Table F-5. Key Question 2 studies, first outcome

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** |
| Bahrami et al., 20041 | G1: Mailed guideline (increase reach)  G2: Guideline + AF (not abstracted)  G3: CAL (increase ability)  G4: CAL + AF (not abstracted) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Proportion of patients whose treatment complied with the guideline. Assessed by two independent researchers and any disagreements were resolved by discussion. | 4 month period in 1999 (preintervention) 4 month period in 2000 (postintervention)  Clinical records | Patients Pre: 3342 Post: 1934  Dentists G1: 11 G3: 11 | Preintervention % (95%CI) G1: 77% (70/85%) G3: 70% (56/84%)  Postintervention G1:81% (70-92%) G3: 73% (59-88%) | NR | Pericoronitis, caries and pulpal pathology  Weighted t-test |
| Banait et al., 20032 | G1: Mailed guidelines (increase reach)  G2: Educational outreach (Multicomponent) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Appropriateness of referrals for open access endoscopy. Proportion of appropriate referrals. Referrals for open access endoscopy were included if the GP had requested the procedure without a prior hospital consultation. The characteristics of each referral made in the 7 months following the initial outreach visit were appraised using predefined medical review criteria based on the guidelines. | 7 months following outreach visit  Chart | G1: 36 G2 (ITT): 44 G2 (only those that accepted invitation to participate in intervention): 27 | Median percentage of appropriate referrals per practice (IQR) G1: 50.0 (221./72.4) G2 (ITT): 63.9 (50.0/100.00) G2: 72.7 (50.0/100.0) | Difference between control and intervention practices:  Mann-Whitney z:  -2.235, 1 df,  p=0.025 | Used when appropriate”, but doesn’t provide more details.  Non-parametric tests |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Beaulieu et al., 20043 | G1: Control (not abstracted)  G2: Guideline (increase reach)  G3: Guideline + reminder notice and stickers for patients’ charts (multicomponent) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Treatment of stable angina in line with guideline. Measured by looking at the prescription of 3 cardiovascular medications in 1999. Data are odds ratios (95%CI) for receiving a prescription for the class of drug | 6 months post intervention  Computerized database of the Quebec health insurance board | Total: 2326 G2: 766 G3: 793 | β-Blocker G2: 1.00 (0.88/1.13) G3: 1.04 (0.92/1.18)  Antiplatelet G2: 1.05 (0.94/1.18) G3: 1.07 (0.95/1.20)  Hypolipaemics G2: 1.02 (0.90/1.16) G3: 0.95 (0.83/1.08) | β-Blocker G2 vs. G3: 0.04 p=NR  Antiplatelet G2 vs. G3: 0.02 p=NR  Hypolipaemics G2 vs. G3: 0.07 p=NR | | Took into account covariance between observations sharing the same hierarchical structure  multilevel logistic regression | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Becker et al., 20084 | G1: Mailed guideline (Increase clinician reach)  G2: Guideline implementation (multicomponent, clinicians only)  G3: Guideline implementation and motivational counseling directed at patient (multicomponent, clinicians and patients) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients)  Functional capacity Hannover Functional Ability Questionnaire for Measuring Back Pain-Related Functional Limitations. Normal function shows scores of 80% to 100%, scores around 70% equal a moderately, scores below 60% a severely limited function.  Days in Pain | Baseline and at 6 months and at 12 months  Self-administered questionnaire | Patient N baseline = 1378 G1: 479 G2: 489 G3: 410  N 6 months=1261 G1: 450 G2: 435 G3: 376  N 12 months=1211 G1: 425 G2: 421 G3: 365 | Functional capacity:  6 months G1: M=70.29 G2: M=72.94 G3: M=73.94  12 months G1: M=71.56 G2: M=72.96 G3: M=74.64  Days in pain 6 months G1: M=80.78 G2: M=63.35 G3: M=62.91  12 months G1: M=71.32 G2: M=58.48 G3: M=61.57 | Functional capacity (odds ratios for groups compared with control only) 6 months Mean diff (95% CI) G1 vs. G2: 2.65  (-0.70/6.01) G1 vs. G3: 3.65 (0.32/6.98) G2 vs. G3: 0.999\* p=NR  12 months Mean diff (95% CI) G1 vs. G2: 1.40  (-2.24/5.02) G1 vs. G3: 3.11  (-0.47/6.70) G2 vs. G3: 1.681\* p=NR  Days in Pain | | Sex, age, fear avoidance, physical activity, and number of days in pain during previous 6 months  Multilevel mixed modeling accounting for clustering of data on practice level | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Becker et al., 20084 (continued) |  |  |  |  |  | 6 months G1 vs. G2: -16.43  (-26.83/-6.03) G1 vs. G3: -17.87  (-28.18/-7.55) G2 vs. G3: 0.434\*  p=NR  12 months G1 vs. G2: -12.84  (-23.38/-2.30) G1 vs. G3: -9.76  (-20.20/-0.69) G2 vs. G3: 3.085\* p=NR | |  | |
| Bekkering et al., 20055,6 | G1: Received guidelines by mail (increase reach)  G2: Received guidelines + active training strategy (multicomponent) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Adherence to 4 recommendations. Proportion of patients for whom each and all 4 were fulfilled. | Baseline and followup (exact time not specified)  Chart | physiotherapists  G1: 48  G2: 37  Patients G1: 253 G2: 247 | Limit # of sessions in normal course:  G1: 13% G2: 27% Set functional treatment goals G1: 71% G2: 79%  Use mainly active interventions G1: 605 G2:77%  Give adequate information G1: 87% G2: 96%  All four recommendations G1: 30% G2: 42% | Effect of strategy OR (95%CI) Limit # of sessions: 2.39 (1.12/5.12)  Set functional treatment goals 1.99 (1.06/3.72)  Use mainly active interventions 2.79 (1.19/6.55)  Give adequate interventions 3.59 (1.35/9.55)  All four 2.05 (1.15/3.65) | | Postgraduate education in low back pain  logistical multilevel analyses | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Bishop and Wing, 200641 | G1: Control (not abstracted)  G2: Physician only (increase reach)  G3: Physician and patient (multicomponent) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Guideline-concordant treatment advice for 0-4 week post onset. The compulsory WCB physician report forms were collected and scored. Dichotomous measure of 1 = presence of concordant/ discordant behavior. | Once at 0-4 weeks  WCB reports | 0-4 weeks Overall=462 G2: 162 G3: 151 | Concordant Behavior:  Education & Reassurance G2: 10% G3: 6% Exercise:  G2: 38% G3: 53% Appropriate Medication= G2: 85% G3: 81% Spinal Manipulation G2: 2.5% G3: 5% Discordant Behavior: Bedrest: G2: 10% G3: 18%  NOTE: Authors did not provide any figures, tables, or data for the >12 week measures. Only state no change seen in the recommended use of ongoing supervised exercise programs. | Percentage difference (authors only compared groups with control) Education & Reassurance:  G2 vs. G3: 4%\*, p=NR Exercise:  G2 vs. G3: 15%\* p=NR G1 vs. G3: 10% difference, p=0.05 Appropriate Medication G2 vs. G3: 4%\*, p=NR Spinal Manipulation G2 vs. G3: 2.5%\*, p=NR Bedrest G2 vs. G3: 8%\*, p=NR Control vs. G2: p=0.05  NOTE: Authors did not analyze between groups difference from each other. Only state no change seen in the recommended use of ongoing supervised exercise programs. | | None  Chi-square | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Bishop and Wing, 200641 (continued) |  |  |  |  |  | Appears all p-values apply to comparisons with the control group, not among G2 and G3.  Bedrest data are for 5-12 weeks, while other data are for 0-4 weeks. | |  | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Campbell et al., 20047 | G1: Control (not abstracted)  G2: LHA (increase motivation)  G3: TPV (multicomponent)  G4: TPV and LHA (multicomponent) | Health-related decisions or behavior (applicable for general public/patients)  Diet. Dietary fruit and vegetable consumption were measured with the 60-item version of the National cancer health habits and history food frequency questionnaire. The questionnaire assesses frequency of consumption and portion size. The Block database was then used to determine fat consumption, percentage of calories from fat, and number of daily servings of fruits and vegetables. Results shown as servings per day (Mean, Standard Error) | Baseline and 1 yr followup  Self-report | N=587  G2: 123 G3: 159 G4: 176 | Fruit and vegetable servings/day Baseline G2: 3.5 (0.18) G3: 3.3 (0.16) G4: 3.4 (0.15)  Followup G2: 3.5 (0.18) G3: 3.9 (0.16) G4: 3.7 (0.15)  % meeting 5-a-day recommendations baseline G2: 16.0 G3: 18.9 G4: 19.5  Followup G2: 15.4 G3: 21.7 G4: 26.4 | G2 vs. G3: 0.2 G2 vs. G4:0.1 G3 vs. G4: 0.1 ns p=0.87  Followup G2 vs. G3: 0.4 G2 vs. G4:0.2 G3 vs. G4: 0.2 p=0 .02 for the TPV “intervention main effect” (NOTE: believe meaning the main effect from the TPV/LHA interaction term, but the main effect is compared to control group in all cases in this study) % meeting 5-a-day recommendations baseline G2 vs. G3: 2.9 G2 vs. G4: 3.5 G3 vs. G4: 0.6 ns, p=0 .34 followup G2 vs. G3: 6.3 G2 vs. G4: 11.0 G3 vs. G4: 4.7 p=0.04 for the TPV “intervention main effect” (see above) | | Demographics  Regression models | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Carney et al., 20058 | G1: Mailed health information (increase reach)  G2: Telephone counseling (increase motivation) | Health-related decisions or behavior (applicable for general public/patients)  Adherence to screening.  To determine participants’ levels of adherence to screening, the dates of all mammographic encounters that occurred among women in the study were entered into the analysis database. Coded as dichotomy | Over the span of a year  Objective measurement; NIH mammography registry | Overall N=258 G1: 126 G2: 132 | Between 1st and 2nd intervention= G1: 47.7% G2: 60.3%  Between 15 months and after 2nd intervention= G1: 34.8% G2: 41.3% | Difference in groups between 1st and 2nd intervention=12.6%, p=0.04  Difference in groups between 15 months and after 2nd intervention=6.5%, p=0.29 | | NR  Chi-square | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Christakis et al., 20069 | G1: Usual care (not abstracted)  G2: Parental content Alone (increase reach)  G3: Provider notification alone (not abstracted)  G4: Parental content and provider notification (multicomponent) | Discussions about the evidence  “At your child’s most recent checkup on [date of last visit], did you and your child’s doctor discuss [each topic]?” All parents were asked about all of the relevant prevention topics targeted by MyHealthyChild, regardless if they had expressed interest. | 2 to 4 weeks after scheduled well-child visit, participants completed a telephone interview  Self-report | Unclear | IRR (95%CI)  G2: 1.05 (0.97-1.13)  G4: 1.09 (1.00-1.20) | G2 vs. G4: 0.04\* | | NR  Poisson analysis | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Davis et al., 200410 | G1: Control - guidelines by mail (increase reach)  G2: Intermediate (multicomponent)  G3: High intervention (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients)  SF-36 general health-related quality of life instrument. Mean composite scores range from 0-100. Higher scores represent better patient-perceived health related QOL. | baseline and 12 month followup  Self-report | Patients at Baseline:  Overall:1,133  G1: 370 G2: 364 G3: 399  Patients at followup Overall=811 G1: 255 G2: 269 G3: 287 | Baseline scores with 95% CI Mental component summary G1: 47.7 (45.2/50.2) G2: 49.7 (48.1/51.3) G3: 49.8 (47.9/51.7)  Physical component summary G1: 44.4 (42.5/46.2) G2: 45.8 (43.2/48.4) G3: 43.6 (41.5/45.6)  General health profile G1: 63.7 (58.3/69.2) G2: 67.6 (64.9/70.3) G3: 62.1 (59.1/65.1)  12 month followup score with 95% CI Mental component summary:  G1: 48 (46.0/50.0) G2: 50.2 (48.6/51.9) G3: 49.0 (46.5/51.4) Physical component summary:  G1: 43.2 (39.4/47.1) G2: 45.1 (42.7/47.4) G3: 44.0 (41.8/46.1) General health profile:  G1: 63.4 (53.8/68.5) G2: 66.8 (63.5/70.2) G3: 62.0 (57.9/66.0) | No significant differences in scale scores were seen across the arms at baseline or after the intervention Mental summary:  G1 vs. G2: 2.0\* G1 vs. G3: 2.1\* G2 vs. G3: 0.1\* p=NR Physical summary G1 vs. G2: 1.4\* G1 vs. G3: 0.8\* G2 vs. G3: 2.2\* p=NR  General health: G1 vs. G2: 3.9\* G1 vs. G3: 1.6\* G2 vs. G3: 5.5\* p=NR  12 month followup Mental summary: G1 vs. G2: 2.2\* G1 vs. G3: 1.0\* G2 vs. G3: 1.2\* p=NR Physical summary G1 vs. G2: 1.9\* G1 vs. G3: 0.8\* G2 vs. G3: 1.1\* p=NR General health: G1 vs. G2: 3.4\* G1 vs. G3: 1.4\* G2 vs. G3: 4.8\* p=NR | | | deprivation, age, sex, and the training status of the practice  t tests |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Eaton et al., 201111 | G1: 1-hour academic detailing (increase clinician ability)  G2: Academic detailing plus a patient education toolkit, a computer kiosk with patient activation software, and a PDA-based decision support tool (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients)  Percentage of patients screened for hyperlipidemia and treated to their LDL and non–HDL cholesterol goals | Baseline and one year postintervention  Objective measurement (medical records) and self-report (by physicians ) | 4,105 patients G1: 2,000 G2: 2,105 | Both groups improved screening (89%) and the percentage of patients at their LDL (74%) and non-HDL cholesterol goals (74%), p<.001.   Results by group, p=NR | No significant difference between groups for primary outcome. Post hoc analysis: G2: Difference: Practices with above-median use of the patient activation kiosk were more likely to have patients screened with a full lipid profile OR: 2.54 95% CI: 1.97 to 3.27 p=NR  Difference: Physicians who were more frequent users of the PDA decision support tool were more likely to have their patients at LDL cholesterol goals (16%) OR = 1.16 95% CI: 0.98 to 1.36  Difference: Physicians who were more frequent users of the PDA decision support tool were more likely to have their patients at LDL cholesterol | | | None  Generalized linear mixed model |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Eaton et al., 201111 (continued) |  |  |  |  |  | goals (16%) OR:1.27; 95% CI, 1.07-1.50 and non-HDL cholesterol goals (12%) OR: 1.12 95% CI: 0.95-1.32 | | |  |
| Elder et al., 2005;12 200642 | G1: Culturally targeted print-materials + activity inserts (increase reach)  G2: Tailored print materials + activity inserts + supporting materials (multicomponent).  G3: Tailored print materials + in-person promotora (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients)  % calories from fat | Baseline, 12 week followup, and 12 month followup  Self-report face-to-face interview | Baseline N=357 G1: 119 G2: 118 G3: 120 Followups N=313 G1: 107 G2: 99 G3: 107 | Adjusted Mean at Time 2  12 weeks  % calories from fat:  G1: 30% G2: 30.4% G3: 29.3%  12 months  NR | 12 weeks  G1 vs. G2: 0.4%\* G2 vs. G3: 1.1%\* G1 vs. G3: 0.7%\* p=NR, but it was not significant.  12 months  NR | | | Baseline measure  Tukey-Kramer multiple comparison test  Mixed effects regression |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Feldstein et al., 200613 | G1: Usual care (not abstracted)  G2: EMR reminder (increase reach for clinicians)  G3: EMR reminder and patient reminder (via letter with educational materials (multicomponent) | Health-related decisions or behavior (applicable for general public/patients)  Percent receiving pharmacological treatment defined as drugs dispensed to patient from outpatient pharmacy system | Within 6 months of intervention  Objective measure from pharmacy system | G1: 101 G2: 101 G3: 109 | G1: 4.0% G2: 11.9% G3: 10.1% | Difference:  G2 vs. G1: 7.9  95% CI: .47 (.35-.59) p=NR G3 vs. G1 6.1 95% CI: .38 (.26-.50) p=NR G3 vs. G2: -2.2 95% CI:NR | | | Fracture type, age, weight less than 127 pounds, osteoporosis diagnosis, and Charlson co-morbidity index.  General linear modeling using treatment group, fracture type, age, weight, osteoporosis diagnosis and Charlson Comorbidity Index indicators. Models include independent variables significant in univariate analyses at p<0.10. Continuous outcome measures change scores regressed on the baseline values and indicators of treatment groups. Logistic regression used for unadjusted results. |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Gattellari et al., 200514 | G1: Leaflet (increase reach)  G2: Video (increase reach)  G3: Booklet (increase reach) | Knowledge about the evidence  14-item measure comprised of 10 T/F questions and 4 multiple choice questions administered at pre and posttest - 2 items on efficacy of PSA screening; 3 on test accuracy; 1 on controversy about PSA screening; 4 on nature of prostate cancer; 2 on risk factors for prostate cancer, and 2 on treatment-related issues; scores were summed and multiplied by 100 for % of items correctly answered | Mean 21 days after receiving information (range 15 to 31)  Self-report | N=405 | Pretest: G1: 30.1% G2: 28.7% G3: 29.8%  Posttest: G1: 42.2% G2: 45.8% G3: 57.2% | Absolute differences within arms (prepost):  G1: 12.1%\*, CI and p<0.001 G2: 17.1%\*, CI and p<0.001 G3: 27.9%\*, CI and p<0.001  Absolute difference in changes between arms: G2-G1: 5.0%\*, CI and p=NR G3-G1: 15.8%\*, CI and p=NR G3-G2: 10.8%\*, CI and p=NR  Posttest G2-G1: 3.6%\* Posttest G3-G1: 15.0%\* Posttest G3-G2: 11.4%\* Overall p<0.001 | | | None  Wilcoxon signed rank test and ANOVA |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Hagmolen et al., 200815 | G1: Guideline dissemination (increase reach)  G2: Guideline dissemination + educational program (increase ability)  G3: Guideline dissemination + educational program + individualized treatment advice based on airway responsiveness and symptoms (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients)  Change in AHR: reflects severity of the asthma. A single concentration methacholine challenge test was performed when FEV% predicted was greater than or equal to 75%. The degree of AHR was expressed as a PD20. Moderate to severe AHR was defined as a PD20 of less than or equal to 300 mcg. | Baseline and one year followup; one year between measures  Objective measurement | Overall N=362 G1: 98 G2: 133 G3: 131  Also conducted post-hoc analysis where Groups 1 and 2 were combined | G1: M=8.3 (SE = 0.2)  G2: M=8.2 (SE = 0.2)  G3: M=8.7 (SE = 0.2)   Post-hoc analysis:  G1&G2: M=8.3 (SE=0.2) G3: M=8.7 (SE=0.2) | Difference:  G1 vs. G2: 0.1\* G1 vs. G3: 0.4\* G2 vs. G3: 0.5\* No significant differences between all 3 groups p=0.09 Significant difference between baseline and end of study for G3: 0.7, p=0.001  Post-hoc analysis (aggregated groups 1 & 2):  G1&G2 vs. G3: 0.4\* Significant difference between groups p=0.03 Significant difference between baseline and end of study for G1&G2 combined: 0.27, p=0.05 and G3: .7, p<0.001. | | | NR  Mixed model ANOVA analyses |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Jain et al., 200616 | G1: Passive intervention- guidelines by mail (increase reach)  G2: Active intervention (multicomponent) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Nutritional adequacy of EN. Defined as the calories received from EN divided by the maximum total daily calories prescribed (recommended by the dietitian) for each individual patient during the first 12 days of ICU stay. | Baseline, 12 month followup  Chart | Practice Overall=58 ICUs randomized as 50 clusters G1: 25 clusters G2: 25 clusters  Patients Baseline Overall=623 G1: 298 G2: 325 Followup Overall=612 G1: 305 G2: 307  Note: the patients were not the same at baseline and followup. The authors took a cross-sectional survey at both time points. | Baseline Mean ± SE  G1: 45.2 ± 2.5 G2: 40.7 ± 2.5  Followup G1: 51.3 ± 2.6 (change from baseline: 6.2 ± 2.2,  p=0.005) G2: 48.7 ± 2.6 (change from baseline 8.0 ± 2.1, p<0.001) | Baseline Difference (G1- G2) Mean ± SE - 4.5 ± 3.5  Followup Difference (G1- G2) Mean ± SE - 2.6 ± 3.5  Change 1.9 ± 3.1, p=0.541  In Subgroup analysis of medical patients only, the difference was significant.  Difference in change from baseline to followup between groups: 8.1 ± 3.9, p=0.036 | | | ICU length of stay  Two-level hierarchical model as implemented in HLM |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Jousimaa et al., 200217 | G1: Computerized version of guidelines (increase ability)  G2: Textbook-based version of guidelines (increase reach) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Number (and percent) of relevant consultations compliant with guidelines | One month postintervention  Objective and self-report | Laboratory examinations: Overall N= G1: 1640 G2: 1529 Radiological examinations: Overall N= G1: 1604 G2: 1518 Physical examinations: Overall N= G1: 1610 G2: 1545 Other examinations: Overall N= G1: 314 G2: 307 Procedures: Overall N= G1: 196 G2: 171 Nonpharma-cologic treatment: Overall N= G1: 92 G2: 122 Pharmacologic treatments: Overall N= G1: 1654 G2: 1568 | Laboratory examinations: G1: 1481 (90.3%) G2: 1372 (89.7%) Radiological examinations: G1: 1504 (93.8%) G2: 1416 (93.3%) Physical examinations: G1: 1494 (92.8%) G2: 1461 (94.6%) Other examinations: G1: 235 (74.8%) G2: 248 (80.8%) Procedures: G1: 152 (77.6%) G2: 140 (81.9%) Nonpharmacologic treatment: G1: 80 (87.0%) G2: 110 (90.2%) Pharmacologic treatments: G1: 1391 (84.1%) G2: 1350 (86.1%) Physiotherapy: G1: 77 (78.6%) G2: 83 (80.6%) Referrals: G1: 1619 (96.1%) G2: 1508 (95.6%) | Proportion of noncompliant decisions considered to be clinically important (major or serious) similar in the two groups: 47.4% (407/859) in G1 compared with 46.3% (349/753) G2.  No statistically significant differences between groups in terms of compliance.  Outcome, OR (95% CI)  Laboratory exams: G1 vs. G2: 109 Difference:  OR=1.07 (0.79-1.44) ICC: 0.015  Radiological exams: G1 vs. G2: 88 Difference:  OR=1.09 (0.81-1.46) ICC: 0 Physical examinations: G1 vs. G2: 33 Difference:  OR=0.74 (0.51-1.06) ICC: 0.015 | | | NR  Chi-squared tests; a retrospective power calculation, adjusting for clustering using an ICC of 0.015 and an average cluster size of 27 |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Jousimaa et al., 200217 (continued) |  |  |  | Physio-therapy: Overall N= G1: 98 G2: 103 Referrals: Overall N= G1: 1684 G2: 1578 |  | Other examinations: G1 vs. G2: 13 Difference:  OR=0.71 (0.43-1.17) ICC: 0.021 Procedures: G1 vs. G2: 12 Difference:  OR=0.77 (0.43-1.36) ICC: 0 Nonpharmacologic treatment: G1 vs. G2: 30 Difference:  OR=0.73 (0.22-2.41) ICC: 0.058 Pharmacologic treatments: G1 vs. G2: 41 Difference:  OR=0.85 (0.67-1.09) ICC: 0.010  Physiotherapy: G1 vs. G2: 6 Difference:  OR=0.88 (0.34-2.32) ICC: 0.195 Referrals: G1 vs. G2: 111 Difference:  OR=1.13 (0.79-1.63) ICC: 0.002 | | |  |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Junghans et al., 200718 | G1: Conventional guideline (increase reach)  G2: Ratings about specific patients in vignettes (increase motivation) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Agreement of physicians’ recommendations with those made by 2 independent expert panels. Agreement was defined by a physician recommending definitely or probably doing a test rated appropriate by the panels or by recommending definitely or probably not doing a test rated inappropriate. An unsure recommendation was interpreted as disagreement | Baseline and immediate posttest  Self-reported decision | N=292 G1: 147 G2: 145 | % that had an appropriate Baseline  Exercise ECG G1: 42.7% G2: 43.5%  Angiography G1: 64.9% G2: 64%  Postintervention Exercise ECG decision G1: 43.5% G2: 54.9%  Angiography G1: 64% G2: 79.9% | Between-arm comparisons  Odds Ratio (95%CI), P value  Patient-specific ratings Exercise ECG OR: 1.57 (1.36,1.82), P<0.001  Angiography OR: 2.24 (1.90,2.62), P<0.001  Convential guidelines Exercise ECG OR: 0.96 (0.83,1.11), P<0.001  Angiography OR: 1.05 (0.87,1.26), P<0.001 | | | NR  Random-effects logistic regression analysis allowing for intracluster correlation |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Kennedy et al., 200319 | G1: Control (not abstracted)  G2: Information (increase reach)  G3: Interview (increase motivation) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients)  Health Status. Measured using the 36-item short-form general health survey (SF-36) instrument | 6 and 12 month data merged together to for a “short-term” followup dataset.   24 months is labeled “long-term”  Self-report | Overall=595 G2: 198 (97% completed) G3: 208 (94% completed) | NR | Adjusted mean between-group difference (G2 vs. G3) at short-term followup (95% CI) Physical function: 0.0 (-3.5/3.5) Social function: -2.7 (-7.7/2.2) Role physical:  -2.5 (-10.3/5.2) Role emotional:  -4.6 (-13.9/13.7) Mental health:  -2.5 (-6.6/1.6) Energy: -2.5  (-6.9/2.0) Pain=-1.3 (-6.4/3.9) General health perception: -0.8 (-5.2/3.5)  Adjusted mean between-group difference (G2 vs. G3) at long-term followup (95% CI) PF: -1.5 (-5.2/2.3) SF: 3.2 (-1.6/8.1) RP: 5.7 (-2.1/13.6) RE: 7.1 (-2.0/16.4) MH: 1.1 (-2.8/4.9) Energy: 0.4 (-5.0/5.7) Pain: 0.3(-5.2/5.7) GHP: -0.1 (-4.0/3.7) | | | Consultant sex; Consultant year of qualification; Age; Baseline health status score; Baseline menorrhagia severity; Baseline knowledge; Duration of problem; Length of followup  Multiple regression |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| King et al., 200720 | G1: Attention control (not abstracted)  G2: Counselor via phone (increase motivation)  G3: Automated counselor via phone (increase reach) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients)  Physical activity behavior.  Assessed using the Stanford 7-Day PAR. The PAR-based mean daily energy expenditure estimates from MOD activity was the primary study outcome measure (#1 below). Measures:  (1) PAR energy expenditures in moderate-intensity or more vigorous (MOD+) activity, kcal/kg-1/day-1 (SD) (2) PAR minutes of MOD+ activity/wk, Mean (SD) (3) PAR days/wk engaged in ≥ 30 min of MOD+ activity, Mean(SD) | Baseline, 6, 12 months  Self report | N=189 G2: 66 G3: 61 | PAR kcal/kg-1/day-1 (SD) Baseline G2: 0.85 (1.0) G3: 0.80(1.2) 6 months G2: 1.69 (1.1) G3: 1.53 (1.3) 12 months G2: 1.64 (1.3) G3: 1.56 (1.4)  PAR min. of MOD+ activity/wk Baseline G2: 99.7 (147.6) G3: 78.4 (113.3) 6 months G2: 170.7 (104.4) G3: 180.0 (230.6) 12 months G2: 177.8 (133.6) G3: 157.3 (142.9)  PAR days/wk engaged in ≥ 30 min of MOD+ Baseline G2: 1.4(1.5) G3: 1.1 (1.6) 6 months G2: 3.2 (2.0) G3: 2.6 (2.3) 12 months G2: 3.1 (2.0) G3: 2.8 (2.5) | Changes across 6 months PAR kcal/kg-1/day-1 G2 vs. G3: 0.11\* p=0.73 PAR min. of MOD+ activity/week G2 vs. G3: 9.3\*, p=0.65 PAR days/week engaged in ≥ 30 min of MOD+ G2 vs. G3: 0.3\*, p=NR but it was ns  Changes across 12 months kcal/kg-1/day-1 (SD) G2 vs. G3=0.08\*, p=0.60 PAR min. of MOD+ activity/week G2 vs. G3: 20.5\*, p=0.66 PAR days/week engaged in ≥ 30 min of MOD+ G2 vs. G3: 0.3\*, p=NR but it was ns | | | Baseline levels of dependent variables Gender  ANCOVA |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Laprise et al., 200921 | G1: CME (increase ability)  G2: CME + practice enablers and reinforcers (multicomponent) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Adherence to guidelines. Proportion of patients, undermanaged at baseline for at least 1 recommendation, for which study physicians undertook at least 1 preventive-care action in the first visit following patients’ recruitment in the study. A binary outcome was used. | Baseline and followup (exact time not specified)  Retrospective audit information | G1: 948 G2: 1396 | Baseline  # of undermanaged rec/patient, n (%) None G1: 172 (18.1%) G2: 263 (18.8%) 1 G1: 313 (33.0%) G2: 452 (32.4%) 2 G1: 282 (29.7%) G2: 339 (32.2%) 3-5 G1: 181 (19.1%) G2: 232 (16.6%)  Followup Implementation of at least 1 of the secondary outcomes  G1: 225 (29.0%) G2: 474(41.8%) | Odds Ratio (95% CI) 1.78 (1.32-2.41) | | | NR  Logistic regression |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Lien et al., 2007,22 Svetkey et al., 2003,23 Young et al., 200924 | G1: Advice only (increase reach)  G2: Advice + behavioral counseling using established intervention (multicomponent)  G3: Established intervention + DASH dietary recommendations (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients)  Change in BP. SBP was the appearance of the first Korotkoff sound; DBP was the disappearance of Korotkoff sounds. At each assessment point, BP was the mean of all of the available measurements. Per criteria: good levels of BP are ≥130/≥85 mm Hg | Baseline and at 6-month followup.  2 BP measurements separated by 30 seconds were obtained and averaged/  Objective measurement | Overall N=671 G1: 273 G2: 188 (71% of randomized participants) G3: 210 (78% of randomized participants) | Reduction from baseline to 6 month followup for SBP G1: 6.6 (9.2) mm Hg G2: 10.5 (10.1) mm Hg G3: 11.1 (9.9) mm Hg  Reduction from baseline to 6 month followup for DBP G1: 3.8 (6.3) mm Hg G2: 5.5 (6.7) mm Hg G3: 6.4 (6.8) mm Hg | On Treatment Analysis Change (Δ) in BP between-group differences (Mean and CI) Δ in G2 minus Δ in G1: -4.9 (-6.6 to -3.3) P<0.001 Δ in G3 minus Δ in G1: -5.7 (-7.2 to -4.1) p<0.001 Δ in G3 minus Δ in G2: -0.7 (-2.5 to 1.0) p=0 .41  Change(Δ) in Diastolic BP between-group differences (Mean and CI) ΔG2-ΔG1: -2.5 (-3.7 to -1.3), p<.001 ΔG3 - ΔG1:: -3.2 (-4.3 to -2.0), p<.001 ΔG3-ΔG2: -0.7 (-1.9 to 0.6), p=0.29 | | | Age, gender, race  General linear modeling |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Lien et al., 2007,22 Svetkey et al., 2003,23 Young et al., 200924 (continued) |  |  |  |  |  | Intention to Treat Analysis SBP ΔG2-ΔG1: -3.7 (-5.3 to -2.1),  P<0.001 ΔG3-ΔG1: -4.3 (-5.9 to -2.8) P<0.001 ΔG3-ΔG2: -0.6 (-2.2 to 0.9) p=0.43 DBP ΔG2-ΔG1: -1.7 (-2.8 to -.06), P<0.01 ΔG3-ΔG1: -2.6 (-3.7 to -1.5), P<0.001 ΔG3-ΔG2: -0.9 (-2.0 to 0.2), p=0.11 | | |  |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Marcus et al., 200925 | G1: Contact control treatment delayed group (not abstracted)  G2: Telephone-based individualized feedback (increase motivation)  G3: Print-based individualized feedback (increase reach) | Behavioral intentions to use or apply the evidence  Instrument developed for behavioral processes of change for exercise by Marcus, et al. | Baseline, 6 and 12 months  Self-report | NR | G1:  6 Months: 2.43;  12 Months: 2.41 G2:  6 Months: 3.08;  12 Months: 2.82  G3:  6 Months: 2.95;  12 Months: 2.91 | Difference:  6 Months: F=24.01;  12 Months: 13.73 95% CI: NR  6 Months:  p<0.0001  12 Months: p<0.0001 | | | Yes  Analysis of covariance, adjusted for treatment effects for gender and seasonal differences. When overall test of between-groups differences was significant at the >05 level, the source of these differences was examined further using single-degree-of-freedom contrasts that compared the active treatment arms with each other as well as with the treatment delayed group. |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | | |
| Maxwell et al.,201026 | G1: Control (not abstracted)  G2: Educational session + letter to provider (multicomponent)  G3: Educational session + letter to provider + FOBT kit (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients)  Self-reported screening  NOTE: participants w/out outcome data were classified as not-screened | 6 months  Self-report  NOTE: subsample validated by physician report for 141 patients | 542, but imputed information on 110 of them (20%) | G1: 14 (9%) G2: 45 (25%) G3: 61 (30%) | G2 v. G3 Difference: 5%  95% CI: NR p=NR  OR G2 to G1 (95% CI): 3.7 (1.8, 7.5) P<0.001  OR G3 to G1 (95% CI): 4.9 (2.4, 9.9) P<0.001 | | | Adjusted for baseline imbalance (e.g. language of baseline interview) and clustering within organization and session  Mixed effects model w/random intercepts for organizations and session within organization |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** |
| Murtaugh et al.,200527 | G1: Usual care (not abstracted)  G2: Basic intervention email reminder (increase reach)  G3: Augmented intervention of email reminder + package of supporting materials (multicomponent) | Discussions about the evidence  % giving patients global instructions about signs and symptoms of CHF | Chart-review of subsequent RN visit, within 45 days of initial intake  chart | 354 | | Overall N=354 G1: 42.1% G2: 53.9% G3: 59.5% | Difference G2-G1: 11.8%, p=0.070  Difference G3-G1: 17.4%, p=0.007 Difference G3-G2: 5.6%\*, CI and p=NR | Sociodemo-graphic variables of the RN (age, gender, race/ethnicity), Rn employment status, educational level and caseload; average baseline characteristics of patients care for by each RN including health, functional status; geographic area where nurse provided care  Predictive multivariate modeling |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Paradis et al.,201128 | G1: Paper handouts (increase reach)  G2: Educational DVD (increase reach) | Knowledge about the evidence  Knowledge of infant development; measured using a subset of 14 questions from the 58-item Knowledge of Infant Development. Inventory that pertained most to newborns. Answers were scored as correct or incorrect. Parents could answer each statement with “agree,” “disagree,” or “not sure,” with uncertain answers considered incorrect. | 2 weeks postintervention  Self-report | Overall N=137 G1: 67 G2: 70 | Mean change in Knowledge (from baseline): G1: -0.06 (S =2.99) G2: 0.00 (SD=2.53)  NOTE: baseline scores G1: 10.2 G2: 9.4 | G2-G1: -0.06 p=0.90 | | Hispanic ethnicity, babies born at outside hospital, #exclusively breast fed  multivariate regression analysis | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Partin et al., 200429 | G1: Usual care (not abstracted)  G2: Pamphlet (increase reach)  G3: Video (increase reach) | Knowledge about the evidence  CaP screening knowledge, as assessed from a 10-item index. The index score is calculated as the summative number of correct responses to 10 knowledge questions. “Don’t know” responses are treated as incorrect. Index scores range from 0 to 10 | 1 week post target appointment  Self-report | N=893 G2: 295 G3: 308 | CaP knowledge index: mean scores: G2: 7.3 G3: 7.4  Other CaP screening knowledge items (Unadjusted) PSA predictive value G2: 0.22 G3: 0.28 Natural History G2: 0.61 G3: 0.62 Treatment efficacy G2: 0.20 G3: 0.19 Expert disagreement G2: 0.18 G3: 0.29 | CaP Index:  G2 vs. G3: 0.1\*, p=NR  Other CaP knowledge items: PSA predictive value G2 vs. G3: 0.06\*, ns Natural History G2 vs. G3: 0.01\*, ns Treatment efficacy G2 vs. G3: 0.01\*, ns Expert disagreement G2 vs. G3: .11\*, p=0.009 | | Baseline characteristics  Logistic regression and standard linear regression | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Rahme et al., 200530 | G1: No treatment control (not abstracted)  G2: Decision tree (increase ability)  G3: Workshop (increase ability)  G4: Workshop + decision tree (multicomponent) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Retrospective assessment of prescribing.  A score of zero or 1 was given to every prescription that was judged as adequate according to the decision tree. | 5-months prior to intervention/5-months postintervention  Objective measurement:  Data were obtained from the Provincial Health Care Fund database | N of prescriptions Preintervention Total: 5318 G2: 1569 G3:536 G4: 1776  Postintervention Total: 4610 G2: 1317 G3: 450 G4: 1634 | Preintervention G2: 51% G3: 51% G4: 58%  Postintervention G2: 54% G3: 56% G4: 62% | Only compared groups to control: Ratio of OR (95%CI) G2 vs. CRL: 1.0 (0.6/1.7) G3 vs. CTRL: 5.7 (0.4/26.9) G4 vs. Ctrl: 1.9 (0.9/3.8)  Within-group differences (post vs. pre) G2: 1.3 (0.9-1.8) G3: 1.6 (0.9-1.8) G4: 1.8 (1.3-2.4) | | Risk of gastrointestinal even.   Additional analyses: Per protocol analysis excluding physicians in the workshop and workshop and tree group who did not attend the workshop  Multilevel Bayesian hierarchical model | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Rebbeck et al., 200631 | G1: Dissemination of guidelines by mail (increase reach)  G2: Implementation group (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients)  Disability - measured using the Functional Rating Index which measures disability due to back and neck pain. It is a 10-item questionnaire with a 5-point response scale for each item. Summation of the 10 items yields a score ranging from 0 to 40, with higher scores indicating greater perceived disability. | Baseline, month 1.5, month 3, month 6, month 12  Self-report | Baseline: G1: 28 G2: 71 Month 1.5 G1: 24 G2: 64 Month 3 G1: 23 G2: 59 Month 6 G1: 19 G2: 56 Month 12 G1: 26 G2: 67 | Baseline: G1: M=23.9, SD=8.6 G2: 22.8, SD=8.2 Month 1.5 G1: 14.8, SD=8.8 G2: 15.8, SD=8.7 Month 3 G1: 12.8, SD=8.5 G2: 12.7, SD=8.5 Month 6 G1: 11.3, SD=9.3 G2: 11.5, SD=9.0 Month 12 G1: 12.0, SD=10.4 G2: 11.4, SD=8.9 | Baseline Difference (G1 vs. G2): 1.0\* 95% CI: -6.1 to 4.1 p=0.68 Month 1.5 Difference (G1 vs. G2): 1.0\* 95% CI: -5.1 to 7.1 p=0.74 Month 3 Difference (G1 vs. G2): 0.1\* 95% CI: -5.8 to 5.7 p=0.99 Month 6 Difference (G1 vs. G2): 0.1\* 95% CI: -6.4 to 6.7 p=0.97 Month 12 Difference (G1 vs. G2): 0.6\*  95% CI: -7.8 to 6.6 p=0.87 | | NR  T-test, adjusted using methods for cluster-randomized trials | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Rimer et al., 200132 | G1: No treatment control/usual care (not abstracted)  G2: Tailored print (increase reach)  G3: Tailored print + telephone counseling (multicomponent) | Health-related decisions or behavior (applicable for general public/patients)  Receipt of a mammogram yearly | Interview 15 months after receiving intervention  Self-report | Overall N=1127 G1: 412 G2: 392 G3: 323 | Baseline- percent up-to-date NR Followup mammogram in 15 months: G1: 260\*, 63% G2: 239\*, 61% G3: 223\*, 69% | Overall p=0.066 G2-G1:- 2%\*, NS G3-G1: 6%\*, NS G3-G2: 8%\*, NS | | None  Pearson chi-squared; F-test | |
| Rycroft-Malone  201233 | G1: Standard dissemination via postal mail (increase reach)  G2: Standard dissemination + a Web-based education package championed by an opinion leader (Multicomponent)  G3: Standard dissemination + plan-do-study-act (Multicomponent) | Clinical:  Duration of fluid fast prior to induction of anaesthesia— Asked patients preoperatively when they last drank and postoperatively when they had a first drink. This information was also checked against reported information in their notes. | Data were collected 4 times preintervention and 4 times postintervention; up to 2 months interval between data collection points  Self-report and objective measurement | Preintervention timepoints: N=1,440  Postintervention timepoints:  N=1,761 | Preintervention=  G1: M=10.1 hours (95% CI: 7.74, 12.5)  G2: M=8.83 hours (95% CI: 7.27, 10.4)  G3: M=9.86 hours (95% CI: 8.02, 11.7)  Postintervention=  G1: M=8.97 hrs. (95% CI: 6.77, 11.2)  G2: M=8.25 hrs. (95% CI: 6.92, 9.58)  G3: M=8.90 hrs. (95% CI: 7.28, 10.5) | Postintervention=  G1: p=0.160  G2: p=0.814  G3: p=0.714  Postintervention Differences  G2-G1: -0.72\*  G3-G1: -0.07\*  G3-G2: 0.65\*  No significant difference in the mean fluid fast time in the postintervention period between the intervention groups (p=0.751).  Effect size: G2 vs. G1: 0.33 (95% CI −0.78, 1.42);  Effect size: G3 vs. G1: 0.12 (95% CI −0.97, 1.21).  No effect size reported for G3 vs. G2. | | NR  ANOVA | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Simon et al., 200534 | G1: Mailed educational materials (increase reach)  G2: Individual academic detailing (increase ability)  G3: Group academic detailing (increase ability) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Change in guideline adherence - A patient was considered to have received a diuretic or beta blocker if he or she received at least one prescription for either drug during the specified time frame. | Baseline, 1-year followup, 2-year followup  Objective measurement (prescription via claims) | Baseline: 3692 Year 1: 3556 Year 2: 2572 | Percent increase Year 1 G1: 6.2% G2: 12.5% G3: 13.2% Year 2 G1: 10.1% G2: 14.7% G3: 11.3% | Year 1 G1 vs. G3: 7%\* Difference: Diuretic or beta blocker use was more likely in G3 than G1 (OR, 1.40) 95% CI: 1.11-1.76 p=NR G1 vs. G2: 6%\* Difference: Diuretic or beta blocker use was more likely in G2 than G1 (OR, 1.30) 95% CI: 0.95-1.79 p=NR Year 2 G1 vs. G2: 4.6% Difference: Diuretic or beta blocker use was more likely in G2 than G1 (OR, 1.22) 95% CI: 0.92-1.62 p=NS G1 vs. G3: 1.2% Difference: Diuretic or beta blocker use was not more likely in G3 than G1 (OR, 1.06) 95% CI: 0.80-1.39 p=NR | | Differences among individual patients  Logistic regression | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Soler et al., 201035 | G1: Control (not abstracted)  G2: Training session on the SEPAR guidelines (increase ability)  G3: G2 + portable-device for spirometry (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients)  Changes in COPD stratification and diagnostic testing according to SEPAR guidelines | Adequate COPD classification according to SEPAR guidelines  Chart | G1: 1481, G2: 2119,  G3: 5556 (Phase II) | G1: 60.1%  G2: 69%  G3: 88.5% | Absolute difference in accurate stratification: G2-G1: 8.9%, p=NR G3-G1: 28.4%, p=NR | | Baseline variable  Within group changes in the three groups assessed by ANCOVA; b/t group p-values NR | |
| Sullivan et al., 201036 | G1: VA guidelines (increase reach)  G2: COPE: web-based education program (increase ability) | Knowledge about the evidence  Knowledge of the role of opioids in CNCP was assessed with 9 multiple choice board-style questions developed by the authors covering opioid pharmacology, controlled substance regulations, and diagnostic challenges (range 0-9) | Pretraining and immediately posttraining  Self-report | N=159 | G1:  Pretest:  M=5.7, SD=1.3 Posttest:  M=6.1, SD=1.3  G2: Pretest:  M=5.9, SD=1.4 Posttest:  M=8.4, SD=0.8 | G1 vs. G2 (posttest): 2.3\*  Difference: t = 12.41, p<0.001  Difference: Significant time by group interaction (different rates of change over time) (Wald χ2 = 72.06, df = 1, p<0.00001) | | Gender; year of residency (no effects observed for these variables)  Independent group t tests; intention-to-treat analyses using the GEE | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Watson et al., 200237 | G1: Guideline materials by postal mail (increase reach)  G2: EO session and guidelines (increase ability)  G3: CPE session and guidelines (increase ability)  G4: Guidelines + EO and CPE (multicomponent) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Appropriateness of OTC management of vulvovaginal candidiasis by community pharmacy staff: measured by the proportion of visits resulting in an appropriate sale or non-sale of an anti-fungal product (based upon the guideline recommendations) | Ten local amateur actors conducted simulated patient visits with 7 scenarios. Each pharmacy was visited 7 times; twice before the intervention between March and April 2000 and five times after the intervention between July and November 2000. No pharmacy received more than one visit per month. Following each visit, the actor completed an assessment form, recording details of their visit, including sale/no sale, product details and the number of staff involved in the interaction.  Direct observation and assessment | Baseline:  G1: 27 visits; G2: 27 visits;  G3: 27 visits;  G4: 27 visits  Followup:  G1: 69 visits  G2:69 visits  G3: 69 visits G4: 69 visits | Baseline:  Appropriate Outcome: G1: 10 (37%); G2: 11 (41%);  G3: 10 (37%) G4: 10 (37%)  Followup:  Appropriate Outcome: G1: 24 (35%);  G2: 32 (46%);  G3: 25 (36%); G4: 24 (35%) | Difference: G2 EO vs. G1 no EO (41% vs. 36%)  G3 CPE compared with G1 no CPE (36% vs. 41%) No statistically significant effect of G2 EO (OR = 1.13) nor CPE (OR=0.88) on appropriateness 95% CI: EO: 0.52-2.45; CPE: 0.41-1.91 p=NR | | Clustering of visits and baseline appropriateness  GEE model | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Wetter et al., 200638 | G1: Single standard telephone-counseling session (increase reach)  G2: Multiple enhanced telephone counseling sessions (multicomponent) | Health-related decisions or behavior (applicable for general public/patients)  Smoking abstinence: self-report of no smoking during the previous 7 days | 5- and 12-week followup assessments  Self-report | NR | % abstinent Week 5: G1: 11.7%  G2: 20.3% Week 12: G1: 20.5% G2: 27.4% | Treatment effect was significant Difference: OR = 3.8 95% CI: NR p=0.048  G1 vs. G2 Week 5: 8.6% Week 12: 6.9% | | Time; demographic and tobacco-related variables  Generalized linear mixed model regression | |
| Wolters et al., 200539 | G1: Control mailed guidelines (increase reach)  G2: Intervention involving package for learning, supporting materials, decision tree, and information leaflets for patients (multicomponent) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)  Adherence to guidelines. Appropriate request of PSA. Classified patients in terms of those that met certain indications. Number of PSA ordered in patients with and without indications | Up to 1 year postintervention  Prospective recording of patient data and management immediately after consultation with eligible patient | Patient With Indications N=69 G1: 39 G2: 30  Patients Without Indications N=118 (n not reported by groups) | Patient With Indications who had PSA’s ordered ( in line with guideline) G1: 22, 66.7% G2: 15, 50%  Patient w/o indications who had PSA’s ordered (non-adherence with guideline) G1: 53.6% G2: 37.1% | Patients with no indications G1 vs. G2: 16.7% Chi sq p=00.16  People w/o indications G1 vs. G2: 16.5% Chi-sq p=00.07 | | Age, group allocation, IPSS and BS  Chi square | |

Table F-5. Key question 2 studies first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,**  **Year** | **Groups** | **Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used** | **Timing of Measurement,**  **Data Source** | **N analyzed for This Outcome** | **Results by Group** | | **Differences in Groups** | | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis,**  **Statistical Methods Used** | |
| Wright et al., 200840 | G1: Standardized lecture by expert opinion leader (increase motivation)  G2: Standardized lecture by expert opinion leader + academic detailing and a toolkit (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients)  Mean # of lymph nodes assessed in patients with stage II colon cancer | 360 days before intervention, 360 days after intervention  NR | NR | G1: Mean # of nodes assessed: 14.9 G2: Mean # of nodes assessed: 18.1 | Difference between G1 and G2 in mean # of nodes: 3.2 Difference: Significant increase in the mean # of lymph nodes assessed and the proportion of cases with 12 or more lymph nodes retrieved for G1 and G2 95% CI: NR p=0.001 No additional increase was found when the opinion leader received academic detailing and the toolkit (G2) | | NR  Logistic regression | |

\* calculated by reviewer   
**Abbreviations:** AF = audit and feedback; AHR = airway hyper-responsiveness; ANCOVA = Analysis of covariance; ANOVA = ANalysis Of Variance; b/t = between; BP = blood pressure; BS=Bother score; CAL = computer-assisted learning; CaP = Cancer of the Prostate; CHF = congestive heart failure; CI = confidence interval; CME = continuing medical education; COPE = Compassionate Options for Progressive Eldercare; CPE = continuing professional education; CRL = control; Ctrl = control; d.f. = degrees of freedom; DASH = Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension; DBP = diastolic blood pressure; DVD = optical disc storage format; ECG = electrocardiogram; EMR = electronic medical record; EN=enteral nutrition; EO = Education Outreach; FEV% = Forced Percentual Expiratory Volume; FOBT = fecal occult blood test; G = group; GEE = generalized estimating equations method; GHP = ;GP = general practitioner; HDL = high-density lipoprotein; HLM=Hierarchical Linear Modeling version 5.04, Scientific Software International; ICC = intracluster correlation coefficient; ICU = intensive care unit; IPSS=International Prostate Symptom Score; IQR = interquartile ratio; IRR = \_ incidence rate ratio; ITT = intention to treat; kcal/kg-1 = kilocalorie/kilogram; LDL = low-density lipoprotein; LHA = lay health advisor; LUTS=lower urinary tract symptoms; M=Mean; mcg = micrograms; MH = \_; mm Hg = millimeter of mercury; MOD = more of moderate or more vigorous; NR = not reported; OR = odds ratio; OTC = Over the counter; PAR = Stanford 7-Day Physical Activity Recall; PD20 = Bronchial responsiveness; PDA = personal digital assistant; PF = \_; PSA = prostate-specific antigen; RE = \_; RN=registered nurse; RP = \_; SBP = systolic blood pressure; SD = standard deviation; SE = standard error; SEPAR = Spanish Society of Pulmonology; SF-36 = Short Form (36) Health Survey; T/F = true/false; TPV = tailored and targeted print and video; VA = Veterans Administration; vs. = versus; WCB = Workers Compensation Board.