implementing a CCOS. In addition to more objective patient outcome measures, surveys of CCOS team members and end users of the CCOS after implementation of the CCOS can monitor the effectiveness of the service, enabling experience and feedback to improve components of the service.

How CCOSs are evaluated will depend on several factors, such as organisational context, model of service, staff expertise, administration resources, information technology (IT) availability, staffing resource, and organisational objectives. A list of the measures commonly used to evaluate the service is found in Box 1; these can be adapted according to the organisation’s specific objectives and service model. Collected monthly, the data can give an overview on how the CCOS is being utilised and how work patterns may be affected by hospital admissions, ICU occupancy, seasonal affects, and systemic organisational changes. Data should be collected for at least 12 months to determine the impact of the CCOS on patient care and experience. By measuring the CCOS service activity and outcomes, a foundation can be established on which to build improvements that not only effect patient care, outcome, and experience but can also be shared with other organisations.

---

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Minimum suggested content to hospital staff</th>
<th>Additional content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Introduce the CCOS team members.</td>
<td>Consider including photographs of team members to help ward staff recognise who is who.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>Provide an overview of the expertise provided by team members (both in terms of knowledge and skills).</td>
<td>Emphasise what the team members can provide and, if appropriate, what they cannot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Describe the remit and boundaries of the team i.e. where they will attend calls and, if appropriate, where they will not.</td>
<td>Identify the perceived benefits of a CCOS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Outline the circumstances in which a referral to the team can be made. This is likely to include information on objective referral criteria (including EWS).</td>
<td>Address any variant procedures that may be used to escalate care in more remote clinical areas, e.g., satellite units, outpatient departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>Provide information about the practicalities of referral including mobile or pager numbers if relevant. Be clear and precise about the ‘go live’ date and when staff can expect a response if they call.</td>
<td>Consider aligning these points to CCON service standard operating procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APP, advanced practice provider; EWS, early warning score; CCOS, critical care outreach service; CCON, critical care outreach nurse; RN, registered nurse.
Box 1
Metrics used to evaluate a CCOS.

- Number of ward patients to determine
  - Number of CCOS referrals \( \frac{10^4}{1000 \text{ admissions}} \)
  - Number of CCOS reviews \( \frac{10^4}{1000 \text{ admissions}} \)
  - Number of ward cardiopulmonary arrests per 1000 admissions \( \frac{1}{1000 \text{ admissions}} \)
  - Number of MET calls per 1000 admissions \( \frac{1}{1000 \text{ admissions}} \)
- Analysis of the CCOS referrals to identify workload that may include:
  - Day of week, time of day, specialty, and ward.
  - CCOSs response times according to agreed criteria based on the acuity of the patient \( \frac{1}{24 \text{ h}} \)
  - The number of patients discharged from critical care to the ward and/or followed up within 24 h \( \frac{1}{24 \text{ h}} \)
  - CCOS activities such as taking and analysing blood gas samples, intravenous line insertion \( \frac{1}{24 \text{ h}} \)
- Review of ward cardiac arrest patients to identify potential delays in escalation \( \frac{1}{24 \text{ h}} \)
- Number of patient or family activations to the CCOS \( \frac{1}{1000 \text{ admissions}} \)
- Number of serious incidents related to sub-optimal care of a deteriorating patient \( \frac{1}{24 \text{ h}} \)
- The number of readmissions to ICU within a specified period of time (such as 48 h) \( \frac{1}{24 \text{ h}} \)

An electronic database rather than a paper-based system is better for the CCOS data collection; hence, the reason why early discussion with IT services when developing the CCOS is useful. Regular feedback of the data to governance bodies will establish a basis for service development, staffing levels, areas of concern, and where patient care and experience have seen an improvement.

4. Conclusion

The interchangeable terms and lack of a single model for a CCOS means research is difficult to interpret in the real-word setting. In addition, limited research into the most effective or appropriate administrative and governance arrangements for an RRS and CCOS required the expert panel—modified Delphi approach to inform commentary; further research into these elements of a CCOS is recommended. Using an expert panel, a rapid review of the literature and a modified Delphi technique to combine evidence, experience, and clinical judgment effectively developed a practical approach to establishing a CCOS. Five key components needed to establish a CCOS were identified and included approaches to service delivery, education and training, organisational engagement, clinical governance, and monitoring and evaluation.

The expert panel research design successfully synthesised evidence, experience, and clinical judgement to provide a practical approach for those establishing a CCOS, thereby reducing the evidence to clinical practice gap. This method of research will likely be valuable in other areas of practice where terms are used interchangeably, and the literature is diverse and lacking a single approach to practice.
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