

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review. They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice, or referenced by the media as validated information.

### Design, operation and strengthening of health practitioner regulation systems: A rapid integrative review

#### Kathleen Leslie ( kleslie@athabascau.ca )

Athabasca University https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0581-126X

lvy Lynn Bourgeault

University of Ottawa

#### Anne-Louise Carlton

Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology: RMIT University

#### Madhan Balasubramanian

Flinders University

- Raha Mirshahi University of Ottawa
- Stephanie Short
- The University of Sydney
- Jenny Carè

University of Technology Sydney

Giorgio Cometto

World Health Organization

Vivian Lin

University of Hong Kong

#### **Research Article**

Keywords: Health Practitioner Regulation, Health Systems, Health Workforce, Systematic Reviews, Integrative Review

Posted Date: December 20th, 2022

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2370701/v1

License: 🐵 🛈 This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. Read Full License

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Human Resources for Health on September 4th, 2023. See the published version at https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-023-00848-y.

### Abstract

**Background:** In addition to promoting patient safety, health practitioner regulation (HPR) systems are increasingly recognized as playing an important role in supporting health workforce availability, accessibility, quality, and sustainability. This review aimed to identify the evidence on the design, delivery and effectiveness of HPR systems to inform policy decisions by policymakers and regulators.

**Methods:** A rapid review approach was adopted to conduct an integrative analysis of literature published between 2010 and 2021. Fourteen databases were searched according to a standardized strategy. Data were extracted and synthesized through an integrative approach and categorized according to a modified Donabedian framework.

**Results** We identified 410 academic and 426 grey literature sources. Key themes included HPR *structures* (regulatory governance systems, regulatory institutions, and system linkages), *processes* (registration and monitoring of continuing competence of practitioners, accreditation of entry-to-practice education programs, regulating scopes of practice, managing complaints and discipline, and regulating traditional and complementary medicine) and *outcomes* (impact of HPR structures and processes on health system and workforce outcomes). More evidence was found on HPR structures and processes than outcomes, though over 99% of studies were descriptive (and evidence, accordingly, of very low certainty). Synthesis was constrained by the lack of common terminology.

**Discussion**: Trends on regulatory structures and processes emerged from this analysis. The evidence base limitations, particularly on HPR outcomes, warrant caution in the interpretation, generalizability, and applicability of these findings. Standardized terminology and more evidence on regulatory outcomes (on both workforce and health systems) could inform decisions on regulatory design and implementation.

### Introduction

Health systems face considerable challenges in recruiting, training, distributing and retaining a sufficiently skilled and competent health workforce. These challenges are often compounded by: increasing volume and privatization of health practitioner education; accelerating international mobility and cross-border service delivery; more team-based models of service delivery; and the growing importance of often unregulated occupations such as community health workers and traditional and complementary medicine practitioners (T&CM) (1).<sup>[1]</sup>

In response to the complex demands on health systems and health workforces, some governments have reformed health practitioner regulation (HPR) systems to better serve the public interest (2–7). Strengthening HPR systems can help to assure competence of the health workforce, the safety of services they provide, and foster the flexibility and innovation needed to meet population needs. There is increasing recognition that HPR systems can also contribute to the required health workforce availability, accessibility, quality, and sustainability to progress toward Universal Health Coverage and the Sustainable Development Goals (1). HPR can optimize the capability of the existing health workforce and assist in better aligning health workforce investments with health system needs (8,9).

There are significant gaps in our knowledge about leading HPR policy and practice, such as which regulatory models, institutional governance and core regulatory functions work best in different contexts. This review aimed to identify the evidence base around HPR design and delivery to help governments, regulators, and other stakeholders achieve health system and workforce goals.

### Defining health practitioner regulation

Based on the International Standard Classification of Occupations (10), we defined health practitioners as including health professionals, associate health professionals, and personal care workers in health services. We excluded health workers not directly engaged with patient care or diagnostics, such as health care management and support staff. We use the term HPR to describe a jurisdiction's suite of laws, regulations, bylaws, decrees, codes, directives, or other rules that are specifically targeted at regulating health occupations. Functions typically associated with HPR are described in Figure 1. We use statutory registration as an umbrella term that captures schemes that apply either or both reservation of title (sometimes referred to as "registration") and reservation of practice (sometimes referred to as "licensing"). When referring to statutory registration, we exclude certification, co-regulation, negative licensing or any other occupational regulation scheme.

### **Conceptual Framework**

We developed a modified Donabedian (11) conceptual framework to guide this review (Figure 1). *Structures* represent the context of HPR systems derived from a modified STEEPLED (social, technological, economic, environmental, political, legislative, ethical, and demographic contexts), adding an equity dimension. *Processes* include the functions and activities of the regulatory system, and *Outcomes* relate to the effectiveness of the HPR system in achieving its objectives.

INSERT Figure 1: Modified Donabedian framework of HPR systems

### **Review Question**

This review was guided by an overarching question:

What key considerations, common principles, core elements, and recent innovations can assist jurisdictions in designing and delivering more effective HPR to improve patient safety and the quality, capability, effectiveness, and sustainability of their health workforce and achieve health system goals?

From this question, we developed a series of operational questions across the three elements of the conceptual framework, to guide the search, selection and synthesis of evidence (Table 1).

Table 1: Operational questions based on the conceptual framework

Elements of Conceptual Framework	Operational questions
Structures: Context of HPR systems	What contextual forces shape the design and delivery of HPR functions, and what are the key challenges governments and regulators face?
<b>Processes:</b> Functions and activities of HPR systems	What are the main functions and activities of HPR systems, and what diversity of approaches, models and tools are evident in how these functions are organized and delivered?
<b>Outcomes:</b> Impact and effectiveness of HPR systems and processes	How effective are various approaches and models of HPR in improving the safety, quality, quantity, capability, and effectiveness of health systems and workforces?

[1] T&CM was the term commonly used in the literature we reviewed. T&CM is part of a broader category of traditional, complementary and integrative medicine, the term used by the WHO.

### **Review Method**

We used rapid review methods (12,13) for this integrative review, a pragmatic choice due to the lack of common HPR terminology and the need to capture a range of evidence (sources and types) from many disciplines and jurisdictions (14–16).

Due to the topic and the breadth of the multidisciplinary academic and grey literature reviewed, we did not conduct risk of bias or formal certainty of evidence assessments on the included studies. We did not apply the GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation) framework since most of the literature included was descriptive or observational and thus would have been classified as very low or low certainty, despite the value offered by this literature. Further, the factors that can increase the certainty of evidence under GRADE (large magnitude of effect, dose-response gradient, and effect of plausible residual confounding) have little applicability when reviewing studies on HPR. The nature of the available literature pointed to a broad assessment of very low certainty of the evidence. Further information on methods, including example database searches and a modified PICO framework, are available in the additional files [see Additional File 1].<sup>[2]</sup>

### Search strategy

The multidisciplinary nature of the literature on HPR and the broad research question required us to set wide parameters for the search strategy and adopt a multidisciplinary (health policy, sociology, economics, law, and public health) approach.

An initial limited search was conducted in Scopus and EMBASE, followed by an analysis of text words in the title, abstract, keywords, and index terms used to describe the article. This initial search informed a revised search strategy that we extended across academic databases, including Medline, Embase, Web of Science, Cochrane Library, CINAHL, PsycINFO, PsychARTICLES, Scopus, Sociological Abstracts, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global, and JBI EBP. Specialist databases including HeinOnline, World Legal Information Institute (WLII) and the ILO Legal Database were also searched. We conducted hand searches on Google and TRIP Clinical search engines. National online legislative databases were used to identify relevant extant legislation. We also used citation tracking and forward-backward searches of references in the included articles, reports and policy documents. The WHO Secretariat and its Technical Expert Group on health practitioner regulation identified additional sources for screening.

### **Eligibility criteria**

Sources were selected for inclusion if they described a HPR legislative instrument, regulatory system, regulator or regulatory function or intervention, or if they examined factors shaping the development, operation, or outcomes of HPR in terms of health systems or workforce goals. Grey literature included reports from international organizations, HPR consortia, regulators and meta-regulatory bodies, and government and inter-governmental policy documents that discussed HPR systems of one or more jurisdictions. Sources published from 2010 to 2021 in English, French, Spanish, Portuguese and Chinese were eligible for inclusion. Older references (before 2010) identified in reference lists or via our expert advisors were included if directly applicable to our research question.

We included both qualitative and quantitative research. Within the published academic literature, original research articles, reviews and commentaries were included. Commentaries, policy papers and perspectives from academic literature were included where they provided substantive content or critique of HPR-related contexts, performance or reform directions. Grey literature included government reports, statutes, and policy documents that examined HPR systems of one or more countries. Review management software Covidence (17) was used to screen articles and select published articles for extraction by two reviewers with a third reviewer assessing conflicts.

### Data extraction

Data extraction was based on a predefined tool to categorize articles by two dimensions:

- 1. Published articles and grey literature sources were classified according to a predetermined set of general topic areas, organized according to structures, processes and outcomes. Themes within these topic areas were identified and tracked
- 2. Data were extracted according to a modified PICO framework (Population/Practitioner, Intervention/HPR Approach, Context/Country and Outcome), for synthesis in tabular format.

A parallel literature extraction tool in Excel was used for the grey literature, and themes were tracked, enabling synthesis with the information extracted from the published literature.

[1] See also our protocol that was registered at Open Science Framework (https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/EMWSU)

### **Findings**

We included 410 published articles and 426 grey literature sources in the review. Not all sources are referenced in this article because we synthesized the main thematic findings and prioritized references accordingly. A description of all sources with reference and selected extraction data is available in an additional spreadsheet file [see Additional File 3]. Figure 2 illustrates the PRISMA flow diagram for the academic literature sources (n = 410) included in the review (18).

#### **INSERT Figure 2: PRISMA flow diagram for academic literature sources**

Figures 3, 4, and 5 provide an overview of evidence sources for each topic, organised according to structures, processes and outcomes, and the predominant countries and health occupations studied in the published and grey literature. Further details on the countries and health occupations in the academic sources are available in the additional files [see Additional File 2].

According to the integrative review approach adopted, the sub-headings were identified as part of the review process, and the modified Donabedian framework as follows: (A) structures (including scope and governance of regulatory systems, institutions and system linkages), (B) processes (including registration and monitoring of continuing competence, accreditation of health practitioner education, regulating scopes of practice, management of complaints and disciplinary matters, and regulation of T&CM practitioners) and (C) outcomes (impacts of regulation on health workforce and system outcomes).

#### INSERT Figure 3: Distribution of published literature by topic and structures (S), processes (P), and outcomes (O)

INSERT Figures 4 and 5: Most frequent countries and health occupations in the published literature (n=410) and grey literature (n = 426).

### Key Findings By Topic

We identified key themes in our evidence synthesis, clustered under a series of HPR topics organized according to our structures-processes-outcomes conceptual framework. These topics and key themes are presented in Figure 6.

#### INSERT Figure 6: Overview of topics and themes categorized by structures, processes, and outcomes.

### (A) Structures

### Scope and governance of regulatory systems

A total of 134 published articles and 203 grey literature sources addressed HPR governance systems. Published articles primarily focused on nurses, midwives and advanced practice nursing (APN) roles (n=35), followed by other health practitioners (n=23) and T&CM practitioners (n=22) (Figure 7). Most literature came from the United States (US) (n=20), Australia (n=19) and the United Kingdom (UK) (n=13). Four themes were identified from the published and grey literature on this topic.

## INSERT Figure 7: Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature addressing the scope and governance of regulatory systems

## *First,* there is diversity in the purpose, scope and features of regulatory systems and how decisions are made about which health occupations should be regulated.

Shaped by contextual factors such as the historical division of labour and population health needs (19–21), there is jurisdictional variation between which occupational groups are regulated and how. While most jurisdictions have some form of legislated licensing scheme for one or more health occupations, the purpose, scope and features vary. More jurisdictions are using good regulatory practice to strengthen the evidence base for making these contested decisions (22–27). The evidence suggests that in jurisdictions without strong regulatory management systems, some occupational groups are being licensed through a less resource-intensive type of regulation, which might provide sufficient public protection at a lesser cost to the practitioner, the regulator and the public (5,24,28–31,31,32).

## Second, the principles and tools of risk-based regulation adopted by some regulators signal a shift to more proactive strategies for harm prevention and minimization.

The literature describes how regulators use data analytics tools to refocus regulatory resources, to systematically identify concentrations or 'hot spots' of risk (due to registrant competence or conduct issues) and develop targeted harm reduction programs (33–38). Some literature suggests that risk-based regulatory strategies have been applied more widely during the COVID-19 pandemic – more nimble regulators have weighed the risks and benefits to the public of various regulatory actions used to facilitate a surge workforce (39–44).

## *Third*, various generic and HPR-specific standards and tools are being used to assess HPR performance, with some adaptable for use in lower-resource environments.

The literature presents a range of frameworks and tools used by governments to improve regulatory policy and practice, from generic whole of government good regulatory practice frameworks (24–27) to HPR-specific evaluation tools (32,36,45–48). We identified an increased focus in the grey literature from high-income countries (HICs) on assessment and accountability standards that apply to regulators, including heightened scrutiny of regulatory operations by integrity agencies and other independent review bodies (2,49–53).

### *Fourth,* there are diverse approaches to regulatory reform, with studies reporting new regulation or regulatory strengthening activities in LMICs, sometimes prompted by development aid or trade agreements.

Jurisdictional regulatory reform processes range from successive system-wide reviews and ongoing formalised reform programs (2–4,6,7,49,51,54,55) to more incremental, piecemeal or ad hoc reforms (19,30,56,57). In LMICs, studies documented the establishment of new regulators and other regulatory strengthening initiatives, sometimes associated with development funding. Six studies from sub-Saharan African countries presented results from the African Health Profession Regulatory Collaborative (58–61,61–63). They reported substantial and sustainable advances in regulating nurses and midwives in Africa, offering a framework for evaluating future progress. In Europe and South-East Asia, studies referred to the role of trade agreement mutual recognition arrangements in motivating governments to establish or reform licensing schemes (64–73).

### **Regulatory institutions**

Our review identified 42 published articles and 64 grey literature documents addressing the institutional arrangements under which HPR functions are delivered. The published literature was primarily on nurses and midwives (n=13), followed by medical practitioners (n=12) and health practitioners in general (n=12). International (global and multi-country) studies were prominent (n=10), followed by studies from the US (n=7) and Australia (n=5) (Figure 8). Three themes were identified from the synthesis of the literature on this topic.

### INSERT Figure 8: Most frequent countries and health occupations in the published literature on regulatory institutions

### First, there is no widely accepted typology for describing HPR institutional and governance arrangements.

There is considerable diversity in the institutions responsible for HPR and their governance arrangements, reflecting diverse political, social, and professional contexts (19,20,74–79). Much of the published literature compared the governance arrangements of regulators across multiple jurisdictions (5,19,20,74,76,79–91) or analyzed the strengths and limitations of specific elements of governance (81,92–95). There was no widely accepted or commonly used taxonomy for describing the features of HPR institutions, and terms such as 'independent', 'autonomous', 'profession-led' and 'government-led' were used without clear or standardized operational definitions.

# Second, tensions between 'profession-led' governance models and increasing government expectations for oversight and control of regulators reflect a long history of contestation in some jurisdictions over who controls the institutions that govern health practitioners.

Some researchers highlighted the potential for conflicts of interest where the regulator operates within a health ministry that has broader service delivery and stewardship responsibilities, calling for reforms to strengthen the independence of regulators from governments (76,81,82,96). Similarly, some international professional associations argue for 'profession-led' (or 'professional self-regulation') rather than government-led regulation (97–99). Conversely, other sources questioned governance arrangements where the regulator is constituted with elected members of the occupational group being regulated, with calls to reduce the level of control exercised by health practitioners and increase government oversight (2–4,6,54,80). A shift away from governance models that embed 'representativeness' (of those being regulated) and towards greater government oversight and control is evident primarily in Anglophone countries with a long history of delegating regulatory powers to 'profession-led' bodies. The grey literature suggests that governments are placing greater expectations on regulators to be more transparent and accountable in their operations, better manage conflicts of interest (through, for example, structural separation of investigation functions from determinative functions in disciplinary matters) and ensure registrants are afforded procedural fairness (2,3,6,49,50,91,100–102).

## *Third,* HPR governance reforms show a trend toward use of umbrella laws and multi-profession regulators, more diverse governing board membership and increased accountability obligations.

There is evidence of trends toward use of umbrella statutes and multi-profession regulatory agencies, with studies from LMICs and HICs suggesting considerable net benefits (20,33,64,91). There is some evidence from HICs that, by achieving greater economies of scale, multi-profession regulators might be more efficient than large numbers of small profession-specific agencies (51,103). WHO publications and government reviews have encouraged multi-profession governance to address the disadvantages of profession-specific regulatory 'silos' for setting education and practice standards and administering

disciplinary and enforcement functions (2,9,49,104). These models also enable more efficient updating of the legislative framework and facilitate international collaboration (6,105).

### Regulatory system linkages

Our review examined evidence concerning the nature of the interfaces and linkages between HPR and other quality assurance mechanisms, within health systems and with other institutions and sectors beyond health. This literature included 110 published articles and 83 grey literature sources. The published articles focused primarily on nurses and midwives (n=31) and medical practitioners (n=31), followed by health practitioners generally (n=27) (Figure 9). Articles came primarily from the US (n=22), followed by studies with a global or international focus (n=18) and Europe (n=11). Two themes were identified from the published and grey literature.

#### INSERT Figure 9: Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature on regulatory system linkages

## *First,* routine collection by regulators of comprehensive workforce data is being used to improve health workforce planning, development, supply and distribution.

The literature shows how HPR can directly impact workforce supply and facilitate (or hinder) a flexible, responsive, and sustainable health workforce (1,4,6,104). The literature also reveals an increasing recognition of the role of regulators in collecting and supplying to governments registrant data for use in health workforce planning (106–108). Several reports highlighted how the COVID-19 pandemic has rapidly escalated the need for timely workforce data collection, planning and mobility (109–111). Actions taken by regulators to support a surge workforce during the pandemic were highlighted, including widespread scope of practice reforms, fast-tracked licensing and foreign credential recognition, rapid recruitment from abroad and from final year medical and nursing students, rapid retraining using online learning, incentivizing labour mobility, and setting practice standards and guidance to support the delivery of virtual care (39,42–44,110,112–114).

## *Second*, despite continuing efforts for harmonization and mutual recognition, challenges remain with cross-border recognition of qualifications and portability of registration.

Many studies addressed the challenges faced by regulators in responding to the demand for greater mobility of health practitioners across jurisdictions, including under mutual recognition arrangements.<sup>[3]</sup> These challenges relate to factors such as the variability in requirements for registration (e.g., qualifications, examinations), the diversity of requirements for renewal of registration (e.g., CPD, revalidation), the need to assure the competency of practitioners providing virtual care, and the management of disciplinary matters that require regulators to share information or that raise cross-border jurisdictional issues (21,68,73,115–118).

### Third, HPR policies impact the migration of health workers.

Studies point to the role of HPR policies (qualifications and other entry requirements for registration, types of registration) in contributing to international migratory flows of skilled health personnel. Several studies documented the adverse impacts for LMICs of health workers leaving their countries or communities to pursue better paying work opportunities elsewhere. Several studies noted the challenges with implementation of the 2010 *WHO Code of Practice on International Recruitment of Health Personnel* (119–124). A complex range of push and pull factors were identified, with gaps in knowledge of effectiveness of policy interventions in HICs and LMICs that might regulate positively the movement of health practitioners from LMICs. A study of implementation of the Code in four ASEAN member states found most of the out-migrating professionals leave voluntarily, that is, outside government-to-government agreements. While registration and employment regulations apply equally to domestic and foreign trained professionals, local language requirements were a barrier.

### (B) Processes

### Registration and monitoring of continuing competence of practitioners

We examined the literature on HPR registration processes, including setting standards for registration, processing applications, monitoring standards of practice and the continuing competence of registrants, and the operation of public registers. We identified 132 published articles and 73 grey literature documents (Figure 10). Most published articles come from the US (n=34), followed by international studies (n=16), and the UK (n=14). Articles focused primarily on medical practitioners (n=61), nurses, midwives and APN roles (n=29), and health practitioners generally (n=15). Five themes were identified from the published and grey literature.

INSERT Figure 10: Most frequent countries and health occupations in the published literature on registration and monitoring of continuing competence of practitioners.

## *First*, while there are signs of regulatory convergence as more jurisdictions establish statutory registration schemes, some schemes lack a comprehensive set of powers, functions, and accountabilities.

There is evidence that many LMICs and HICs with differing legal traditions have enacted statutory registration schemes for key occupational groups, such as medical doctors, nurses, midwives, dentists and pharmacists.<sup>[4]</sup> However, in some cases, regulators do not have the full suite of requisite powers, functions and accountabilities (e.g., powers to grant different types of registration, impose annual registration renewals, monitor compliance with practice standards, and

take enforcement action for breaches; and obligations to observe procedural fairness in regulatory decision making, collect and supply practitioner data for workforce planning and system improvement purposes, and report routinely on the performance and outcomes of regulatory activities) (9,19,74,76,77,84,85,104,125,126).

## *Second,* the evidence on the effectiveness of the national licensing examination (NLE)<sup>[5]</sup> for assuring graduate capability is limited, and the complexities of running a robust and reliable NLE can be underestimated.

Four UK-authored systematic reviews examined whether NLEs assure practitioner competence or improve patient safety and found the evidence was weak (127–130). Several studies from LMICs highlighted factors contributing to the pressure to introduce an NLE, such as the rise in private sector education providers resulting in a surplus of graduates and uncertain standards, the need to standardize training and entry to the public service, and to improve quality of care (67,73,131–134). These studies also highlighted the complexities of introducing NLEs, including in the context of mutual recognition agreements that seek to harmonize entry requirements to promote fairness, the common market, and freedom of movement (73).

## *Third*, statutory registration schemes can help governments address workforce shortages in rural areas and during emergencies.

The literature discussed the role of HPR processes in addressing the challenges of securing a sufficient rural workforce in LMICs (66,135–138) and HICs (139–143). Regulatory tools can be used to support the implementation of broader rural workforce recruitment, retention and development strategies. Examples include compulsory service requirements tied to registration or modified qualification requirements, scopes of practice and supervision arrangements for practitioners recruited specifically to work in areas of workforce shortage (66,135–138). In HICs, the literature focused on regulatory changes made or advocated to support advanced practice nurses serving rural communities. There is substantial evidence that jurisdictions enabling autonomous advanced nursing practice achieve higher supply of these nurses, improve patient access to health services, and better healthcare outcomes, especially in rural and underserved areas (139,140,144).

## *Fourth*, the recruitment and integration of internationally educated health practitioners into a workforce presents particular challenges, with evidence of effective integration programs.

Studies examined how statutory registration impacts internationally educated health practitioners (IEHPs), focusing on how well they integrate into a health workforce. Studies evaluated the impact of assessment requirements (145–149), comparative rates of disciplinary or fitness to practice actions against internationally and locally educated practitioners (150,151), the implementation and effectiveness of specific transition-assistance programs (142,152), and the broader implications of IEHP mobility (153,154), mostly from the point of view of destination countries. Various international conventions, treaties and intergovernmental trade agreements were instrumental in encouraging governments to remove or reduce barriers and facilitate health practitioner mobility (155–161).

## *Fifth*, while regulator-mandated continuing professional development (CPD) is common and can be effective, various continuing competency mechanisms are found in HICs, with limited evidence of comparative effectiveness.

Continuing competency mechanisms vary across jurisdictions and practitioner groups in the same jurisdiction. These mechanisms include mandatory CPD standards required to renew registration (162–164), certification and recertification programs run by a range of non-government bodies (118,165–167), maintenance of certification programs run by specialist colleges (168–173), and revalidation programs run in partnership between regulators and employers (127,174,175). Requiring participation in CPD is the most common mechanism used by regulators to assure the continuing competence of registrants. However, studies point to deficiencies in these requirements where insufficient attention is given to the context, the learner's needs and the delivery methods (176–179). Evidence suggests a link between CPD requirements and improved skills and knowledge (180,181). In LMICs, mandatory CPD linked to registration can be a pivotal strategy to lift the skills of various health workers, but adequate enforcement and continued resource inputs are required (58,67,182–185).

### Accreditation of health practitioner education (HPE) programs

Literature on the role of HPR in accrediting education programs for entry to practice included 35 published articles and 43 grey literature sources. The published literature on this topic focused primarily on nurses and midwives (n=14), followed by medical practitioners (n=7) and health practitioners generally (n=5) (Figure 11). The international literature was most prominent (n=11) but so too were articles on the US (n=5) and sub-Saharan Africa (n=3). Four themes were identified from the published and grey literature.

#### INSERT Figure 11: Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature addressing accreditation of HPE programs

### First, arrangements for delivering HPE accreditation for entry-to-practice programs vary across jurisdictions and occupation.

Responsibility for assessing and assuring the quality of HPE programs and under what governance arrangements varies across and within jurisdictions. This function may be carried out by one or more statutory regulators, the responsible education ministry, or a non-government professional body under delegation from government. Sometimes there is an oversight body that brings together key government, regulator and non-government entities. This diversity extends to the linkages between the health and education sector accreditation processes (if any), the extent of coverage of public and private sector institutions and programs, and the transparency of operation and performance of accreditation systems (5,20,21,64,78,90,91,186–190). In some jurisdictions, graduation from a program of study accredited by the regulator is sufficient to qualify for registration (102,192). In others, graduates of accredited programs must also sit an NLE (5,90,91). Several reports highlighted the interdependence of the health and education sectors in quality assuring HPE programs and the need for stronger coordination and joint standard setting (102,182,191). No studies were identified that evaluated the effectiveness of different governance models.

## *Second,* despite the diversity in governance, core elements of HPE accreditation appear broadly consistent across jurisdictions and there appears to be a growing involvement of international accreditation agencies and standards.

While several studies noted a lack of evidence to support accreditation as a tool for quality assuring the health workforce (193–195), this review found broadly similar core elements of HPE accreditation described in the literature (195–198). Also evident is a shift to outcomes-based measures and competency-based education (46,193,196), including in documents published by international standard-setting bodies such as the International Confederation of Midwives and the World Federation of Medical Education (199,200).

## *Third*, while there is little evidence of the effectiveness of HPE accreditation, it is considered an important tool for assuring graduate competence for entry-to-practice and progressing broader social goals.

The review found little published literature assessing the effectiveness of HPE accreditation in producing skilled and competent practitioners (193,194). No studies were found that compared jurisdictions with and without HPE accreditation or compared HPE accreditation with other quality assurance mechanisms such as national examinations. Despite the limited evidence base, some have pointed to the potential to use accreditation to achieve broader societal goals, such as increasing equity, diversity and cultural sensitivity of the workforce and removing racial discrimination from the health system (191,206).

## *Fourth,* HPE accreditation is being used as a tool for regulatory strengthening, although implementation is often weak, especially in some LMICs.

There is evidence that establishing HPE accreditation in LMICs has been prioritized in regulatory strengthening programs, particularly for nurses and midwives. The largest group of studies was associated with regulatory strengthening programs in sub-Saharan African countries (62,131,182,187,190,201,202). There were also studies from Cambodia, India, Nepal and Vietnam (64,203,204). Initiatives to introduce or strengthen accreditation of education programs and institutions were embedded within broader HPR reform programs designed to improve the quality of the health workforce (62,64,201,205). There is, however, some evidence in the grey literature that implementation of accreditation standards in some LMICs is hampered by insufficient mechanisms to ensure compliance (88–90,188).

### Regulation of scopes of practice

We examined the literature on different approaches to regulating practitioner scopes of practice and the impact on health workforce capability, flexibility and access for patients to safe, high-quality services. The 119 published articles and 57 grey literature documents on this topic predominantly focused on nurse practitioners or APN roles (n=36), nurses or midwives (n=24), followed by health practitioners generally (n=16) (Figure 12). The US was the most studied country (n=46), followed by international studies (n=17) and Canada or the UK (n=8). Four themes were identified from the published and grey literature.

### INSERT Figure 12: Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature addressing regulation of scopes of practice

## *First*, there is evidence that restrictive and unresponsive scope of practice regulation is stifling innovation, inhibiting workforce reform and having adverse impacts on healthcare access and quality.

The literature shows how regulators in some jurisdictions are empowered to use reserved practice provisions to control which occupations or classes of registrant may carry out certain procedures and who must work under supervision or only on referral. Such blanket occupation-based and centrally administered restrictions may hamper the development of team-based care and other innovative models of care, and many studies documented the adverse impacts on access to and quality of care (140,144,207–217). Overly restrictive scopes of practice were criticized during the COVID-19 pandemic, with both published and grey literature documenting the need for more flexibility in determining local health service roles and skill mix and enabling task shifting to support the crisis response (218–221).

### Second, conflicts over scopes of practice reflect the tensions and competing interests between occupations.

The literature on scope of practice reform underlines the complexities of a dynamic and evolving division of labour in the health sector, the modern context of team-based and collaborative practice, and the urgency of workforce reform to improve access to care. Comparative studies emphasize the need to use the best available evidence to inform scope of practice reform (39,222–225) and grey literature documents propose criteria and processes to strengthen evidence-informed decision-making and better manage competing interests and politics (5,226–228,228–231).

## *Third*, using HPR to support expanded scopes of practice, such as authorization to prescribe or administer restricted medicines, is improving healthcare access and quality in both LMICs and HICs.

There is evidence that expanding health care worker scopes of practice to encompass prescribing and administering restricted medicines improves access to and quality of care, particularly for rural or other underserved populations (94,209,232–246). The role of regulators includes setting the necessary competencies, accrediting training programs, monitoring compliance with standards for safe use of medicines and dealing with registrants breaching accepted practice standards (6,247).

# *Fourth*, with increasing reliance on health associate professionals, quality assurance of this workforce relies primarily on employer measures, although negative licensing provides an additional layer of public protection in some jurisdictions, particularly for practitioners who are self-employed.

The review found diverse literature indicating increasing reliance on and expanding scopes of practice of registered and unregistered health associate professionals<sup>[6]</sup> - in both HICs (212,248–251) and LMICs (252–255). Studies focused on the HPR processes used to support a rationalization of the skills mix

and allocation of roles and responsibilities, including education, management and supervision requirements to ensure safe and quality care. The evidence was mixed. Several studies from both HICs and LMICs highlighted safety concerns where role delegation reforms, often involving the administration of medicines, occurred without adequate accompanying measures and supervision and sometimes beyond what was authorized by law. More studies reported positive outcomes, both for program efficiency and patient care. The grey literature yielded extensive evidence of the benefits of skills mix and role delegation reforms, and the ingredients of successful reform initiatives, particularly in dental care, nursing, pharmacy and allied health. There is evidence that negative licensing (where a mandatory code of conduct applies to all unregistered health workers with regulators empowered to investigate breaches and remove unfit workers from the health workforce) provides an additional layer of public protection for health service users (31,256–262).

### Regulation of complaints-handling and discipline

Sixty-seven (67) published articles and 72 grey literature sources included content related to the operation of complaints and disciplinary functions under HPR regimes. The published literature focused primarily on medical practitioners (n=35), followed by health practitioners in general (n=10) and then nurses and midwives (n=9) (Figure 13). The US was the most prominent jurisdiction (n=17), followed by Australia (n=16), Canada and the UK (n=10 each). Three themes were identified from the published and grey literature.

#### INSERT Figure 13: Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature on regulation of complaints-handling and discipline

## *First,* there is considerable diversity in the regulatory powers, governance of and processes for managing complaints and discipline, but little evidence on how best to design and deliver effective systems.

Despite the importance of HPR processes for identifying and managing practitioners with conduct, competence, or capacity concerns, there is considerable diversity of arrangements for dealing with complaints and discipline: in the architecture of the disciplinary process, the triggers for regulatory action, the conduct that regulators focus on, the range of powers and penalties available, the extent of monitoring and enforcement activity, the procedural fairness safeguards and the level of transparency and reporting of the performance of these functions (5,74,76,78,91). Comparative studies (71,76,207,263–265) were primarily in HICs. Three studies addressed challenges with managing complaints and discipline in LMICs (266–268). Government or regulator commissioned reports in HICs explore some of the systemic complexities and tensions in complaints management, including whether the primary purpose of regulation is punitive or remedial, how these processes fit within broader jurisdictional civil and criminal law and malpractice compensation systems, and how to better support complainants and practitioners throughout the process (2,3,49,54,269–271). Comparative studies are rare and mainly descriptive. With a few exceptions, most systems lack transparency, with little evidence of performance reporting or focus on quality improvement.

## *Second*, regulators in some HICs are designing risk management and prevention strategies, informed by studies of prevalence rates for disciplinary action.

The literature suggests substantial research effort in HICs directed at measuring the prevalence rates for disciplinary action in particular cohorts of practitioners and how regulators may use these data to identify and mitigate the risk of harm to the public. A shift to risk-based regulation is evident with disciplinary data analysed to identify the patterns and characteristics of registrants subject to disciplinary action (37,38,272–274). In the US, multiple studies found that physicians who failed to recertify or allowed their certification to lapse were significantly more likely to be subject to disciplinary action later (168–170,172). While several studies examined practitioner stress when subject to disciplinary action (275–277), it is primarily governments and regulators that have commissioned research on the complainant experience (48,278–282).

## *Third*, remediation programs for impaired and poorly performing practitioners and mandatory reporting obligations may be effective public protection mechanisms, albeit with resourcing and implementation challenges.

There is growing interest from regulators and researchers in remediation (returning impaired or poorly performing practitioners to safe and competent practice) and mandatory reporting (legislated obligations on registrants and/or employers to report certain registrant misbehaviour to regulators). Studies have generally reported positive effects of HPR remediation processes, though such programs are resource-intensive (283,284). Studies also examined legislated obligations for mandatory reporting as a mechanism for alerting regulators to practitioners or students with conduct, competence or impairment concerns, finding that these obligations may strengthen public protection if carefully structured and clearly communicated (207,272,273,285–287).

### Regulation of traditional and complementary medicine practitioners

There were 56 published articles and 35 grey literature sources relevant to regulating T&CM practitioners. Articles from Australia (n=12), the US (n=10) and international focus (n=7) were prominent (Figure 14). Three themes were identified from the published and grey literature.

INSERT Figure 14: Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature addressing regulation of T&CM practitioners.

## *First*, statutory registration is being extended to more T&CM occupations in more jurisdictions, in response to evidence of risk.

Statutory registration schemes have been enacted at an accelerating rate for T&CM occupations over the past decade, often to preserve Indigenous medicine traditions in LMICs and in response to pressure from representative bodies in HICs (20,91). Some jurisdictions have applied regulatory impact assessment processes to inform decisions about whether and how to regulate these occupations (55,288–290). These studies suggest the risk profile of some T&CM occupations warrants the level of public protection that statutory registration affords (6,20,260,288,289,291–295).

## Second, statutory registration is a favored strategy of many T&CM professional bodies as a strategy to prevent entry of untrained practitioners, foster collaborative practice and promote integration into the mainstream healthcare system.

While the literature points to continuing interest in and use of T&CM in LMICs (91,296–298) and HICs (299–303), studies suggest that T&CM practitioners continue to struggle for institutional recognition of their practice and to engage conventional practitioners in collaborative practice. In LMICs, studies show efforts to better harness indigenous medicine practitioners to deliver primary care and meet public health goals, with statutory registration a vehicle to lift the status of indigenous medicine practitioners and facilitate their integration into mainstream health systems (297,298,304,305). In HICs, occupational closure is sought to lift standards, protect the public and increase institutional recognition. It may also be pursued to address restrictive regulations that limit practice or prevent access to tools of trade (herbal medicines).

## *Third*, studies suggest that statutory registration works equally well for established and widely practised T&CM occupations, with some adjustments.

Statutory registration of T&CM occupations has been implemented in both LMICs and HICs. Where such schemes are in operation, studies suggests that this regulatory model works just as well as for other health occupations (260,288). A similar range of research concerns was found, such as the content of accreditation standards (306,307), implementing evidence-based national examinations (20,308–310), regulatory strengthening (311,312), and regulating scopes of practice (294,301,313–316). Studies note some of the policy challenges and adjustments required when applying statutory registration to the T&CM occupations, such as evaluating risk, protecting traditional knowledge, applying flexible language requirements, or delivering care to underserved populations (288,294,313–315,317–323).

### (COutcomes

### Impacts of regulation on health workforce and health system outcomes

To assess the evidence on the impact of HPR structures and processes in achieving the health workforce and health system outcomes desired by governments and other stakeholders, we reviewed studies that reported or measured the following health system and workforce outcomes: safety, quality, capacity/access, capability, effectiveness, quantity (of practitioners), and sustainability. We found 310 empirical studies in the published literature and 105 grey literature sources that included a discussion of one or more of these outcomes when broadly defined. Studies were primarily on nurses, midwives and APN roles (n=105), and medical practitioners (n=79), followed by health practitioners in general (n=46). Similar to other topics, the US was prominent (n=75), followed by international studies (n=48), Australia (n=29) and Canada (n=27) (Figure 15). Four themes were identified from the integrated synthesis of the published and grey literature on this topic.

## INSERT Figure 15: Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature addressing impacts of HPR on health workforce and health system outcomes.

## *First*, few jurisdictions have institutionalized arrangements for periodic review and continuous improvement of their HPR systems.

Some literature examined the economic impacts of occupational licensing in general (56,57,324–326) and evaluated the effectiveness of a licensing law or the overall performance of a regulator or regulatory system (288,291,295,327–329). It is difficult to draw conclusions from these studies given the diversity of topics covered, though findings often included calls for stronger regulation, expansion of statutory registration to additional occupational groups, and greater accountability to operate in the public interest. In a small number of Anglophone HICs, extensive grey literature shows regulatory reform efforts over several decades to strengthen governance, transparency and government oversight and expand and codify statutory powers and functions (2,4,49,51,54,330–333). There were reports of unscheduled or one-off regulatory reviews that led to significant legislative and administrative reform, generally in response to a crisis or regulatory failure (2,334–336). The UK, New Zealand, and Ontario (Canada) were identified as having a proactive system of periodic review of the performance of regulators. An active program of continuous improvement was evident in the UK with the operation of its meta-regulator, the Professional Standards Authority, and in New Zealand, a requirement for independent performance reviews of regulatory authorities has been legislated. American bodies such as the National Council of State Boards of Nursing and the Federation of State Medical Boards also featured in the grey literature on regulatory system improvement, as did international organizations including the OECD and the WHO (9,25,104,311,337–343).

## *Second*, further evaluation is needed of alternative models for regulating the health workforce, such as negative licensing and quality assured voluntary registers.

We identified studies in the published literature that addressed the effectiveness of other types of occupational regulation, such as voluntary certification (6,78,293,303,344–346) and negative licensing (6,28,260,261,292,293,347). In a few of these studies, researchers were critical of non-statutory certification or negative licensing schemes, instead advocating for the level of public protection afforded by statutory registration/licensing. The grey literature search found government-commissioned studies that examined the costs and benefits of different approaches to HPR in achieving the government public protection objectives (31,289,290,348–351).

## *Third*, regulatory strengthening initiatives in LMICs aim to build stronger regulatory institutions, infrastructure, networks and governance, with some evidence of success.

The review identified studies that evaluated the impacts of HPR system strengthening initiatives, mostly in LMICs (sub-Saharan African countries of Uganda, Nigeria, Kenya, Eswatini, Malawi and South-East Asian countries of Cambodia and Vietnam). These studies suggest that the Regulatory Function Framework

developed through the African Health Profession Regulatory Collaborative program is a valuable tool to assist with designing and implementing HPR strengthening projects and evaluating the effectiveness of system strengthening initiatives in LMICs.

## *Fourth*, studies that compare regulatory regimes across multiple jurisdictions were mostly descriptive, underscoring the need for more robust outcome measures and measurement tools.

Academic and grey literature sources that compared the operation of HPR schemes across multiple jurisdictions or globally were mostly descriptive, comparing key features such as the scope and governance of schemes or specific regulatory functions, sometimes including a historical perspective (5,20,74,91,340). Some studies evaluated specific regulatory interventions, such as NLEs (73), mandated CPD (131), maintenance of certification schemes (171), processes for dealing with misconduct (264), mandatory reporting obligations (285), and the application of administrative sanctions (76). Academic and grey literature provide frameworks for comparative studies of HPR regimes that can be used to strengthen methodologies and standardize outcome measurement (19, 85, 86).

<sup>[3]</sup> Examples of mutual recognition agreements include ASEAN in South-East Asia, CARICOM, Europe, Tran-Tasman Mutual Recognition Arrangement, Licensure Compacts in the US and the previous North American Free Trade Agreement.

<sup>[4]</sup> Since 2010, statutory registration schemes have been established or extended in jurisdictions as diverse as Australia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Cook Islands, Czech Republic, Fiji, India, Malaysia, Mali, New Zealand, Pakistan, Senegal, Singapore, the Philippines, Samoa, Uganda, the UK and the USA. Note this is not an exhaustive list.

<sup>[5]</sup> We use NLE here to describe a large-scale examination either provided or commissioned by a health practitioner regulator and used to determine whether an applicant is qualified to practice. We use this term to encompass examinations at the national level and at the sub-national level in federated systems of government.

<sup>[6]</sup> These practitioners are classified as health associate professionals under the ILO classification. However, the terms assistant and support workforces were often used in the literature.

### Discussion

This review aimed to assess the evidence base around HPR design and delivery in achieving health system goals and supporting health workforce availability, accessibility, quality, and sustainability. We identified key themes around HPR structures, processes, and outcomes.

Certain governance trends, such as multi-discipline regulators or umbrella laws, were evident, but the lack of standardized typology complicated comparisons of these governance arrangements across jurisdictions and occupations. Some jurisdictions have regulatory management systems that embed evidenceinformed regulatory policymaking, particularly when deciding changes to the scope of a licensing scheme or introducing new practice restrictions These systems are designed to better target regulation and ensure legislative frameworks are regularly reviewed and fit for purpose. Some regulators use risk-based regulation tools to better target regulatory interventions, weighing risk to the public with the need for access to health services.

Most studies in this review focused on occupational licensing, and evidence suggested this model of HPR is increasingly being enacted across various jurisdictions and practitioner groups. The review found evidence suggesting that this HPR model may strengthen public protection for some T&CM occupations based on risk profiles. For health associate professionals, lower-cost models of quality assurance (for example, non-legislated certification schemes, co-regulation,<sup>[7]</sup> or negative licensing) may be sufficient, but further study of these models is required.

HPR generally has been challenged to keep pace with the demands for greater flexibility arising from collaborative team-based models of care and a more dynamic division of labour in health care. This tension is most apparent in the literature on scope of practice regulation. Scope of practice reforms, while necessary to maintain a flexible, responsive and sustainable health workforce, are among the most highly charged policy issues facing legislators and health care regulators (226,352). There are costs to the health system, the health workforce and health consumers when scopes of practice are too tightly regulated in a way that is unresponsive to reform. For instance, the evidence suggests HPR should regulate individual scopes of practice around the edges, such as in response to a disciplinary process or when supporting the upskilling of a registrant cohort to take on specific authorities (where not all registrants have completed the necessary training). Prescribing rights are a case in point: some health practitioner groups, particularly nurses and non-physician clinicians, have struggled to secure prescribing and administration authorities, sometimes due to resistance from physician groups. These tensions suggest workforce reform should be core business for governments, and demarcation disputes between occupational groups should be managed in a more interventionist way to increase the pace of reform. The imperatives created by the COVID-19 pandemic have demonstrated how quickly scope of practice reforms can be implemented. These reforms should be evaluated systematically.

There was some evidence from both LMICs and HICs that HPR can contribute to strategies for workforce planning, development, supply and distribution, particularly to address workforce shortages. For many governments, the capacity to carry out accurate and effective workforce planning is hampered by a lack of health workforce data, a gap that could be addressed through leveraged HPR registry data. However, this generally requires robust information technology systems and a clear legislative basis that authorizes regulators to collect this data and provide it in a de-identified way to stakeholders such as governments and educators.

The evidence in our review suggests that widespread barriers impact the mobility of practitioners. This is despite considerable efforts to standardize and harmonize regulatory arrangements across jurisdictions. Mutual recognition schemes create incentives to streamline qualification recognition and registration processes for IEHPs (353), but implementation has been variable.

The review also identified evidence supporting the impact of outcomes-based CPD models on continuing competence to practise and patient safety. Limited evidence suggests CPD may be valuable in upskilling specific health occupational groups in LMICs if delivered as part of a broader workforce development strategy. While revalidation mechanisms have been considered and implemented in a few cases, the resource-intensive nature of these schemes means the uptake has been limited and is unlikely to be considered or implemented in LMICs. Beyond making CPD mandatory for registration renewal, applying other risk-based strategies that target continuing competence requirements to higher-risk groups may be more cost-effective.

Reform in HPR was evident in many contexts. Throughout sub-Saharan Africa, South-East Asia and in Mekong countries (Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam), the introduction of statutory registration schemes is a relatively recent development, with regulatory models, governance and institutions being adapted to local circumstances. In Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific Island countries, networks of regulators are working together to set standards for education and training, develop CPD programs, and support health system strengthening. In many countries, statutory registration schemes have been introduced to accelerate the integration of indigenous medicine and T&CM practitioners and to enable the recruitment of this workforce to better address public health priorities.

A few innovative models of occupational regulation were found that target the unregistered workforce and provide a lower-cost alternative to statutory registration for lower-risk health occupations. The accredited registers program in the UK (and more recently in Hong Kong) and negative licensing/prohibition order powers in Australia and the USA (Minnesota) are notable examples. Innovation is also evident in some Anglophone HICs countries where statutory registration schemes have been operating for over a century. Four areas are worth noting. First, regulators are applying the tools of risk-based regulation, using data analytics to identify hotspots of risk and design targeted and time-limited preventive or harm minimization strategies. The stronger capability of a multi-discipline regulator operating under an umbrella law is evident in the quantity and quality of information about scheme operations published on regulator websites. Second, greater attention is being paid to health system linkages and networks of quality assurance, including how regulators work together with other government and non-government standard setting and regulatory agencies and stakeholders (employers, third party payers, professional associations, consumer groups) to assure health service quality. Third, many more jurisdictions are applying good regulatory practices to facilitate evidence-informed regulatory policymaking in decisions about which health occupations to regulate, in the design of legislation, and in the development and application of standards that impact practice and competition within the health market. More jurisdictions undertake period review and reform to maintain a fit-for-purpose regulatory framework. Finally, in some countries, the mandate of regulators now extends beyond public protection to include a broader role in health system improvement. Some regulators are now expected to use the tools of HPR to better support the achievement of broader social objectives such as reducing inequality and increasing diversi

### Limitations of the review

A critical limitation of comparative HPR research and synthesizing the state of HPR evidence is the lack of standardized language. Definitional ambiguity arises from how terms such as self-regulation, registration, licensing, and accreditation are used differently in different countries and contexts (74,79). This lack of standard language made comparative analysis and synthesis difficult, given the diversity of PICO (populations, interventions, contexts, outcomes) elements in studies and the wide variety of research designs. While we used rigorous extraction and thematic analysis processes to strengthen our review, the largely descriptive nature of the underlying evidence made it challenging to link regulatory interventions to outcomes of interest and to draw causal inferences. More consistent definitions would enhance global understanding of HPR, improve the design of regulatory regimes and the mobility of practitioners, and ultimately increase public safety and access to health care (354).

Publications from the US, UK, Australia and Canada dominate the literature. This is partly an artifact of funding availability and the broader research landscape. As a result, the themes and findings strongly reflect matters of interest and contention in high-income Anglophone countries. In the design of the review (the framing of the research questions, topics and inclusion criteria) and the synthesis and presentation of the findings, we have highlighted available data from LMICs and discussed the implications of our findings for lower-resourced environments.

### Key evidence gaps for future research

We identified areas where critical knowledge gaps remain. As noted, there is less published literature on HPR structures, processes, and outcomes in LMICs. Evaluations should focus on identifying the highest impact HPR structures and processes and viable alternatives to full statutory occupational licensing schemes, such as negative licensing, particularly for lower-risk occupational groups.

There were few studies in the published literature that had a robust measurement of the results of regulatory interventions on patient safety or quality of care, or that measured in a systematic way whether a regulatory system was effective in achieving its objectives. Different institutional and governance arrangements should be evaluated against a standardized framework; this would enable stronger cross-jurisdictional comparisons of HPR performance. For instance, comparative studies of the performance of regulatory regimes against outcome measures such as safety and quality of care, health workforce availability and distribution, cost-effectiveness, or against process criteria, such as accountability transparency, and agility may increase our understanding of what works. Schemes that lack basic transparency measures, such as online searchable registers, online patient complaint submissions, and published disciplinary decisions, may not make the best use of regulatory data for health system improvement. Also, despite an increasing focus on risk-based approaches to HPR, robust evaluations of the impact of these approaches on patient safety and health workforce quality are required.

Knowledge gaps remain around the relative benefits of national licensing examinations and HPE accreditation in assuring the quality of the health workforce. Despite increased research around remediation programs and mandatory reporting obligations, more evidence is required on the effectiveness of these specific HPR complaints and discipline processes across jurisdictions, HPR models, and occupational groups.

The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the importance of agile HPR processes and effective linkages between HPR and other regulators, systems and stakeholders. Empirical studies of the effectiveness of HPR pandemic responses have continued to be published after our review's inclusion dates (355–357). Further research in this area would help evaluate HPR reforms and innovations to determine which changes should be maintained long-term and which would be most beneficial for future crises. This research should also evaluate the effectiveness of system linkages and how HPR is best placed to contribute to emergency responses that require a fit-for-purpose surge workforce.

In the aggregate, the lack of a methodologically robust evidence base, particularly on HPR outcomes, and the dominance in the literature of the experience of high-income Anglophone countries, warrant caution in the interpretation, generalizability, and applicability of these findings. Assessing the impact of HPR should be prioritized, systematically tracking the results of studies that evaluate the effectiveness of regulatory interventions on health workforce and patient care outcomes.

<sup>[7]</sup> Co-regulation involves a self-regulating professional association with certification functions that are either delegated from or recognized by government. This government recognition or delegation may be conditional on the certification body meeting specified standards. This recognition process establishes, in effect, a partnership between government and the certifying bod. The benefits that flow to practitioners from certification create incentives for practitioners to comply with the professional association's standards.

### Declarations

#### Ethics approval and consent to participate: n/a

#### Consent for publication: n/a

Availability of data and material: Data analysed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary information files. Additional details are available in the full review report and appendices prepared for the World Health Organization.

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

#### Authors' contributions:

KL, ILB, and ALC undertook data analysis, initial draft preparation, overall design of the paper, and revisions. RM and JC undertook data analysis and management, figure preparation, and draft review and revision. MB, SDS, GC, and VL contributed to the overall design of the study and reviewed several drafts.

Acknowledgements: We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Sarika Parambath and Tess Aiken. We thank Agya Mahat from the Health Workforce Department of the WHO and the WHO Secretariat and its Technical Expert Group on health practitioner regulation for advice and assistance during this project.

Funding: This study was funded by the Health Workforce Department of the World Health Organization.

### References

- 1. WHO. Request for Proposals (RFP): Research on the Design, Reform and Implementation of Health Practitioner Regulation across Countries. World Health Organization (WHO); 2021 p. 1–41.
- Francis R. Report of the Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust Public Inquiry (Executive Summary) [Internet]. London: The Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust; 2013 Feb p. 1–116. Report No.: HC 947. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/279124/0947.pdf
- 3. Cayton H. An Inquiry into the performance of the College of Dental Surgeons of British Columbia and the Health Professions Act [Internet]. British Columbia Ministry of Health, The Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care; 2018. Available from: https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/health/practitioner-pro/professional-regulation/cayton-report-college-of-dental-surgeons-2018.pdf
- 4. Australian Government Productivity Commission. Australia's Health Workforce: Productivity Commission Research Report [Internet]. Canberra: Australian Government Productivity Commission; 2005 Dec. Available from: https://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/health-workforce/report/healthworkforce.pdf
- 5. Carlton AL. Review of the Allied Health Professions Act 2016: Final report for the Malaysian Ministry of Health on establishing an effective regulatory framework for the allied health professions findings and recommendations from WHO consultancy conducted September 2020 July 2021. World Health Organization Western Pacific Region (WHO WPR); 2021 Oct p. 1–114.
- 6. Carlton AL. The forces shaping regulation of the health professions in Australia: from 'club government' to inclusive regulatory institutions [Internet]. [Victoria]: La Trobe University; 2017. Available from: http://arrow.latrobe.edu.au:8080/vital/access/manager/Repository/latrobe:42672
- 7. Adams TL. Health professional regulation in historical context: Canada, the USA and the UK (19th century to present). Hum Resour Health. 2020;18(1):7.
- 8. Institute of Medicine. The Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health [Internet]. Washington DC: National Academies Press; 2011. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK209881/
- 9. WHO WPR. Western Pacific regional action agenda on regulatory strengthening, convergence and cooperation for medicines and the health workforce. World Health Organ West Pac Reg. 2019;1–96.

- 10. ILO. Resolution Concerning Updating the International Standard Classification of Occupations [Internet]. International Labour Organization; 2008. Available from: https://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/isco/docs/resol08.pdf
- 11. 11. Donabedian A. Evaluating the quality of medical care. 1966. Milbank Q. 2005;83(4):691–729.
- 12. Tricco AC, Langlois EV, Straus SE. Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: a practical guide [Internet]. World Health Organization; 2017. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/258698/9789241512763eng.pdf%3Bjsessionid=67CBF50256D5E49B68F747AD51A1A09E?sequence=1
- 13. Tricco AC, Antony J, Zarin W, Strifler L, Ghassemi M, Ivory J, et al. A scoping review of rapid review methods. BMC Med. 2015 Sep 16;13(1):224.
- 14. Hong QN, Pluye P, Bujold M, Wassef M. Convergent and sequential synthesis designs: implications for conducting and reporting systematic reviews of qualitative and quantitative evidence. Syst Rev. 2017 Mar 23;6(1):61.
- 15. Pearson A, White H, Bath-Hextall F, Salmond S, Apostolo J, Kirkpatrick P. A mixed-methods approach to systematic reviews. JBI Evid Implement [Internet]. 2015;13(3). Available from: https://journals.lww.com/ijebh/Fulltext/2015/09000/A\_mixed\_methods\_approach\_to\_systematic\_reviews.3.aspx
- 16. Stern C, Lizarondo L, Carrier J, Godfrey C, Rieger K, Salmond S, et al. Methodological guidance for the conduct of mixed methods systematic reviews. JBI Evid Synth [Internet]. 2020;18(10). Available from:

 $https://journals.lww.com/jbisrir/Fulltext/2020/10000/Methodological_guidance_for\_the\_conduct\_of\_mixed.3.aspx$ 

- 17. Covidence. Covidence: Better systematic review management [Internet]. Covidence. Available from: https://www.covidence.org/
- 18. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ [Internet]. 2021;372. Available from: https://www.bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n71
- 19. NCSBN. A Global Profile of Nursing Regulation, Education, and Practice. Natl Counc State Boards Nurs. 2020;10:1–116.
- 20. WNF. Naturopathy: Practice, Effectiveness, Economics & Safety [Internet]. Lloyd I, Steel A, Wardle J, editors. World Naturopath Federation (WNF); 2021. Available from: https://worldnaturopathicfederation.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Health-Technology-Assessment-HTA\_eBook.pdf
- 21. Couto JG, McFadden S, Bezzina P, McClure P, Hughes C. An evaluation of the educational requirements to practise radiography in the European Union. Radiography. 2018;24(1):64–71.
- 22. ASEAN. ASEAN Guidelines on Good Regulatory Practices [Internet]. Association of Southeast Asian Nations; 2019. Available from: https://asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/ASEAN-Guidelines-on-Good-Regulatory-Practices2.pdf
- 23. APO. Regulatory Management Framework to Enhance Productivity [Internet]. Asian Productivity Commission; 2019. Available from: https://www.apo-tokyo.org/publications/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/Regulatory-Management-Framework-to-Enhance-Productivity.pdf
- 24. OECD. Regulatory Impact Assessment. OECD. 2020 Feb 25;1-35.
- 25. OECD. Recommendation of the Council on Regulatory Policy and Governance [Internet]. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; 2012. Available from: https://www.oecd.org/gov/regulatory-policy/49990817.pdf
- 26. UK Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy. Better Regulation Framework (Interim Guidance) [Internet]. gov.uk; 2020. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/916918/better-regulation-guidance.pdf
- 27. Australian Government Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Regulatory Impact Analysis Guide for Ministers' Meetings and National Standard Setting Bodies [Internet]. gov.au; 2021. Available from: https://obpr.pmc.gov.au/sites/default/files/2021-06/regulator-analysis-guide.pdf
- 28. Wardle JL, Sibbritt D, Broom A, Steel A, Adams J. Is health practitioner regulation keeping pace with the changing practitioner and health-care landscape? An Australian perspective. Front Public Health. 2016;4:91.
- 29. Ross JK. The Inverted Pyramid: 10 Less Restrictive Alternatives to Occupational Licensing. Institute of Justice; 2017.
- 30. Frogner BK, Fraher EP, Spetz J, Pittman P, Moore J, Beck AJ, et al. Modernizing scope-of-practice regulations Time to prioritize patients. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(7):591–3.
- 31. COAG Health Council. A National Code of Conduct for health care workers. COAG Health Council; 2015 Apr p. 1–114.
- 32. PSA. Right-touch reform: a new framework for assurance of professions [Internet]. Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care. 2017. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/publications/thought-paper/right-touch-reform-2017.pdf?s
- 33. Bismark MM, Fletcher M, Spittal MJ, Studdert DM. A step towards evidence-based regulation of health practitioners. Aust Health Rev. 2015;39(4):483–5.
- Lloyd-Bostock S. The creation of risk-related information: The UK General Medical Council's electronic database. J Health Organ Manag. 2010;24(6):584– 96.
- 35. Phipps DL, Noyce PR, Walshe K, Parker D, Ashcroft DM. Risk-based regulation of healthcare professionals: what are the implications for pharmacists? Health Risk Soc. 2011;13(3):277–92.
- 36. Pegalis SE, Bal BS. Closed medical negligence claims can drive patient safety and reduce litigation. Clin Orthop. 2012;470(5):1398-404.
- 37. Thomas LA, Milligan E, Tibble H, Too LS, Studdert DM, Spittal MJ, et al. Health, performance and conduct concerns among older doctors: a retrospective cohort study of notifications received by medical regulators in Australia. J Patient Saf Risk Manag. 2018;23(2):54–62.
- 38. Thomas LA, Tibble H, Too LS, Hopcraft MS, Bismark MM. Complaints about dental practitioners: an analysis of 6 years of complaints about dentists, dental prosthetists, oral health therapists, dental therapists and dental hygienists in Australia. Aust Dent J [Internet]. 2018;04. Available from: https://sydney.alma.exlibrisgroup.com/openurl/61USYD\_INST/61USYD\_INST:sydney?

sid=OVID: embase & id=pmid: 29862517 & id=doi: 10.1111% 2Fadj. 12625 & issn=1834-1000 and issues and independent of the second second

 $7819 \& is bn = \& volume = 63 \& is sue = 3 \& spage = 285 \& pages = \& date = 2018 \& title = Australian + dental + journal \& at it le = Complaints + above the subscript{abs} and the su$ 

- 39. HWTAC. Health Professions Regulation in the US [Internet]. Health Workforce Technical Assistance Center (HWTAC). Available from: https://www.healthworkforceta.org/health-professions-regulation-in-the-us/
- 40. Sagan A, Thomas S, Karanikolos M, Azzopardi-Muscat N, de la Mata I, Figueras J. COVID-19 and Health Systems Resilience: Lessons Going Forwards. Eurohealth. 2020;26(2):20–4.
- 41. Benton DC, Alexander M, Fotsch R, Livanos N. Lessons Learned and Insights Gained: A Regulatory Analysis of the Impacts, Challenges, and Responses to COVID-19. OJIN Online J Issues Nurs [Internet]. 2020;25(3). Available from: https://ojin.nursingworld.org/MainMenuCategories/ANAMarketplace/ANAPeriodicals/OJIN/TableofContents/Vol-25-2020/No3-Sept-2020/Articles-Previous-Topics/Regulatory-Analysis-of-Impacts-Challenges-and-Responses-to-COVID-19.html
- 42. PSA. Learning from Covid-19: a case-study review of the initial crisis response of 10 UK health and social care professional regulators in 2020 [Internet]. UK Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care; 2021. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/defaultsource/publications/thought-paper/learning-from-covid-19-case-studies.pdf?sfvrsn=cdad4920\_6
- 43. OECD. Regulatory responses to the COVID-19 pandemic in Southeast Asia. Organ Econ Co-Oper Dev. 2021 Oct 11;1-52.
- 44. WP. The Impact on Entry Level Education and The Responses of Regulators (Briefing Paper 4) [Internet]. World Physiotherapy; 2020 Aug. (World Physiotherapy response to COVID-19). Available from: https://world.physio/sites/default/files/2021-06/COVID-19-Briefing-paper-4-regulators-FINAL-2021.pdf
- 45. McCarthy CF, Kelley MA, Verani AR, St Louis ME, Riley PL. Development of a framework to measure health profession regulation strengthening. Eval Program Plann. 2014/05/01 ed. 2014 Oct;46:17–24.
- 46. PSA. The performance review process 2016-2021 [Internet]. UK Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care; 2021. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/publications/performance-reviews/performance-reviewprocessb19917f761926971a151ff000072e7a6.pdf?sfvrsn=2f0b7e20\_6
- 47. PSA. A new approach to how we review the regulators: 2021 consultations [Internet]. UK Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care. 2021. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/what-we-do/improving-regulation/consultation/consultation-on-performance-reviews
- 48. PSA. How we approach our performance review process (report on our consultation) [Internet]. UK Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care; 2021. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/publications/consultation-response/our-consultation/2020-performance-review-process-consultation/how-we-approach-the-performance-review-process-consultation-report.pdf?sfvrsn=927c4920\_8
- 49. BC Ministry of Health. Recommendations to modernize the provincial health profession regulatory framework [Internet]. British Columbia Ministry of Health, Steering Committee on Modernization of Health Professional Regulation; 2020. Available from: https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/health/practitioner-pro/professional-regulation/recommendations-to-modernize-regulatory-framework.pdf
- 50. Victorian Department of Health. Department of Health Submission to Legislative Council Committee Inquiry into AHPRA [Internet]. State Government Victoria; 2013. Available from:

https://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/images/stories/committees/SCLSI/Leg\_ctee/AHPRA/Submissions2/50\_Department\_of\_Health.pdf

- 51. Snowball K. Independent Review of the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme for health professions. Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council (AHMAC); 2014 Dec.
- 52. Ontario Ministry of Health. Health Workforce Regulatory Oversight Branch Summary Report: College Performance Measurement Framework [Internet]. Ontario Ministry of Health - Ministry of Long-Term Care. 2021. Available from: https://health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/hwrob/CPMF\_summary\_report.aspx#:~:text=The%20College%20Performa nce%20Measurement%20Framework%20(%20CPMF%20)%2C%20was%20developed%20collaboratively,public%2 0and%20subject%20matter%20experts.&text=Standards%3A%20Performance%2Dbased%20activities%20that,a%20 College%20will%20be%20measured.
- 53. COAG Health Council. Review of Governance of the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme (NRAS). COAG Health Council; 2017 Nov p. 1–26.
- 54. UK Department of Health and Social Care. Trust, assurance and safety: the regulation of health professionals in the 21st century [Internet]. GOV.UK. 2007. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/trust-assurance-and-safety-the-regulation-of-health-professionals-in-the-21st-century
- 55. New Zealand Ministry of Health. Workforce Regulatory Reforms: The Workforce Regulatory Reform Programme [Internet]. Manatu Hauora. 2021. Available from: https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/health-workforce/workforce-regulatory-reforms
- 56. Traczynski J, Udalova V. Nurse practitioner independence, health care utilization, and health outcomes. J Health Econ. 2018 Mar;58:90-109.
- 57. Spetz J, Parente S, Town R, Bazarko D. Scope-of-practice laws for nurse practitioners limit cost savings that can be achieved in retail clinics. Health Aff Proj Hope. 2013 Nov 1;32:1977–84.
- 58. Moetsana-Poka F, Lehana T, Lebaka M, McCarthy CF. Developing a continuing professional development programme to improve nursing practice in Lesotho. Afr J Midwifery Womens Health. 2014;8(2):10–3.
- 59. McCarthy CF, Riley PL. The African health profession regulatory collaborative for nurses and midwives. Hum Resour Health. 2012;10:5.
- 60. McCarthy CF, Voss J, Salmon ME, Gross JM, Kelley MA, Riley PL. Nursing and midwifery regulatory reform in east, central, and southern Africa: a survey of key stakeholders. Hum Resour Health. 2013;11(1):1–7.
- 61. McCarthy CF, Zuber A, Kelley MA, Verani AR, Riley PL. The African health profession regulatory collaborative (ARC) at two years. Afr J Midwifery Womens Health. 2014;8(2):4–9.
- 62. Dynes M, Tison L, Johnson C, Verani A, Zuber A, Riley PL. Regulatory Advances in 11 Sub-Saharan Countries in Year 3 of the African Health Profession Regulatory Collaborative for Nurses and Midwives (ARC). JANAC J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care. 2016;27(3):285–96.

- 63. Kelley MA, Spangler SA, Tison LI, Johnson CM, Callahan TL, lliffe J, et al. Regulatory reform: the African Health Profession Regulatory Collaborative (ARC) for nursing and midwifery year 4 evaluation. J Nurs Regul. 2017;8(3):41–52.
- 64. Fujita N, Matsuoka S, Koto-Shimada K, Ikarashi M, Hazarika I, Zwi AB. Regulation of nursing professionals in Cambodia and Vietnam: a review of the evolution and key influences. Hum Resour Health Electron Resour. 2019;17(1):48.
- 65. Matsuoka S, Fujita N, Koto-Shimada K, Zwi AB. Regulation of nursing professionals in Cambodia: strategies to overcome underpinning challenges. Int Nurs Rev. 2021;13.
- 66. Sonoda M, Syhavong B, Vongsamphanh C, Phoutsavath P, Inthapanith P, Rotem A, et al. The evolution of the national licensing system of health care professionals: a qualitative descriptive case study in Lao People's Democratic Republic. Hum Resour Health. 2017;15:13.
- 67. Law KM, Te V, Hill PS. Cambodia's health professionals and the ASEAN Mutual Recognition Arrangements: registration, education and mobility. Hum Resour Health Electron Resour. 2019;17(1):14.
- 68. Legido-Quigley H, Doering N, McKee M. Challenges facing teleradiology services across borders in the European union: a qualitative study. Health Policy Technol. 2014;3(3):160–6.
- 69. Ling K, Belcher P. Medical migration within Europe: Opportunities and challenges. Clin Med J R Coll Physicians Lond. 2014;14(6):630-2.
- 70. Solé M, Panteli D, Risso-Gill I, Döring N, Busse R, McKee M, et al. INTERNATIONAL. How do medical doctors in the European Union demonstrate that they continue to meet criteria for registration and licencing? Clin Med. 2014;14(6):633–9.
- 71. Struckmann V, Panteli D, Legido-Quigley H, Risso-Gill I, McKee M, Busse R. Deciding when physicians are unfit to practise: an analysis of responsibilities, policy and practice in 11 European Union member states. Clin Med. 2015;15(4):319–24.
- 72. Clarke D, Duke J, Wuliji T, Smith A, Phuong K, Un S, et al. Strengthening health professions regulation in Cambodia: a rapid assessment. Hum Resour Health. 2016;14:1–9.
- 73. Kittrakulrat J, Jongjatuporn W, Jurjai R, Jarupanich N, Pongpirul K. The ASEAN economic community and medical qualification. Glob Health Action. 2014;7:24535.
- 74. de Vries H, Sanderson P, Janta B, Rabinovich L, Archontakis F, Ismail S, et al. International comparison of ten medical regulatory systems (Egypt, Germany, Greece, India, Italy, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, South Africa and Spain). RAND Europe; 2009.
- 75. NCSBN. Member Board Profiles Responses | 2021 Board Structure Survey [Internet]. National Council of State Boards of Nursing (NCSBN). 2021. Available from: https://www.ncsbn.org/2021BoardStructureMBPResponsesfinal31221bookmarks.pdf.pdf
- 76. Morioka Y, Higuchi N, Kuroyanagi T, Nudeshima J. Regulatory organizations for physicians' status and administrative sanctions on physicians: Examining the framework of government administrative systems for physicians in Japan based on a questionnaire survey conducted on 13 national medical associations. Jpn Med Assoc J. 2014;57(3):139–45.
- 77. Besançon LJR, Rockey P, van Zanten M. Regulation of health professions: disparate worldwide approaches are a challenge to harmonization. Globalization. 2012;1:3.
- 78. Dunn JM, Steel AE, Adams J, Lloyd I, De Groot N, Hausser T, et al. Characteristics of global naturopathic education, regulation, and practice frameworks: results from an international survey. BMC Complement Med Ther. 2021;21(1):67.
- 79. Kovacs E, Schmidt AE, Szocska G, Busse R, McKee M, Legido-Quigley H. PROFESSIONAL ISSUES. Licensing procedures and registration of medical doctors in the European Union. Clin Med. 2014;14(3):229–38.
- 80. Carlton AL. Health Workforce Regulation in Pakistan: A contribution to formulation of a National Health Workforce Strategy based on the findings of the WHO mission of 29 January 2 February 2018. 2018 May p. 1–134.
- 81. 81. Choi JW, Kim KK, Lee J, Choi DJ, Kim KN. Establishment of a dental license regulation authority is required in Korea: results of the Delphi technique. J Educ Eval Health Prof. 2017;14:11.
- 82. Huh S, Chung MH. Can a medical regulatory system be implemented in Korea? J Korean Med Assoc. 2013 Mar;56(3):158-63.
- 83. NCSBN. Member Board Profiles [Internet]. National Council of State Boards of Nursing (NCSBN). 2021. Available from: https://www.ncsbn.org/profiles.htm
- 84. Yam HK. Fit for purpose: Do Hong Kong's current assessment and monitoring systems for medical practice meet modern day needs? Diss Abstr Int Sect B Sci Eng. 2018;79(4-B(E)).
- 85. Benton DC, Fernandez-Fernandez MP, Gonzalez-Jurado MA, Beneit-Montesinos JV. Analysis of a global random stratified sample of nurse legislation. Int Nurs Rev. 2015;62(2):207–17.
- 86. Benton DC, González-Jurado MA, Beneit-Montesinos JV. A Typology of Professional Nurse Regulatory Models and Their Administration. J Nurs Regul. 2013 Jul 1;4(2):22–9.
- 87. Carlton AL. Report of WHO Mission to Afghanistan Medical Council. World Health Organisation Eastern Mediterranean Region (WHO EMR); 2018 Apr p. 1–22.
- Carlton AL. Health Workforce Regulation in the Philippines: EU-Philippine Health Sector Reform Contract Health Human Resources Regulation Mission of April - September 2018. 2018 Oct p. 1–90.
- Carlton AL. Regulation of Traditional Medicine Practitioners in Cambodia: Report on progress with development of a licensing regime for Traditional Medicine practitioners in Cambodia - findings and recommendations from WHO consultancy conducted 11-29 June 2018. World Health Organization Western Pacific Region (WHO WPR); 2018 Aug p. 1–90.
- 90. Carlton AL. Report of WHO Mission to the National Health Professions Commission of Somaliland 6-10 October 2019. World Health Organization Eastern Mediterranean Region (WHO EMR); 2020 Apr p. 1–90.

- 91. Carlton AL. Regulation and education of traditional and complementary (T&CM) practitioners in the Western Pacific Region a status update. World Health Organisation Western Pacific Region (WHO WPR); 2021 Feb p. 1–115.
- 92. Dower C, Moore J, Langelier M. It is time to restructure health professions scope-of-practice regulations to remove barriers to care. Health Aff (Millwood). 2013;32(11):1971–6.
- 93. Hudspeth R. Issues of a federal versus a state-based nurse licensure system: a below-the-radar discussion. Nurs Adm Q. 2013;37(1):83-4.
- 94. Lowery B, Scott E, Swanson M. Nurse practitioner perceptions of the impact of physician oversight on quality and safety of nurse practitioner practice. J Am Assoc Nurse Pract. 2016;28(8):436–45.
- 95. Dixon-Woods M, Yeung K, Bosk CL. Why is U.K. medicine no longer a self-regulating profession? The role of scandals involving 'bad apple' doctors. Soc Sci Med. 2011;73(10):1452–9.
- 96. Amgalan N, Shin JS, Lee SH, Badamdorj O, Ravjir O, Yoon HB. The socio-economic transition and health professions education in Mongolia: a qualitative study. Cost Eff Resour Alloc. 2021;19(1):1–12.
- 97. ICM. Global Standards for Midwifery Regulation (2011) [Internet]. International Confederation of Midwives; 2011. Available from: https://www.internationalmidwives.org/assets/files/regulation-files/2018/04/global-standards-for-midwifery-regulation-eng.pdf
- 98. WMA. Plan to Dismantle Physician Self Governance Strongly Criticised by World Medical Association [Internet]. World Medical Association (WMA). 2018. Available from: https://www.wma.net/news-post/plan-to-dismantle-physician-self-governance-strongly-criticised-by-world-medical-association/
- 99. ICN. Position Statement: Nursing Regulation [Internet]. International Council of Nurses; 2013. Available from: https://www.icn.ch/sites/default/files/inline-files/B04\_Nsg\_Regulation.pdf
- 100. Parliament of Victoria. Inquiry into the Performance of the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency [Internet]. Legislative Council Legal and Social Issues Legislation Committee; 2014 Mar. Report No.: Report 2. Available from: https://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/file\_uploads/Final\_version\_AHPRA\_report\_30314\_nnVxPmWJ.pdf
- 101. AHMAC. National Registration and Accreditation Scheme for the Health Professions. Consultation Paper. Proposed arrangements for handling complaints and dealing with performance, health and conduct matters. Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council; 2008.
- 102. Woods M. Australia's Health Workforce: strengthening the education foundation | Independent Review of Accreditation Systems within the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme for health professions. Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council, COAG Health Council; 2017 Nov.
- 103. UK Department of Health and Social Care. Promoting professionalism, reforming regulation [Internet]. GOV.UK. 2017. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/promoting-professionalism-reforming-regulation
- 104. WHO WPR. Health workforce regulation in the Western Pacific Region. World Health Organization Western Pacific Region; 2016.
- 105. Faulconbridge J, Muzio D. Professions in a Globalizing World: Towards a Transnational Sociology of the Professions. Int Sociol. 2012 Jan 1;27.
- 106. Acord LG, Dennik-Champion G, Lundeen SP, Schuler SG. Vision, grit, and collaboration: how the Wisconsin Center for Nursing achieved both sustainable funding and established itself as a state health care workforce leader. Policy Polit Nurs Pract. 2010;11(2):126–31.
- 107. Benton DC, Cleghorn J, Coghlan A, Damgaard G, Doumit MAA, George JL, et al. Acting in the public interest: Learnings and commentary on the occupational licensure literature. J Nurs Regul. 2019;10(2, Supplement):S1–40.
- 108. Hazarika I. Health workforce governance: Key to the delivery of people-centred care. Int J Healthc Manag. 2021;14(2):358-62.
- 109. European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies. COVID-19 Health System Response Monitor (HSRM) [Internet]. European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies. 2020. Available from: https://eurohealthobservatory.who.int/monitors/hsrm/
- 110. NCSBN. NCSBN's Environmental Scan COVID-19 and Its Impact on Nursing and Regulation. Natl Counc State Boards Nurs. 2021 Jan;11.
- 111. Thomas S, Sagan A, Larkin J, Cylus J, Figueras J, Karanikolos M. Policy Brief 36: Strengthening Health Systems Resilience: Key Concepts and Strategies [Internet]. European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies; 2020 Jun p. 1–33. (Health Systems and Policy Analysis). Available from: https://eurohealthobservatory.who.int/publications/i/strengthening-health-system-resilience-key-concepts-and-strategies
- 112. Buchan J, Williams GA, Zapata T. Governing Health Workforce Responses During COVID-19. In: COVID-19 and the opportunity to strengthen health system governance (EUROHEALTH) [Internet]. European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies, World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe; 2021. p. 41–8. (COVID-19 Health System Governance; vol. 27). Available from: https://eurohealthobservatory.who.int/publications/i/covid-19-and-theopportunity-to-strengthen-health-system-governance-eurohealth
- 113. OECD. Contribution of migrant doctors and nurses to tackling COVID-19 crisis in OECD countries. Organ Econ Co-Oper Dev. 2020 May 13;1-10.
- 114. OECD. Skill measures to mobilise the workforce during the COVID-19 crisis. Organ Econ Co-Oper Dev. 2020 Jul 10;1-17.
- 115. Bullock A, Bailey S, Cowpe J, Barnes E, Thomas H, Thomas R, et al. Continuing professional development systems and requirements for graduate dentists in the EU: survey results from the DentCPD project. Eur J Dent Educ. 2013;17 Suppl 1:18–22.
- 116. Kunaviktikul W, Turale S, Petrini MA, Tungpunkom P, Avant KC. Experiences from Southeast Asia on nursing education, practice, mobility and influencing policy. Int Nurs Rev. 2019;66(4):474–81.
- 117. Risso-Gill I, Legido-Quigley H, Panteli D, McKee M. Assessing the role of regulatory bodies in managing health professional issues and errors in Europe. Int J Qual Health Care. 2014;26(4):348–57.
- 118. Sehlbach C, Govaerts MJ, Mitchell S, Rohde GGU, Smeenk F, Driessen EW. Doctors on the move: a European case study on the key characteristics of national recertification systems. BMJ Open. 2018;8(4):10.
- 119. Abuagla A, Badr E. Challenges to implementation of the WHO Global Code of Practice on International Recruitment of Health Personnel: the case of Sudan. Hum Resour Health Electron Resour. 2016;14(Suppl 1):26.

- 120. Castro-Palaganas E, Spitzer DL, Kabamalan MM, Sanchez MC, Caricativo R, Runnels V, et al. An examination of the causes, consequences, and policy responses to the migration of highly trained health personnel from the Philippines: the high cost of living/leaving-a mixed method study. Hum Resour Health Electron Resour. 2017;15(1):25.
- 121. Penaloza B, Pantoja T, Bastias G, Herrera CA, Rada G. Interventions to reduce emigration of health care professionals from low- and middle-income countries. Cochrane Database Syst Rev [Internet]. 2014;(10). Available from: https://ezproxy.library.usyd.edu.au/login? url=http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=coch&AN=00075320-100000000-06148
- 122. Tangcharoensathien V, Travis P, Tancarino AS, Sawaengdee K, Chhoedon Y, Hassan S, et al. Managing In- and Out-Migration of Health Workforce in Selected Countries in South East Asia Region. Int J Health Policy Manag. 2018;7(2):137–43.
- 123. WHO. WHO Global Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel. World Health Organization; 2010.
- 124. Reinhart E, Alam E. The neocoloniality of who cares: US underinvestment in medical education exacerbates global inequities. BMJ. 2020 Nov 17;371:m4293.
- 125. ICN. ICN Regulation Series: Regulatory Board Governance Toolkit. The International Council of Nurses; 2014.
- 126. Benton DC, George J. Regulating the regulators? World Med J. 2018 Sep;64:3-8.

2020;86(1):45.

- 127. Archer J, Regan de Bere S, Nunn S, Clark J, Corrigan O. 'No one has yet properly articulated what we are trying to achieve': a discourse analysis of interviews with revalidation policy leaders in the United Kingdom. Acad Med. 2015;90(1):88–93.
- 128. Archer J, Lynn N, Coombes L, Roberts M, Gale T, Price T, et al. The impact of large scale licensing examinations in highly developed countries: a systematic review. BMC Med Educ [Internet]. 2016;16(1). Available from: https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84982242480&doi=10.1186%2fs12909-016-0729-7&partnerID=40&md5=a7f5018817cfa456675efc1f296738c5
- 129. Price DW, Biernacki H, Nora LM. Can Maintenance of Certification Work? Associations of MOC and Improvements in Physicians' Knowledge and Practice. Acad Med. 2018;93(12):1872–81.
- 130. Archer J, Lynn N, Roberts M, Coombes L, Gale T, de Bere SR. A Systematic Review on the impact of licensing examinations for doctors in countries comparable to the UK [Internet]. 2015 May p. 1–52. Available from: https://www.gmc-
- uk.org/-/media/documents/A\_systematic\_review\_on\_the\_impact\_of\_licensing\_examinations\_\_for\_doctors\_in\_countries\_comparable\_to\_the\_UK.pdf\_61103 131. Msibi G, Nkwanyana N, Kuebel H. Eswatini Nursing Council Regulatory Reforms: Process towards Entry to Practice Examination. Ann Glob Health.
- 132. Yigzaw T, Carr C, Stekelenburg J, van Roosmalen J, Gibson H, Gelagay M, et al. Using task analysis to generate evidence for strengthening midwifery education, practice, and regulation in Ethiopia. Int J Womens Health. 2016;8:181–90.
- 133. 133. Fan AP, Tran DT, Kosik RO, Mandell GA, Hsu HS, Chen YS. Medical education in Vietnam. Med Teach. 2012;34(2):103-7.
- 134. Adusi-Poku Y, Okine LKN, Hlortsi-Akakpo FK, Fleischer TC, Mensah MLK, Arhin P, et al. Assessing herbal medical practitioners in professional qualifying examination in Ghana, a model. Afr J Tradit Complement Altern Med AJTCAM. 2009 Oct 15;7(1):85–7.
- 135. Putri LP, O'Sullivan BG, Russell DJ, Kippen R. Factors associated with increasing rural doctor supply in Asia-Pacific LMICs: a scoping review. Hum Resour Health. 2020;18(1):93.
- 136. 136. Li X, Shen JJ, Yao F, Jiang C, Chang F, Hao F, et al. Does exam-targeted training help village doctors pass the certified (assistant) physician exam and improve their practical skills? A cross-sectional analysis of village doctors' perspectives in Changzhou in Eastern China. BMC Med Educ. 2018;18(1):107.
- 137. Meliala A, Hort K, Trisnantoro L. Addressing the unequal geographic distribution of specialist doctors in Indonesia: The role of the private sector and effectiveness of current regulations. Soc Sci Med. 2013;82:30–4.
- 138. Das S, Barnwal P. The need to train uncertified rural practitioners in India. J Int Med Res. 2018;46(1):522-5.
- 139. Smith T, McNeil K, Mitchell R, Boyle B, Ries N. A study of macro-, meso- and micro-barriers and enablers affecting extended scopes of practice: the case of rural nurse practitioners in Australia. BMC Nurs. 2019;18(1):N.PAG-N.PAG.
- 140. Odell E, Kippenbrock T, Buron W, Narcisse MR. Gaps in the primary care of rural and underserved populations: the impact of nurse practitioners in four Mississippi Delta states. J Am Assoc Nurse Pract. 2013;25(12):659–66.
- 141. Marcus K, Purwaningrum F, Short S. Towards more effective health workforce governance: The case of overseas-trained doctors. Aust J Rural Health. 2021;29(1):52–60.
- 142. Wright A, Regan M, Haigh C, Sunderji I, Vijayakumar P, Smith C, et al. Supporting international medical graduates in rural Australia: a mixed methods evaluation. Rural Remote Health. 2012;12:1897.
- 143. Xue Y, Kannan V, Greener E, Smith JA, Brasch J, Johnson BA, et al. Full Scope-of-Practice Regulation Is Associated With Higher Supply of Nurse Practitioners in Rural and Primary Care Health Professional Shortage Counties. J Nurs Regul [Internet]. 2018 Jan;8(4). Available from: https://regroupproduction.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/ReviewReference/377577102/9.\_Full\_Scope-of-Practice\_Regulation\_ls\_Associated\_with\_Higher\_Supply\_of\_Nurse\_Practitioners-with-cover-page-v2.pdf? AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAJBZQ0DCMKJA4H7DA&Expires=1653061456&Signature=zUxUWcVTYOeyYarJoTqdSlh3j0Q%3D
- 144. Ying X, Kannan V, Greener E, Smith JA, Brasch J, Johnson BA, et al. Full scope-of-practice regulation is associated with higher supply of nurse practitioners in rural and primary care health professional shortage counties. J Nurs Regul. 2018;8(4):5–13.
- 145. Nordstrom PM, Kwan JA, Wang MZ, Qiu ZG, Cummings GG, Giblin C. Internationally educated nurses' competency assessment and registration outcomes. Int J Migr Health Soc Care. 2018;14(3):332–46.
- 146. Klingler C, Ismail F, Marckmann G, Kuehlmeyer K. Medical professionalism of foreign-born and foreign-trained physicians under close scrutiny: A qualitative study with stakeholders in Germany. PLoS ONE Electron Resour. 2018;13(2):e0193010.

- 147. Balasubramanian M, Brennan DS, Spencer AJ, Watkins K, Short SD. Overseas-qualified dentists' experiences and perceptions of the Australian Dental Council assessment and examination process: the importance of support structures. Aust Health Rev. 2014;38(4):412–9.
- 148. Kwan JA, Wang M, Cummings GG, Lemermeyer G, Nordstrom P, Blumer L, et al. The evaluation of evidence-informed changes to an internationally educated nurse registration process. Int Nurs Rev. 2019;66(3):309–19.
- 149. Kmietowicz Z. Study raises concerns over racial discrimination in MRCGP exam. BMJ. 2013 Sep 26;347:f5792.
- 150. Alam A, Khan J, Liu J, Klemensberg J, Griesman J, Bell CM. Characteristics and rates of disciplinary findings amongst anesthesiologists by professional colleges in Canada. Can J Anaesth. 2013;60(10):1013–9.
- 151. Tiffin PA, Paton LW, Mwandigha LM, McLachlan JC, Illing J. Predicting fitness to practise events in international medical graduates who registered as UK doctors via the Professional and Linguistic Assessments Board (PLAB) system: a national cohort study. BMC Med. 2017;15(1):66.
- 152. Xu Y, He F. Transition programs for internationally educated nurses: what can the United States learn from the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada? Nurs Econ. 2012;30(4):215–24.
- 153. Masselink LE, Lee SYD. Nurses, Inc.: Expansion and commercialization of nursing education in the Philippines. Soc Sci Med. 2010;71(1):166–72.
- 154. McCall C. Southeast Asian countries to allow free flow of doctors. The Lancet. 2014 Mar 1;383(9919):771–2.
- 155. UNESCO-COE. Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region [Internet]. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Council of Europe; 1997. Available from: https://rm.coe.int/168007f2c7
- 156. European Union. Directive (EU) 2018/958 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 June 2018 on a proportionality test before adoption of new regulation of professions [Internet]. EUR-Lex. 2018. Available from: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A32018L0958
- 157. European Union. Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications [Internet]. EUR-Lex. 2005. Available from: https://eurlex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/LSU/?uri=celex:32005L0036
- 158. ASEAN. ASEAN Mutual Recognition Arrangement on Medical Practitioners [Internet]. Association of Southeast Asian Nations; 2008. Available from: https://asean.org/wp-content/uploads/images/2013/economic/sectoral/healthcare\_services/mra\_medical.pdf
- 159. ASEAN. ASEAN Mutual Recognition Arrangement on Dental Practitioners [Internet]. Association of Southeast Asian Nations; 2008. Available from: https://asean.org/wp-content/uploads/images/2013/economic/sectoral/healthcare\_services/mra\_dental.pdf
- 160. ASEAN. ASEAN Mutual Recognition Arrangement on Nursing Services [Internet]. Association of Southeast Asian Nations; 2006. Available from: https://asean.org/wp-content/uploads/images/2015/april/mra\_nursing/MRA%20Nursing%20signed.pdf
- 161. Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition Agreement [Internet]. 1996. Available from: https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/ttmra.pdf
- 162. Knox S, Cullen W, Dunne C. Continuous Professional Competence (CPC) for Irish paramedics and advanced paramedics: a national study. BMC Med Educ. 2014;14:7.
- 163. Knox S, Dunne S, Cullen W, Dunne CP. A qualitative assessment of practitioner perspectives post-introduction of the first Continuous Professional Competence (CPC) guidelines for emergency medical technicians in Ireland. BMC Emerg Med. 2015;15:11.
- 164. Knox S, Dunne SS, Hughes M, Cheeseman S, Dunne CP. Regulation and registration as drivers of continuous professional competence for Irish prehospital practitioners: a discussion paper. Ir J Med Sci. 2016;185(2):327–33.
- 165. Whitehead L, Ghosh M, Walker DK, Bloxsome D, Vafeas C, Wilkinson A. The relationship between specialty nurse certification and patient, nurse and organizational outcomes: A systematic review. Int J Nurs Stud. 2019;93:1–11.
- 166. Price D, Campbell C, Van Hoof TJ, ElChamaa R, Jeong D, Chappell K, et al. Definitions of physician certification used in the North American literature: a scoping review. J Contin Educ Health Prof. 2020;40(3):147–57.
- 167. Stawicki SP, Nwomeh BC, Peck GL, Sifri ZC, Garg M, Sakran JV, et al. Training and accrediting international surgeons. Br J Surg. 2019;106(2):E27–33.
- 168. Peabody MR, Young A, Peterson LE, O'Neill TR, Pei X, Arnhart K, et al. The relationship between board certification and disciplinary actions against boardeligible family physicians. Acad Med. 2019;94(6):847–52.
- 169. Nelson LS, Duhigg LM, Arnold GK, Lipner RS, Harvey AL, Reisdorff EJ. The association between maintaining American Board of Emergency Medicine Certification and state medical board disciplinary actions. J Emerg Med. 2019;57(6):772–9.
- 170. McDonald FS, Duhigg LM, Arnold GK, Hafer RM, Lipner RS. The American Board of Internal Medicine maintenance of certification examination and state medical board disciplinary actions: a population cohort study. J Gen Intern Med. 2018;33(8):1292–8.
- 171. Kwee RM, Kwee TC. Maintenance of certification for radiologists: an overview of European countries. Insights Imaging. 2020;11(1):7.
- 172. Kinney CL, Raddatz MM, Sliwa JA, Driscoll SW, Robinson LR. Association of participation in the American Board of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Maintenance of Certification Program and physician disciplinary actions. Am J Phys Med Rehabil. 2020;99(4):325–9.
- 173. Chappell K, Newhouse R, Lundmark V, ElChamaa R, Jeong D, Gallagher DK, et al. Methods of nursing certification in North America-a scoping review. Nurs Outlook. 2020;68(4):484–93.
- 174. Bryce M, Luscombe K, Boyd A, Tazzyman A, Tredinnick-Rowe J, Walshe K, et al. Policing the profession? Regulatory reform, restratification and the emergence of responsible officers as a new locus of power in UK medicine. Soc Sci Med. 2018;213:98–105.
- 175. Archer J, de Bere SR. The United Kingdom's experience with and future plans for revalidation. J Contin Educ Health Prof. 2013;48-53.
- 176. Murgatroyd GB. Continuing professional development: the international perspective. General Medical Council; 2011.
- 177. Davis DA, McMahon GT. Translating evidence into practice: lessons for CPD. Med Teach. 2018;40(9):892-5.

- 178. Bullock A, Browne J, Poletti C, Dorottya C& E. Review of research into health and care professional regulation [Internet]. Professional Standards Authority. 2020. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/publications/detail/review-of-research-into-health-and-care-professional-regulation
- 179. Balmer JT. Transforming continuing education across the health professions. J Contin Educ Nurs. 2012;43(8):340-1.
- 180. Hartley H, Smith JD, Vandyk A. Systematic review of continuing education interventions for licensed nurses working in psychiatry. J Contin Educ Nurs. 2019;50(5):233–40.
- 181. Neimeyer GJ, Taylor JM, Orwig JP. Do Continuing education mandates matter? an exploratory study of the relationship between CE regulations and disciplinary actions. Prof Psychol Res Pract. 2013;44(2):99–104.
- 182. Couper I, Ray S, Blaauw D, Ng'wena G, Muchiri L, Oyungu E, et al. Curriculum and training needs of mid-level health workers in Africa: a situational review from Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa and Uganda. BMC Health Serv Res. 2018;18(1):553.
- 183. Feldacker C, Pintye J, Jacob S, Chung MH, Middleton L, lliffe J, et al. Continuing professional development for medical, nursing, and midwifery cadres in Malawi, Tanzania and South Africa: A qualitative evaluation. Plos ONE. 2017;12(10):15.
- 184. Hosey KN, Kalula A, Voss J. Establishing an online continuing and professional development library for nurses and midwives in East, Central, and Southern Africa. J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care. 2016;27(3):297–311.
- 185. Gawugah JNK, Jadva-Patel H, Jackson MT. The uptake of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) by Ghanaian radiographers. Radiography. 2011;17(4):332–44.
- 186. Bandiera G, Frank J, Scheele F, Karpinski J, Philibert I. Effective accreditation in postgraduate medical education: from process to outcomes and back. BMC Med Educ. 2020;20(1):1–7.
- 187. 187. McCarthy CF, Gross JM, Verani AR, Nkowane AM, Wheeler EL, Lipato TJ, et al. Cross-sectional description of nursing and midwifery pre-service education accreditation in east, central, and southern Africa in 2013. Hum Resour Health. 2017;15(1):48.
- 188. World Bank. ECSA (Eastern, Central and Southern African Region) Education and Labor Markets for Nurses. Challenges and Opportunities [Internet]. World Bank Group; 2021. Available from: https://www.icn.ch/system/files/2021-07/ECSA\_Report\_2021.pdf
- 189. Bogossian F, Craven D. A review of the requirements for interprofessional education and interprofessional collaboration in accreditation and practice standards for health professionals in Australia. J Interprof Care. 2021;35(5):691–700.
- 190. Bvumbwe TM, Mtshali NG. A middle-range model for improving quality of nursing education in Malawi. Curationis. 2018;41(1):e1-11.
- 191. Frenk J, Chen L, Bhutta ZA, Cohen J, Crisp N, Evans T, et al. Health professionals for a new century: transforming education to strengthen health systems in an interdependent world. The Lancet. 2010 Dec 4;376(9756):1923–58.
- 192. HCPC. Education: We approve and monitor programmes within the UK for the professions we regulate [Internet]. Health & Care Professions Council (HCPC). 2021. Available from: https://www.hcpc-uk.org/education/
- 193. Tackett S, Zhang C, Nassery N, Caufield-Noll C, Van Zanten M. Describing the evidence base for accreditation in undergraduate medical education internationally: a scoping review. Acad Med. 2019;94(12):1995–2008.
- 194. Boulet J, van Zanten M. Ensuring high-quality patient care: The role of accreditation, licensure, specialty certification and revalidation in medicine. Med Educ. 2014;48(1):75–86.
- 195. Taber S, Akdemir N, Gorman L, van Zanten M, Frank JR. A "fit for purpose" framework for medical education accreditation system design. BMC Med Educ. 2020;20(1):1–12.
- 196. Nove A, Pairman S, Bohle LF, Garg S, Moyo NT, Michel-Schuldt M, et al. The development of a global Midwifery Education Accreditation Programme. Glob Health Action. 2018;11(1):1–1.
- 197. IAMRA. Statement: Accreditation of Medical Education Programs [Internet]. International Association of Medical Regulatory Authorities; Available from: https://www.iamra.com/resources/Documents/IAMRA%20Statement%20on%20Accreditation.pdf
- 198. Frank JR, Taber S, van Zanten M, Scheele F, Blouin D, on behalf of the International Health Professions Accreditation Outcomes Consortium. The role of accreditation in 21st century health professions education: report of an International Consensus Group. BMC Med Educ. 2020 Sep 28;20(1):305.
- 199. WFME. The WFME Programme for Recognition of Accrediting Agencies for Medical Education (recognition criteria for agencies accrediting medical schools) [Internet]. World Federation for Medical Education (WFME); 2019. Available from: https://wfme.org/download/wfme-recognition-programme-recognition-criteria-2018-revision/?

- 200. ICM. Essential Competencies for Midwifery Practice (2018 Update) [Internet]. International Confederation of Midwives; 2019. Available from: https://internationalmidwives.org/assets/files/general-files/2019/02/icm-competencies\_english\_final\_jan-2019-update\_final-web\_v1.0.pdf
- 201. Fullerton JT, Johnson PG, Thompson JB, Vivio D. Quality considerations in midwifery pre-service education: Exemplars from Africa. Midwifery. 2011;27(3):308–15.
- 202. Touré CO, Bijou S, Joiner M, Brown A, Tessougué J, Maiga H, et al. Accreditation of private midwifery and nursing schools in Mali: a local sustainable solution to increasing the supply of qualified health workers. Hum Resour Health. 2021;19(1):1–8.
- 203. Mayra K, Padmadas SS, Matthews Z. Challenges and needed reforms in midwifery and nursing regulatory systems in India: Implications for education and practice. Plos ONE [Internet]. 2021;16(5 May). Available from: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/file? id=10.1371/journal.pone.0251331&type=printable

- 204. Bogren MU, van Teijlingen E, Berg M. Where midwives are not yet recognised: A feasibility study of professional midwives in Nepal. Midwifery. 2013;29(10):1103–9.
- 205. McCarthy CF, Gross JM, Verani AR, Nkowane AM, Wheeler EL, Lipato TJ, et al. Cross-sectional description of nursing and midwifery pre-service education accreditation in east, central, and southern Africa in 2013. Hum Resour Health. 2017;15(1):48.
- 206. AHPRA. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Strategy [Internet]. Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency. 2021. Available from: https://www.ahpra.gov.au/About-Ahpra/Aboriginal-and-Torres-Strait-Islander-Health-Strategy.aspx
- 207. Leslie K, Moore J, Robertson C, Bilton D, Hirschkorn K, Langelier MH, et al. Regulating health professional scopes of practice: comparing institutional arrangements and approaches in the US, Canada, Australia and the UK. Hum Resour Health. 2021;19(1):1–12.
- 208. Hastings-Tolsma M, Foster SW, Brucker MC, Nodine P, Burpo R, Camune B, et al. Nature and scope of certified nurse-midwifery practice: A workforce study. J Clin Nurs John Wiley Sons Inc. 2018;27(21–22):4000–17.
- 209. Kurtzman ET, Barnow BS, Johnson JE, Simmens SJ, Infeld DL, Mullan F. Does the regulatory environment affect nurse practitioners' patterns of practice or quality of care in health centers? Health Serv Res. 2017;52:437–58.
- 210. Mack R. Increasing access to health care by implementing a consensus model for advanced practice registered nurse practice. J Nurse Pract. 2018;14(5):419–24.
- 211. 211. Manion AB, Odiaga JA. Health care economics and the advanced practice registered nurse. J Pediatr Health Care. 2014;28(5):466-9.
- 212. Maxey HL, Norwood CW, O'Connell JB, Liu Z. Impact of state workforce policies on underserved patients' access to dental care: a longitudinal study. J Dent Hyg. 2017;91(5):26–39.
- 213. Osborne K. Regulation of prescriptive authority for certified nurse-midwives and certified midwives: 2015 national overview. J Midwifery Womens Health. 2015;60(5):519–33.
- 214. Perloff J, Clarke S, DesRoches CM, O'Reilly-Jacob M, Buerhaus P. Association of state-level restrictions in nurse practitioner scope of practice with the quality of primary care provided to Medicare beneficiaries. Med Care Res Rev. 2019;76(5):597–626.
- 215. Phoenix BJ, Chapman SA. Effect of state regulatory environments on advanced psychiatric nursing practice. Arch Psychiatr Nurs. 2020;34(5):370-6.
- 216. Xue Y, Ye Z, Brewer C, Spetz J. Impact of state nurse practitioner scope-of-practice regulation on health care delivery: Systematic review. Nurs Outlook. 2016;64(1):71–85.
- 217. Yang YT, Attanasio LB, Kozhimannil KB. State scope of practice laws, nurse-midwifery workforce, and childbirth procedures and outcomes. Womens Health Issues. 2016;26(3):262–7.
- 218. Leung TI, Biskup E, DeWitt D. Facilitating credentialing and engagement of international physician -migrants during the COVID-19 crisis and beyond. Rural Remote Health. 2020;20(3):5.
- 219. Panteli D, Maier CB. Regulating the health workforce in Europe: implications of the COVID-19 pandemic. Hum Resour Health Electron Resour. 2021;19(1):80.
- 220. Stucky CH, Brown WJ, Stucky MG. COVID 19: An unprecedented opportunity for nurse practitioners to reform healthcare and advocate for permanent full practice authority. Nurs Forum (Auckl). 2021;56(1):222–7.
- 221. Bell DL, Katz MH. Modernize medical licensing, and credentialing, too lessons from the COVID-19 pandemic. JAMA Intern Med. 2021;181(3):312-5.
- 222. Moore C, Kabbe A, Gibson TS, Letvak S. The pursuit of nurse practitioner practice legislation: a case study. Policy Polit Nurs Pract. 2020;21(4):222-32.
- 223. Bourgeault I, Kuhlmann E, Neiterman E, Wrede S. How can optimal skill mix be effectively implemented and why? Eur Obs Health Syst Policies Health Evid Netw World Health Organ. 2008 Nov 12;1–33.
- 224. Langelier M, Surdu S. Top-Of-License Dental Hygiene Practice [Internet]. Dimensions of Dental Hygiene. 2017. Available from: https://dimensionsofdentalhygiene.com/top-of-license-dental-hygiene-practice/
- 225. Moore J. From the Complex to the Simple: Translating Scope of Practice Research for Policy Makers | Building Bridges and Breaking Down Barriers: Diversity, Inclusion and the Health Workforce [Internet]. Oral Health Workforce Research Center (OHWRC), Center for Health Workforce Studies, School of Public Health, University of Albany; 2018 May 10; Tyson, Virginia. Available from: https://www.chwsny.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/JMoore-AAMC.pdf
- 226. FSMB. Assessing Scope of Practice in Health Care Delivery: Critical Questions in Assuring Public Access and Safety [Internet]. Federation of State Medical Boards (FSMB); 2005. Available from: https://www.fsmb.org/siteassets/advocacy/policies/assessing-scope-of-practice-in-health-care-delivery.pdf
- 227. AHMAC. AHMAC information on regulatory assessment criteria and process for adding new professions to the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme for the health professions. Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council; 2018 Sep p. 1–18.
- 228. AHMAC. Guidance: A joint jurisdictional assessment process for proposals for nationally consistent scheduled medicines authorities for the unregistered health professions. Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council; 2019 p. 1–12.
- 229. Carter E. Health Professions Regulation in the US: What are the Issues? (HWTAC Webinar Series) [Internet]. Health Workforce Technical Assistance Center (HWTAC). 2014. Available from: https://www.healthworkforceta.org/media-library/health-professions-regulation-in-the-u-s-what-are-the-issues/
- 230. AHPRA. Quality Framework for Accreditation Function [Internet]. Ahpra Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency. 2018 [cited 2021 Jul 18]. Available from: http://www.ahpra.gov.au/Publications/Accreditation-publications.aspx
- 231. HPRAC. Regulation of a New Health Profession under the Regulated Health Professions Act (RHPA), 1991 (Criteria and Process) [Internet]. Health Professions Regulatory Advisory Council (HPRAC); 2011 Nov. Available from: https://www.hprac.org/en/reports/resources/RegulatingaNewProfession\_CriteriaProcess\_Nov2011.pdf

- 232. Adams AJ, Weaver KK. The continuum of pharmacist prescriptive authority. Ann Pharmacother. 2016;50(9):778-84.
- 233. Auta A, Strickland-Hodge B, Maz J, David S. Pharmacist prescribing: a cross-sectional survey of the views of pharmacists in Nigeria. Int J Pharm Pract. 2018;26(2):111–9.
- 234. Black A, Gage H, Norton C, Franklin BD, Murrells T, Courtenay M. A comparison between independent nurse prescribing and patient group directions in the safety and appropriateness of medication provision in United Kingdom sexual health services: A mixed methods study. Int J Nurs Stud. 2020;107:103590.
- 235. DePriest K, D'Aoust R, Samuel L, Commodore-Mensah Y, Hanson G, Slade EP. Nurse practitioners' workforce outcomes under implementation of full practice authority. Nurs Outlook. 2020;68(4):459–67.
- 236. Dingman DA, Schmit CD. Authority of pharmacists to administer human papillomavirus vaccine: Alignment of state laws with age-level recommendations. Public Health Rep. 2018;133(1):55–63.
- 237. Driscoll A, Harvey C, Green A, Weatherby RP, Liew D, Prentice D, et al. National nursing registration in Australia: a way forward for nurse practitioner endorsement. J Am Acad Nurse Pract. 2012;24(3):143–8.
- 238. Goodwin M, Higgins S, Lewis S. Epilepsy specialist nurse prescribing practice in the United Kingdom: a national questionnaire survey. Seizure. 2011;20(10):754–7.
- 239. Hawes EM, Misita C, Burkhart JI, McKnight L, Deyo ZM, Lee RA, et al. Prescribing pharmacists in the ambulatory care setting: Experience at the University of North Carolina Medical Center. Am J Health Syst Pharm. 2016;73(18):1425–33.
- 240. Klein T, Kaplan L. Prescribing competencies for advanced practice registered nurses. J Nurse Pract. 2010;6(2):115-22.
- 241. Klein T, Lugo R. Evaluating Prescribing Competence in Nurse Practitioner Fellowship and Residency programs. J Nurse Pract. 2018;14(10):e197–205.
- 242. Kooienga S, Wilkinson J. RN prescribing: an expanded role for nursing. Nurs Forum (Auckl). 2017;52(1):3-11.
- 243. Ladd E, Schober M. Nurse prescribing from the global vantage point: the intersection between role and policy. Policy Polit Nurs Pract. 2018;19(1-2):40-9.
- 244. MacLeod-Glover N. An explanatory policy analysis of legislative change permitting pharmacists in Alberta, Canada, to prescribe. Int J Pharm Pract. 2011;19(1):70–8.
- 245. McGrath RE. Prescriptive authority for psychologists. Annu Rev Clin Psychol. 2010;6:21-47.
- 246. Romero-Collado A, Raurell-Torreda M, Zabaleta-Del-Olmo E, Rascon-Hernan C, Homs-Romero E. Nurse prescribing in Spain: the law and the curriculum. Nurs Health Sci. 2017;19(3):373–80.
- 247. Stewart D. Guidelines on Prescriptive Authority for Nurses [Internet]. International Council of Nurses (ICN); 2021. Available from: https://www.icn.ch/system/files/2021-09/ICN\_Nurse\_prescribing\_guidelines\_EN\_WEB.pdf
- 248. Afzal A, Stolee P, Sanyal C, Heckman GA, Boscart VM. The role of unregulated care providers in Canada—A scoping review. Int J Older People Nurs. 2018;13(3):1–1.
- 249. Penner JD, Snively A, Packham TL, Henderson J, Principi E, Malstrom B. Viewpoints of the Occupational Therapist Assistant–Physiotherapist Assistant Role on Inter-Professional Teams: A Mixed-Methods Study. Physiother Can. 2020;72(4):394–405.
- 250. Frost TP, Adams AJ. Expanded pharmacy technician roles: accepting verbal prescriptions and communicating prescription transfers. Res Soc Adm Pharm. 2017;13(6):1191–5.
- 251. Corazzini KN, Anderson RA, Mueller C, Thorpe JM, McConnell ES. Licensed practical nurse scope of practice and quality of nursing home care. Nurs Res. 2013;62(5):315–24.
- 252. Baine SO, Kasangaki A. A scoping study on task shifting; the case of Uganda. BMC Health Serv Res. 2014 Apr 23;14(1):184.
- 253. Baine SO, Kasangaki A, Baine EMM. Task shifting in health service delivery from a decision and policy makers' perspective: a case of Uganda. Hum Resour Health Electron Resour. 2018;16(1):20.
- 254. Dambisya Y, Matinhure S. Policy and programmatic implications of task shifting in Uganda: a case study. East Cent South Afr Health Community. 2012;12(61):1–10.
- 255. van de Ruit C. Unintended consequences of community health worker programs in South Africa. Qual Health Res. 2019;29(11):1535-48.
- 256. NSW HCCC. Public Statements and Warnings [Internet]. New South Wales Health Care Complaints Commissions (NSW HCCC). 2021. Available from: https://www.hccc.nsw.gov.au/Hearings-decisions/Public-Statements-Warnings
- 257. OHO. Orders against health practitioners [Internet]. Office of the Health Ombudsman (OHO). 2021. Available from: https://www.oho.qld.gov.au/public/protective-orders
- 258. Health Complaints Commissioner Victoria. Orders & Warnings: Prohibition orders [Internet]. Health Complaints Commissioner. 2021. Available from: https://hcc.vic.gov.au/orders-warnings/prohibition-orders#:~:text=The%20Commissioner%20can%20make%20a,or%20welfare%20of%20the%20public.
- 259. HCSCC. Orders issued under the Code of Conduct [Internet]. Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner South Australia. 2021. Available from: https://www.hcscc.sa.gov.au/code-of-conduct-for-unregistered-health-practitioners/orders-issued-under-the-code-of-conduct-for-unregistered-health-practitioners/
- 260. Freckelton I. Regulating the unregistered. J Law Med. 2008 Dec;16:413-8.
- 261. Freckelton I. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health practitioner regulation. J Law Med. 2014;21(3):550–60.
- 262. Lim MYH, Lin V. Governance in health workforce: how do we improve on the concept? A network-based, stakeholder-driven approach. Hum Resour Health. 2021 Jan 2;19(1):1.
- 263. Papinaho O, Häggman-Laitila A, Liedenpohja A, Kangasniemi M. Integrative review of studies about nurses who have been disciplined by their professional regulatory bodies. J Nurs Manag John Wiley Sons Inc. 2019;27(8):1588–603.

- 264. Gallagher CT, Mukhtar F, Sarfaraz T, Chaar B. Fit to practise? Processes for dealing with misconduct among pharmacists in Australia, Canada, the UK and US. Res Soc Adm Pharm. 2019;15(10):1195–203.
- 265. Harris JA, Byhoff E. Variations by state in physician disciplinary actions by US medical licensure boards. BMJ Qual Saf. 2017;26(3):200-8.
- 266. Kasuma N, Bahar A, Tegnan H. Law and medical disciplinary sanctions: enhancing medical practice and health quality in Indonesia. J Leg Ethical Regul Issues [Internet]. 2018;21(4). Available from: https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85063289387&partnerID=40&md5=c098f2756a499a58538b701e7c89b679
- 267. 267. Jafree SR, Zakar R, Fischer F, Zakar MZ. Ethical violations in the clinical setting: the hidden curriculum learning experience of Pakistani nurses. BMC Med Ethics. 2015;16:11.
- 268. Maestad O, Mwisongo A. Informal payments and the quality of health care: Mechanisms revealed by Tanzanian health workers. Health Policy. 2011;99(2):107–15.
- 269. PSA. The patient and public perspective on future fitness to practise processes (community research) [Internet]. UK Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care; 2020. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/publications/research-paper/patient-andpublic-perspectives-on-future-fitness-to-practise-processes.pdf?sfvrsn=36897620\_5
- 270. Cuthbert L. Advice on biases in fitness to practise decision-making in accepted outcome versus panel models for the professional standards authority [Internet]. UK Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care; 2021. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/publications/research-paper/advice-on-biases-in-fitness-to-practise-decision-making.pdf?sfvrsn=b0154920\_8
- 271. Sanderson P. From Public Hearings to Consensual Disposal: Insights from the Decisionmaking Literature (A Review for the Professional Standards Authority) [Internet]. UK Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care; 2019. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/publications/research-paper/from-public-hearings-to-consensual-disposal-literaturereview.pdf?sfvrsn=5
- 272. Bismark MM, Morris JM, Clarke C. Mandatory reporting of impaired medical practitioners: protecting patients, supporting practitioners. Intern Med J. 2014;44(12a):1165–9.
- 273. Bismark MM, Spittal MJ, Morris JM, Studdert DM. Reporting of health practitioners by their treating practitioner under Australia's national mandatory reporting law. Med J Aust. 2016;204(1):24.e1-24.e6.
- 274. Ryan AT, Too LS, Bismark MM. Complaints about chiropractors, osteopaths, and physiotherapists: a retrospective cohort study of health, performance, and conduct concerns. Chiropr Man Ther. 2018;26:12.
- 275. Boyd JE, Graunke B, Frese FJ, Jones JTR, Adkins JW, Bassman R. State psychology licensure questions about mental illness and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Am J Orthopsychiatry. 2016;86(6):620–31.
- 276. Austin Z, Gregory PAM. The role of disengagement in the psychology of competence drift. Res Soc Adm Pharm. 2019;15(1):45-52.
- 277. Casey D, Choong KA. Suicide whilst under GMC's fitness to practise investigation: Were those deaths preventable? J Forensic Leg Med. 2016;37:22–7.
- 278. PSA. Public Response to Alternatives to Final Panel Hearings in Fitness to Practise Complaints [Internet]. UK Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care, Research Works; 2013 May. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/publications/researchpaper/public-response-to-alternatives-to-final-panel-hearings-2013.pdf?sfvrsn=65c47f20\_8
- 279. PSA. Enhancing confidence in fitness to practise adjudication [Internet]. London: UK Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care, Research Works; 2011 May p. 1–26. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/publications/researchpaper/enhancing-confidence-in-fitness-to-practise-adjudication-2011.pdf?sfvrsn=66c67f20\_6
- 280. PSA. Dishonest behaviour by health and care professionals: Exploring the views of the general public and professionals [Internet]. UK Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care, POLICIS; 2016. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/publications/research-paper/dishonest-behaviour-by-hcp-research.pdf?sfvrsn=cff17120\_34
- 281. AHPRA. Setting things right: AHPRA actions to improve consumer experience [Internet]. Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency. 2014. Available from: https://www.ahpra.gov.au/News/2014-09-23-media-release.aspx
- 282. Health Issues Centre. bringing in the consumer perspective: consumer experiences of complaints processes in Victorian Health Practitioner Registration Boards. Victorian Department of Health, Resolution Resources Network RRN; 2004 Oct.
- 283. Lillis S, Takai N, Francis S. Long-term outcomes of a remedial education program for doctors with clinical performance deficits. J Contin Educ Health Prof. 2014;34(2):96–101.
- 284. Weenink JW, Kool RB, Hesselink G, Bartels RH, Westert GP. Prevention of and dealing with poor performance: an interview study about how professional associations aim to support healthcare professionals. Int J Qual Health Care. 2017;29(6):838–44.
- 285. Leslie K, Nelson S. Mandatory reporting of health professional incompetence and incapacity: is it time to adopt the Australian regime? Nurs Leadersh Tor Ont. 2018;31(3):8–18.
- 286. Braatvedt C, Poole P, Merry A, Gorman D, Reid P, Bagg W. Fitness to practice of medical graduates: one programme's approach. N Z Med J. 2014;127(1405):70–7.
- 287. Price T, Archer J. UK Policy on doctor remediation: trajectories and challenges. J Contin Educ Health Prof. 2017;37(3):207–11.
- 288. Lin V, Gillick D. Does workforce regulation have the intended effect? the case of Chinese medicine practitioner registration. Aust Health Rev. 2011;35(4):455–61.
- 289. Lin V, Bensoussan A, Myers SP, McCabe P, Cohen M, Hill S, et al. The practice and regulatory requirements of naturopathy and western herbal medicine. School of Public Health, La Trobe University; 2005.

- 290. Bensoussan A, Myers S. Towards a safer choice: the practice of traditional Chinese medicine in Australia. Campbelltown, N.S.W: Faculty of Health, University of Western Sydney Macarthur; 1996.
- 291. Freckelton I. Prohibition orders and the regulation of unregistered health practitioners. J Law Med. 2020 Apr 1;27:551-60.
- 292. Wardle J. Holding unregistered health practitioners to account: an analysis of current regulatory and legislative approaches. J Law Med. 2014;22(2):350– 75.
- 293. Mayberry JF. Review: Statutory regulation of invasive complementary therapies, such as hijama and acupuncture, is the only effective way of ensuring both patient safety and good practice. Med Leg J. 2018;86(1):23–31.
- 294. Ijaz N, Boon H, Muzzin L, Welsh S. State risk discourse and the regulatory preservation of traditional medicine knowledge: the case of acupuncture in Ontario, Canada. Soc Sci Med. 2016;170:97–105.
- 295. Sibbritt D, Kaye M, Millbank J, Stuhmcke A, Wardle J, Karpin I. How are complementary health professions regulated in Australia? An examination of complementary health professions in the national registration and accreditation scheme. Complement Ther Med. 2018 Apr 1;37:6–12.
- 296. Howland O. Fakes and chemicals: indigenous medicine in contemporary Kenya and implications for health equity. Int J Equity Health. 2020;19(1):199.
- 297. Haruna U, Kansanga MM, Bagah DA. Repositioning traditional birth attendants to provide improved maternal healthcare services in rural Ghana. Int J Health Plann Manage. 2019;34(2):e987–94.
- 298. Chandra S, Patwardhan K. Allopathic, AYUSH and informal medical practitioners in rural India a prescription for change. J Ayurveda Integr Med. 2018;9(2):143–50.
- 299. Carè J, Steel A, Wardle J. Stakeholder attitudes to the regulation of traditional and complementary medicine professions: a systematic review. Hum Resour Health. 2021;19(1):42.
- 300. Krug K, Kraus KI, Herrmann K, Joos S. Complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) as part of primary health care in Germany-comparison of patients consulting general practitioners and CAM practitioners: a cross-sectional study. BMC Complement Altern Med [Internet]. 2016;16(1). Available from: http://www.biomedcentral.com/bmccomplementalternmed/
- 301. Almeida J, Gabe J. CAM within a field force of countervailing powers: the case of Portugal. So Sci Med. 2016;155:73-81.
- 302. Nadareishvili I, Pkhakadze G, Japiashvili N, Lunze K. Regulatory environment for complementary and alternative medicine in Georgia-a health policy analysis. Int J Health Plann Manage [Internet]. 2021; Available from: ://MEDLINE:33735447
- 303. Pokladnikova J, Telec I. Provision of complementary and alternative medicine: Compliance with the health professional requirements. Health Policy. 2020;124(3):311–6.
- 304. Park Y, Canaway R. Integrating traditional and complementary medicine with national healthcare systems for universal health coverage in Asia and the Western Pacific. Health Syst Reform. 2019;5(1):24–31.
- 305. Wiese M, Oster C, Pincombe J. Understanding the emerging relationship between complementary medicine and mainstream health care: a review of the literature. Health (N Y). 2010;14(3):326–42.
- 306. Innes SI, Leboeuf-Yde C, Walker BF. Similarities and differences of a selection of key accreditation standards between chiropractic councils on education: a systematic review. Chiropr Man Ther [Internet]. 2016;24(1). Available from: http://www.chiroandosteo.com/
- 307. Innes SI, Cope V, Leboeuf-Yde C, Walker BF. A perspective on Councils on Chiropractic Education accreditation standards and processes from the inside: A narrative description of expert opinion. Chiropr Man Ther [Internet]. 2019;27(1). Available from: http://www.chiroandosteo.com/
- 308. Gimpel JR, Horber D, Sandella JM, Knebl JA, Thornburg JE. Evidence-based redesign of the COMLEX-USA series. J Am Osteopath Assoc. 2017;117(4):253–61.
- 309. Maholtz DE, Erickson MJ, Cymet T. Comprehensive Osteopathic Medical Licensing Examination-USA level 1 and level 2-cognitive evaluation preparation and outcomes. J Am Osteopath Assoc. 2015;115(4):232–5.
- 310. Amaral P, Fronteira I. Regulation of non-conventional therapies in Portugal: lessons learnt for strengthening human resources in health. Hum Resour Health. 2021;19(1):114.
- 311. WHO. WHO traditional medicine strategy: 2014-2023 [Internet]. World Health Organization (WHO); 2013 May p. 1–76. (Global Strategy). Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241506096
- 312. WHO WPR. The Regional Strategy for Traditional Medicine in the Western Pacific (2011-2020) [Internet]. World Health Organization Western Pacific Region; 2012. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789290615590
- 313. Ijaz N, Boon H. Statutory regulation of traditional medicine practitioners and practices: the need for distinct policy making guidelines. J Altern Complement Med. 2018;24(4):307–13.
- 314. Ijaz N, Boon H. Medical pluralism and the state: regulatory language requirements for traditional acupuncturists in English-dominant diaspora jurisdictions. SAGE Open. 2018;8(2):2158244018768677.
- 315. Palatchie B, Beban A, Andersen B. The myth of medical multiculturalism: how social closure marginalises traditional Chinese medicine in New Zealand. Health Sociol Rev. 2021;1–16.
- 316. Herman PM, Coulter ID. Mapping the health care policy landscape for complementary and alternative medicine professions using expert panels and literature analysis. J Manipulative Physiol Ther. 2016;39(7):500–9.
- 317. Ijaz N. Paradigm-Specific Risk Conceptions, Patient Safety, and the Regulation of Traditional and Complementary Medicine Practitioners: The Case of Homeopathy in Ontario, Canada. Front Sociol [Internet]. 2020;4(89). Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fsoc.2019.00089

- 318. Ijaz N, Steinberg M, Flaherty T, Neubauer T, Thompson-Lastad A. Beyond professional licensure: a statement of principle on culturally-responsive healthcare. Glob Adv Health Med [Internet]. 2021 Jan 1;10. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/21649561211043092
- 319. Ijaz N, Boon H. Chinese medicine sans Chinese: The Unequal impacts of Canada's "Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework". Law Policy. 2018;40(4):371–97.
- 320. Templeman K, Robinson A. Integrative medicine models in contemporary primary health care. Complement Ther Med. 2011;19(2):84–92.
- 321. Wiesener S, Falkenberg T, Hegyi G, Hök J, di Sarsina PR, Fønnebø V. Legal status and regulation of complementary and alternative medicine in Europe. Forsch Komplementarmed. 2012;19:29–36.
- 322. Wiesener S, Salamonsen A, Fonnebo V. Which risk understandings can be derived from the current disharmonized regulation of complementary and alternative medicine in Europe? BMC Complement Altern Med. 2018;18(1):11.
- 323. Ijaz N, Boon H, Brosnan C, Vuolanto P, Danell JAB. Safety as 'Boundary Object': The Case of Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine Regulation in Ontario, Canada. Complement Altern Med Knowl Prod Soc Transform. 2018;193–213.
- 324. Redbird B. The New Closed Shop? The Economic and structural effects of occupational licensure. Am Sociol Rev. 2017 Jun 1;82(3):600-24.
- 325. Stange K. How does provider supply and regulation influence health care markets? Evidence from nurse practitioners and physician assistants. J Health Econ. 2014;33(1):1–27.
- 326. Bloom G, Henson S, Peters DH. Innovation in regulation of rapidly changing health markets. Glob Health [Internet]. 2014;10(1). Available from: http://www.globalizationandhealth.com/content/10/1/53
- 327. Dejene D, Yigzaw T, Mengistu S, Ayalew F, Kahsaye M, Woldemariam D. Exploring health workforce regulation practices and gaps in Ethiopia: a national cross-sectional study. Glob Health Res Policy. 2019;4(1):12.
- 328. Lynch M, Kodate N. Professional practice following regulatory change: an evaluation using principles of 'Better Regulation'. Res Soc Adm Pharm RSAP. 2020;16(2):208–15.
- 329. Sheikh K, Saligram PS, Hort K. What explains regulatory failure? Analysing the architecture of health care regulation in two Indian states. Health Policy Plan. 2015 Feb 1;30(1):39–55.
- 330. Victorian Department of Health. Regulation of the health professions in Victoria a discussion paper [Internet]. State Government Victoria; 2003. Available from: https://vgls.sdp.sirsidynix.net.au/client/search/asset/1160624
- 331. HPRAC. Reports & Resources [Internet]. Health Professions Regulatory Advisory Council (HPRAC). 2019. Available from: https://www.hprac.org/en/reports/currentreports.asp
- 332. PSA. Home [Internet]. UK Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care. 2021. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/home
- 333. New Zealand Ministry of Health. Professional and regulatory bodies [Internet]. Ministry of Health Manatu Hauora. 2021. Available from: https://www.health.govt.nz/new-zealand-health-system/key-health-sector-organisations-and-people/professional-and-regulatory-bodies
- 334. AHPRA. Ahpra and Medical Board announce review of cosmetic surgery checks and balances [Internet]. Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency. 2021. Available from: https://www.ahpra.gov.au/News/2021-11-24-cosmetic-review.aspx
- 335. AHPRA. Medical Board and AHPRA adopt all recommendations of chaperone report [Internet]. Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency. 2017. Available from: https://www.ahpra.gov.au/News/2017-04-11-chaperone-report.aspx
- 336. NHPO. Chaperone review [Internet]. National Health Practitioner Ombudsman. 2021. Available from: https://www.nhpo.gov.au/chaperone-review
- 337. NCSBN. Index [Internet]. National Council of State Boards of Nursing (NCSBN). Available from: https://www.ncsbn.org/index.htm
- 338. FSMB. Home [Internet]. Federation of State Medical Boards (FSMB); Available from: https://www.fsmb.org/
- 339. von Rueden C, Bambalaite I. Measuring occupational entry regulations: a new OECD approach. OECD. 2020 Mar 31;1-70.
- 340. Bambalaite I, Nicoletti G, von Rueden C. Occupational entry regulations and their effects on productivity in services: Firm-level evidence. OECD. 2020 Mar 31;1–53.
- 341. OECD. Regulatory quality and COVID-19: Managing the risks and supporting the recovery. Organ Econ Co-Oper Dev. 2020 Apr 29;1-7.
- 342. OECD. Regulatory quality and COVID-19: The use of regulatory management tools in a time of crisis. Organ Econ Co-Oper Dev. 2020 Sep 30;1-23.
- 343. WHO AFRO. The regional professional regulatory framework for nursing and midwifery: creating a common approach to regulation, educational preparation and practice: future direction for nursing & midwifery development in the African region. World Health Organ Reg Off Afr. 2016;1–86.
- 344. Cade JE, Eccles E, Hartwell H, Radford S, Douglas A, Milliner L. The making of a nutrition professional: the Association for Nutrition register. Public Health Nutr. 2012;15(11):2012–9.
- 345. Hutchins JC, Sagsveen MG, Larriviere D. Upholding professionalism: the disciplinary process of the American Academy of Neurology. Neurology. 2010;75(24):2198–203.
- 346. Wardle J, Steel A, McIntyre E. Independent registration for naturopaths and herbalists in Australia: the coming of age of an ancient profession in contemporary healthcare. Aust J Herb Med. 2013;25(3):101–59.
- 347. McWhirter R. Regulation of unregistered birth workers in Australia: homebirth and public safety. Women Birth. 2018;31(2):134–42.
- 348. New Zealand Ministry of Health. Regulating a new profession [Internet]. Ministry of Health Manatu Hauora. 2021. Available from: https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/regulation-health-and-disability-system/health-practitioners-competence-assurance-act/regulating-new-profession
- 349. PSA. Right-touch assurance for sonographers based on risk of harm arising from practice | Report to Health Education England [Internet]. UK Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care; 2019. Available from: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-

source/publications/policy-advice/right-touch-assurance-for-sonographers-a-report-for-hee.pdf?sfvrsn=9cfd7420\_13

- 350. Western Australian Department of Health. Registration of Paramedics in Australia and amending the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (WA) Act 2010 | Summary Decision Regulatory Impact Statement for Western Australia [Internet]. Government of Western Australia; 2016. Available from: https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/~/media/Files/Corporate/Reports-and-publications/Registration\_of\_paramedics/Registration-of-Paramedics-DRIS-Summary.pdf
- 351. AHMAC. Options for regulation of paramedics. Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council; 2015 Sep p. 1–110.
- 352. Magnago C, Pierantoni CR. Situational analysis and reflections on the introduction of advanced practice nurses in Brazilian primary healthcare. Hum Resour Health. 2021 Jul 22;19(1):90.
- 353. European Commission. Commission calls on 18 Member States to strengthen the EU Single Market for regulated professions [Internet]. European Commission. 2021. Available from: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP\_21\_6389
- 354. Benton DC, Gonzalez-Jurado MA, Beneit-Montesinos JV. Professional regulation, public protection and nurse migration. Coll J R Coll Nurs Aust. 2014;21(1):53–9.
- 355. Adams TL, Wannamaker K. Professional regulation, profession-state relations and the pandemic response: Australia, Canada, and the UK compared. Soc Sci Med. 2022 Mar 1;296:114808.
- 356. Reid A, Leistikow I, Paniagua M, Udekwu P, Letlape K. Expecting the unexpected: how regulators can prepare for serious events. J Med Regul. 2021 Nov 22;107(3):28–33.
- 357. van Stralen AC, Carvalho CL, Girardi SN, Massote AW, Cherchiglia ML. International strategies for flexibilization of the regulation of health workforce practices in response to the COVID-19 pandemic: a scoping review. Cad Saúde Pública CSP [Internet]. 2022;38(2). Available from: https://www.scielo.br/j/csp/a/FWrHHKCZHWZCc56BrMrFtjJ/?format=pdf&lang=en

### **Figures**



#### Figure 1

Modified Donabedian framework of HPR systems





PRISMA flow diagram for academic literature sources



#### Figure 3

Distribution of published literature by topic and structures (S), processes (P), and outcomes (O)



#### Most frequent countries and health occupations in the published literature (n=410) and grey literature (n = 426).<sup>[1]</sup>

<sup>[1]</sup> Articles classified as "international" were broad in scope. Rather than focusing on a single country, group of countries or a region, these articles generally took a broad look at an HPR issue or topic, such as a scoping review of all English language literature on a HPR topic. If an article focused on a group of LMICs, it was classified as LMIC (a separate category in our data extraction) rather than international.



#### Figure 5

#### Most frequent countries and health occupations in the published literature (n=410) and grey literature (n = 426).<sup>[1]</sup>

<sup>[1]</sup> Articles classified as "international" were broad in scope. Rather than focusing on a single country, group of countries or a region, these articles generally took a broad look at an HPR issue or topic, such as a scoping review of all English language literature on a HPR topic. If an article focused on a group of LMICs, it was classified as LMIC (a separate category in our data extraction) rather than international.



resented with XMind

#### Figure 6

Overview of topics and themes categorized by structures, processes, and outcomes



Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature addressing the scope and governance of regulatory systems



#### Figure 8

Most frequent countries and health occupations in the published literature on regulatory institutions



Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature on regulatory system linkages



#### Figure 10

Most frequent countries and health occupations in the published literature on registration and monitoring of continuing competence of practitioners.



Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature addressing accreditation of HPE programs



#### Figure 12

Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature addressing regulation of scopes of practice



Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature on regulation of complaints-handling and discipline



#### Figure 14

Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature addressing regulation of T&CM practitioners.



Most frequent countries and health occupations in published literature addressing impacts of HPR on health workforce and health system outcomes.

### **Supplementary Files**

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- AdditionalFile1SearchstrategiesandPIC0.docx
- AdditionalFile2CountriesandHealthOccupations.docx
- AdditionalFile3Academicandgreyliteraturesources.xlsx