

Comparison 3: EOV vs other interventions

Dichotomous outcomes

Study	Comparison	Outcome	N HPs	Other inter before	EO before	Other inter after	EO after	RD unadj	RD adj
Borgiel 1999	EO including AF vs AF	% (median) quality of care scores in family practice (median variable % with appropriate charting)	56					-1.30	0.60
McBride 2000	EO vs conference	% patient medical records with cardiovascular screening (all patients)	26	40	33	45	49	4.00	11.00
McBride 2000	EO + coordinator vs conference	% patient medical records with cardiovascular screening (all patients)	25	40	23	45	67	22.00	39.00
McBride 2000	EO + coordinator vs coordinator	% patient medical records with cardiovascular screening (all patients)	22	31	23	56	67	11.00	19.00
McBride 2000	EO vs coordinator	% patient medical records with cardiovascular screening (all patients)	23	31	33	56	49	-7.00	-9.00
Ornstein 2004	EO including AF + reminders vs AF	% mean indicators at or above target	61	6.3	11.3	22.7	33.7	11.00	6.00
Santoso 1996	EO vs seminar	% of customer visits resulting in sale of oral rehydration salts	480	65.8	70.20	71.5	77.30	5.80	1.40
Siriwardena 2002	EO including AF vs AF	% (median) influenza and pneumococcal vaccination uptake	unclear					4.20	5.00

			N HPs	Other inter before	EO before	Other inter after	EO after	Post difference	Adj change
Continuous outcomes									
Braybrook a 1996	EO including AF vs AF	Mean difference in prescribing antibiotics per 1000 patients (in text)							1
Braybrook b 2000	EO including AF vs AF	Mean difference in prescribing NSAIDs per 1000 patients (in text)							1.37
Steele 1989	EO vs AF + reminders	Mean cost per fill of prescriptions (variety of meds)	21	6	5	6	5	-1	0
Weller 2003	EO including AF + Ed Meetings vs AF + Ed Meetings	Test-ordering rates per 100 consultations	93	2	2	2	1	-1	0
Patient outcomes									
				Other inter before	EO before	Other inter after	EO after	RD unadj	RD adj
Borgiel 1999	EO including AF v	% median satisfaction scores						-0.8	
Ornstein 2004	EO including AF + reminders vs AF	% median clinical target achieved (median variable BP <140/90 for all patients)		69	64	71	72	2	6

RR unadj	RR adj	Baseline Compliance	Study quality 1= high 2=moderate 3= low	Prescribing 1=Yes 2=No	Contribution of EO	Baseline Data 1=Yes 2=No	# Clinicians per Visit 1= 1 Clinician 2= 2 or more	Number of Visits	Complexity 1= high 2=moderate 3= low	Seriousness 1=high 2=moderate 3=low
0.98	1.01	0.75	2	2	50	1	1	1	2	2
1.09	1.32	0.33	2	2	100	1	2	5	3	2
1.49	2.59	0.23	2	2	25	1	2	5	3	2
1.20	1.61	0.23	2	2	25	1	2	5	3	2
0.88	0.82	0.33	2	2	100	1	2	5	3	2
1.48	0.83	0.11	2	2	80	1	2	4	1	2
1.08	1.01	0.70	2	2	100	1	2	1	3	2
1.06	1.07		2	2	100	1	2	1	2	2

Percent change relative to control after	Adj percent change relative to control	Adj percent change in desired direction	Study quality 1= high 2=moderate 3= low	Prescribing 1=Yes 2=No	Contribution of EO	Baseline Data 1=Yes 2=No	# Clinicians per Visit 1= 1 2= 2 or more	Number of Visits	Complexity 1= high 2=moderate 3= low	Seriousness 1=high 2=moderate 3=low
insufficient data			2	1	100		2	1	3	3
insufficient data			2	1	100		2	1	3	3
0	0	0	1	1	100	1	1	2	2	2
0	0	0	1	2	100	1	1	2	3	3
RR unadj	RR adj									
0.99			2		50	1	1	1	2	2
0	0	0	2	2	80	1	2	4	1	2

Source 1= influential 2=peer 3=anyone else	EOV included feedback 1=		EOV included tailoring 1=	
	Yes No	2= 1=	Yes No	2= 1=
	1	1		2
	3		1	2
	3		1	2
	3		1	2
	3		1	2
	3		1	2
	1		2	1
	2		1	2

Source 1= influential 2=peer 3=anyone else	EOV included feedback 1= Yes 2= No	EOV included tailoring 1= Yes 2= No
3	1	2
3	1	2
3	2	2
3	1	2
1	1	2
3	1	2