

Comparison of different ways of audit and feedback															
Study	Comparison	Outcome	N health professionals	A&F a before	A&F b before	A&F a after	A&F b after	RD: Unadj	RD: Adjust	RR: Unadjust	RR: Adjust	Study quality	Intensity of A&F	Complexity	Seriousness
Anderson	Group versus group plus individual A&F	% patient received prophylaxis for venous thromboembolism		21	27	49	55	6.00	0.00	1.12	0.87				
Kiefe	Audit with mean peer comparison versus audit with peer and achievable benchmark	% rates performance of five quality of care measures	97					5.00	2.50	1.08	1.03	moderate	moderate (both)	moderate	moderate
Sondergaard 3G	A&F from individual patients versus A&F with aggregated data plus peer comparison	% asthmatic patients treated with inhaled steroids	292						2			high	moderate (both)	low	low
van den Hombergh 1999	A&F by peer vs A&F by non-phycisian (within outreach visit in both groups)	208 indicators of practice management (40 outcomes reported)	90									moderate	moderate	high	
Continuous outcomes				Ctr before	A&F before	Ctr after	A&F after	Post difference in desired direction	Adjust change in desired direction	Prosent change relative to control after					
Wones 1987	A&F with peer comparison vs A&F without	Tests per patient-day	14			3.1	3.27	0.17	0.17	5%		moderate	moderate	moderate	
Ward 3G 1996 c	A&F + outreach by peer vs A&F + outreach by nurse	Adequate Competent Care score for diabetes	80	4.3	3.5	6.1	4.8	-1.30	-0.5	-8%		moderate	moderate	moderate	moderate
Patient outcomes								RD: Unadj	RD: Adjust	RR: Unadjust	RR: Adjust				
Gullion 4G 1988a	A&F on performance versus A&F on medication	% patients with controlled blood pressure	55	60.74	62.11	66.93	66.54	-0.39	-1.76	0.994	0.97	moderate	moderate	moderate	

