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The objective of this study is to identify the optimal dissemination and implementation strategies for clinical guidelines in order to propose avenues for improvement in Belgium.

Sections of the scientific report

This report has three parts:

- An overview of the systematic literature reviews on the efficacy of the strategies for guideline dissemination and implementation (chapter 1);
- A qualitative study to describe the landscape of guidelines in Belgium i.e. the different organizations and the links between them (chapter 2);
- The discussion of proposals to improve the future dissemination and implementation of guidelines in Belgium, with an involvement of representatives of major associations at stake (chapter 3).

Background: knowledge translation

Different concepts are used in the literature to describe the so called “knowledge–to-action gap” i.e. the translation of research findings (e.g. clinical guidelines) into practice. Graham et al. made an overview of the different concepts of knowledge translation (only the keywords of the definition are presented):

- Knowledge translation: the exchange, synthesis and ethically-sound application of knowledge to accelerate the capture of the benefit of research through improved health, more effective services and products and a strengthened health care system;
- Knowledge transfer: a systematic approach to capture, collect and share tacit knowledge in order for it to become explicit knowledge. This concept is sometimes interpreted as the first step of disseminating knowledge to stakeholders and does not extend to the use of the knowledge;
- Knowledge exchange: interaction between researchers and decision makers. This term is now preferred by the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation and is a modified version from the knowledge transfer concept;
- Research utilization: focused on moving research findings into action, mainly used in nursing;
Implementation: the execution of the adoption decision, that is the innovation or the research is put into practice. This term is more common in the United Kingdom and Europe;

Implementation research has been defined as the scientific study of methods to promote the systematic uptake of clinical research findings and other evidence-based practices into routine practice to improve the quality and effectiveness of health care;

Dissemination: the spreading of knowledge or research, such as is done in scientific journals and at scientific conferences, but with a general lack of emphasis on the development of knowledge or the actual uptake or implementation of the knowledge.

Next to these main terms, other terms are often also used in the context of knowledge-to-action, e.g. translational research, diffusion, continuing education, continuing professional development.

The authors further offered a conceptual framework about the knowledge-into-action process. The initial phase consists of knowledge creation whose last phase is the production of tools and products tailored to the user.

Knowledge action itself is a cycle around the creation phase, with activities needed for knowledge application: adaptation of knowledge to local context, barriers assessment, tailored interventions, monitoring and evaluation of knowledge use, further actions to sustain and improve it.

Scope of the report: focus on professional specific interventions

These phases of knowledge creation and translation apply to the practice guidelines as well.

- Knowledge creation and action were considered in the description of the Belgian landscape. The description includes the production or adaptation of guidelines, strategies to disseminate them and if possible to implement them in the practice of Belgian professionals;
- The literature review produced background information to highlight the Belgian situation and possible improvements. The focus was on professional interventions described in the EPOC taxonomy. This taxonomy describes interventions to favour the uptake of guidelines by health professionals (including professional but also organisational, financial and regulatory interventions). The initial question of the Belgian Centre for evidence-based medicine (CEBAM) focused on interventions for professionals and furthermore the literature usually focuses on those interventions as well.
1 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS ON GUIDELINE DISSEMINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

This first section is an overview of the systematic literature reviews on the professional interventions for guideline dissemination and implementation to identify the most effective strategies for the knowledge transfer of clinical guidelines.

The researchers synthesized existing reviews given the high quality of the existing work and the huge number of primary studies (e.g. from the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Group, EPOC). The results are classified according to the EPOC taxonomy of professional interventions (see description in the synthesis).

1.1 Methods

1.1.1 Inclusion criteria

1.1.1.1 Type of studies

Systematic reviews, meta-reviews and meta-analyses published in English, French or Dutch between 2002 and 2012 were included.

1.1.1.2 Participants

We included studies involving qualified health professionals. Studies targeting patients only were excluded.

1.1.1.3 Interventions

Studies were included if they assessed the implementation of clinical practice guidelines by means of professional interventions listed in the EPOC taxonomy summarized in the synthesis.

Studies on the usability and effectiveness of specific devices (e.g. spirometers, electronic record systems) were excluded.

Reviews that did not specifically address the dissemination or implementation of guidelines were excluded as well. Yet some outstanding reviews on implementation strategies of medical knowledge in general (proposed by validators) were added in the discussion to put the results in perspective.

1.1.1.4 Outcome measures

Any objective measure of provider behaviour, clinical process change, compliance, performance indicators on process of care (including prescription behaviour) and indicators on patients’ health outcomes were considered as suitable outcomes for the measurement of the effectiveness, efficacy or efficiency of guideline dissemination.

Cost–benefit and cost-effectiveness analyses were not excluded but studies that included only economic outcomes were discussed in the discussion section. Studies only reporting changes in the physician’s knowledge or presenting only subjectively assessed outcomes (e.g. satisfaction) were excluded. Studies measuring effectiveness of strategies only by patient outcome (without link with physician’s behaviour) were excluded.
1.1.2 Identification of studies

1.1.2.1 Search terms

The search strategy (available upon request) combined broad terms describing the problem under study (guidelines, practice guidelines, clinical guidelines, care pathways and management protocol) with those describing the dissemination intervention (diffusion of innovation, information dissemination, implementation uptake and dissemination) and the outcome (guideline adherence, decision making, physician practice pattern, behaviour outcome assessment, compliance and clinical competence). These terms were searched in title, abstract, keyword and MESH terms.

1.1.2.2 Databases

Electronic searches were undertaken in the following databases:

- Ovid MEDLINE(R) 1946 to November Week 2 2012;
- EMBASE (1980) to November Week 3 2012;

The search prepared for Medline was translated to Embase and CINAHL. Hand search was performed in the following databases:

- Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Group reviews (2000) to November 2012;

1.1.3 Study selection

Results were merged and duplicates removed. The citations were screened by two researchers against the inclusion criteria (Anja Desomer-AD, Julien Piérart-JP). A third researcher (Dominique Paulus-DP) solved disagreements during the screening and extraction processes. Data extraction tables were used to extract data from references, aims and short description, methodological characteristics, intervention characteristics and results. A flow diagram describes this screening process (Figure 1).

1.1.4 Critical appraisal

The two researchers mentioned above (AD, JP) appraised the 22 selected reviews using the AMSTAR (Assessment of Multiple Systematic Reviews) tool (see appendix 1.1). For inter-tester reliability, a random sample of 6 studies was evaluated by both researchers. Discussions about these 6 dual-appraised reviews were solved by the third researcher (DP). The results of the quality appraisal are in appendix 1.2.

1.1.5 Data analysis and synthesis

The analytical framework of Grimshaw et al., 2004 is used to present a narrative review. Meta-analysis techniques were not possible given high heterogeneity between studies: (1) complex presentation of effects calculated for single and up to 6 different interventions; (2) effects of multifaceted interventions (up to seven intervention combinations) compared to no intervention (i.e. usual care or control group that did not receive any interventions); (3) control groups that also received up to three interventions; (4) mix of dichotomous and continuous process/outcomes of care variables.

This review describes the following strategies:

- Audit and feedback;
- Distribution of educational materials (printed and electronic) and reminders;
- Educational meetings (including interprofessional education);
- Educational outreach visits;
- Local Opinion leaders;
- Multifaceted interventions.

The review considers the following comparisons:

- Single interventions:
  - compared with no intervention controls;
  - compared with intervention controls.
- Multifaceted interventions:
  - compared with no intervention controls;
  - compared with intervention controls.
1.2 Results

1.2.1 Search results

The search strategy yielded 1728 citations after removing duplicates (Figure 1). After screening, the following systematic reviews were included on:

- Audit and feedback: Ivers 2012\(^5\), Chaillet 2006\(^6\);
- Distribution of educational materials and reminders: Giguère 2012\(^7\), Damiani 2010\(^8\), McGowan 2010\(^9\), Shojania 2011\(^10\), Medves 2010\(^11\), Akbari 2011\(^12\);
- Educational meetings and interprofessional education: Forsetlund 2012\(^13\), Reeves 2009\(^14\), Medves 2010\(^11\);
- Educational outreach visits: O’Brien 2007\(^15\);
- Local opinion leaders: Flodgren 2011\(^16\);
- Multifaceted interventions: Grimshaw 2004\(^4\), Prior 2008\(^17\), Menon 2009\(^18\), Van der Wees 2008\(^19\), Brusamento 2012\(^20\), Hakkenes 2008\(^21\), Weinmann 2007\(^22\), Chaillet 2006\(^6\);
- Effect modifiers: Francke 2008\(^23\), Baker 2010\(^24\), Baskerville 2012\(^25\).

One systematic review of economic evaluations was included in the discussion (Vale 2007\(^26\)).

The researchers further added the conclusions of the KCE report on educational outreach visits\(^27\).

The included studies are described per dissemination strategy and the data evidence tables are in appendix 1.3.
Figure 1 – Flow diagram

Potentially relevant citations identified: 1728

Based on title and abstract evaluation, citations excluded: 1761
Reasons:
- Problem: 1523
- Intervention: 220
- Outcome: 2
- Design: 14
- Language: 2

Studies retrieved for more detailed evaluation: 35

Based on full text evaluation, studies excluded: 12
Reasons:
- Problem: 1
- Intervention: 6
- Outcome: 1
- Design: 2

Relevant studies: 23
1.2.2 Methodological quality

The quality appraisal based on AMSTAR scores (see appendix 1.2) found that all but one systematic review were of high quality. Only the review of Dulko 2007 was excluded.

1.3 Effectiveness of professional interventions

The results of the literature search are presented per dissemination strategy. The description encompasses the definition (cf. EPOC taxonomy, see the synthesis), overall assessment and brief presentation of effect modifiers for each strategy under study. Each strategy is assessed as a single intervention and/or as a core component of multifaceted interventions.

A separate section (see 1.3.6) is dedicated to multifaceted interventions in which no core component could be identified. Also the reviews with no clear distinction between strategies are described in this section. This chapter concludes with the description of the barriers and facilitators for guideline dissemination (see 1.3.7) and with an overview of the main findings (see 1.4).

1.3.1 Audit & Feedback

1.3.1.1 Definition

The Cochrane review from Ivers 2012 defines audit and feedback as “any summary of the clinical performance of healthcare provider(s) over a specified period of time”. Audit and feedback (A&F), also known as “clinical performance feedback”, may include recommendations for clinical action and may be delivered in a written, electronic or verbal format.

Information on the theories that underlie the possible mechanisms behind each implementation intervention can be found in the full text of the Cochrane review.

1.3.1.2 Results of search strategy

The search strategy retrieved three systematic reviews on audit and feedback: Dulko 2007, Ivers 2012 and Chaillet 2006. Dulko 2007 was excluded given the low quality (see appendix 1.2). This description is mainly based on the results of the Cochrane review of Ivers 2012 and completed where possible with the results of the review of Chaillet 2006.

1.3.1.3 Effectiveness of Audit & Feedback

This Cochrane review focuses on feedback on clinical performance, excluding feedbacks for procedural skills, performance on tests or simulated patients interactions or other interventions from the EPOC categories. Audit and feedback had to be the essential element of a single or multifaceted intervention. The review considered the following comparisons:

- Any intervention in which audit and feedback is the single intervention or is the essential element of a multifaceted intervention, compared to usual care. Specific analyses focused on two types of comparisons:
  - Audit and feedback alone compared to no intervention;
  - Audit and feedback as the core feature of a multifaceted intervention compared to no intervention.
- Different ways of providing audit and feedback;
- Audit and feedback alone compared with audit and feedback combined with complementary interventions;
- Audit and feedback compared to other interventions.
Effectiveness of audit and feedback: overall assessment

The overall assessment first analyzed the effectiveness of audit and feedback without differentiation between single and multifaceted interventions (see also Table 1). It should be noted that most studies were found to have a high risk of bias.

- Increase in compliance with desired practice

For dichotomous outcomes the weighted median adjusted risk difference was +4.3% (IQR (Interquartile Range) 0.5% to 16%), based on 82 comparisons from 49 studies. For continuous outcomes the weighted median adjusted change relative to baseline control was +1.3% (IQR 1.3% to 23.2%), based on 26 comparisons from 21 studies.

- Changes in patient outcomes

A slight decrease in desired outcomes was found for dichotomous outcomes (-0.4% weighted median adjusted risk difference (IQR -1.3% to 1.6%) based on 12 comparisons from 6 studies). However there was an increase in desired outcomes for continuous outcomes (+17% weighted median adjusted change relative to baseline control (IQR 1.5% to 17%) based on 8 comparisons from 5 studies).

In studies evaluating audit and feedback in obstetrics (Chaillet 2006), the majority of the included studies found a positive effect on the guideline implementation (in 9 of the 11 studies). However, in the description of the results no differentiation was made between single and multifaceted interventions and it was not clearly reported on which specific outcomes (practice or patient outcomes) the positive effect had place. Also the magnitude of effect was not precised, resulting in a more vague and general finding that some positive effect after an intervention with audit and feedback could be seen.

Effectiveness of audit and feedback as single intervention (compared to no intervention)

Audit and feedback as unique intervention seem to increase compliance with desired practice in comparison with no intervention. The results were positive for both dichotomous (+3.0% weighted median adjusted risk difference (IQR 1.8% to 7.7%) based on 32 comparisons from 26 studies) and continuous outcomes (+1.3% weighted median adjusted change relative to baseline control (IQR 1.3% to 11.0%) based on 14 comparisons from 13 studies).

Table 1 – Audit and feedback: summary of findings from Cochrane meta-analysis for the no-intervention comparison – description of outcomes adapted from Ivers 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Adjusted absolute improvement (Risk difference) Median (Interquartile range)</th>
<th>Number of participants (studies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with desired practice (dichotomous outcomes)</td>
<td>Median 3.0% (1.8% to 7.7%)</td>
<td>1617 health providers (14 trials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>759 groups of health providers (12 cluster trials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with desired practice (continuous outcomes)</td>
<td>Median 1.3% (1.3% to 11.0%)</td>
<td>494 health providers (5 trials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>348 groups of health providers (8 cluster trials)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effectiveness of audit and feedback as (core) component of a multifaceted intervention (compared to no intervention)

Audit and feedback as core of a multifaceted interventions seem to increase compliance with desired practice in comparison with no intervention. Results were positive for both dichotomous outcomes (+5.5% weighted median adjusted risk difference (IQR 0.4% to 16%) based on 50 comparisons from 32 studies) and continuous outcomes (+26.1% weighted median adjusted change relative to baseline control (IQR 12.7% to 26.1%) based on 12 comparisons from 11 studies).

Audit and feedback combined with complementary interventions (compared to audit and feedback alone)

The narrative review included 53 comparisons from 43 trials. The analysis revealed small and conflicting differences in desired practice for the combination with other interventions: reminders, other educational interventions, case management, financial incentives, patient-mediated interventions. Only an increase in desired practice was found in audit and feedback combined with educational outreach compared to audit and feedback alone.

Other interventions compared to audit and feedback

The narrative review included 22 comparisons from 20 trials. Conflicting results were found in the comparisons of audit and feedback with reminders, educational outreach, other educational interventions, case management, organizational interventions or patient-mediated interventions. No clear conclusion can be drawn on which intervention would be more effective compared to audit and feedback.

Characteristics explaining the heterogeneity (effect modifiers)

All 5 characteristics related to the intervention were significant for explaining the variation in effects: format (p=0.02), source (p<0.001), frequency (p<0.001), instructions for improvement (p<0.001), direction of change required (i.e. decrease of provider’s behaviour, p=0.007). Also lower baseline performance was associated with greater effectiveness for the interventions (p=0.007). The clinical setting (outpatient versus inpatient versus mixed/other/unclear) had no influence on the effectiveness of audit and feedback. The kind of targeted behaviour had an impact on the effectiveness: for prescribing the effect of audit and feedback increased to a weighted median adjusted risk difference 13.1% (IQR 3% to 17%). The authors conclude that audit and feedback may be more effective when baseline performance is low, the source is a supervisor or colleague, it is provided more than once, it is delivered in both verbal and written format and when it included both explicit targets and an action plan.

1.3.1.4 Limitations of studies

- Publication bias
- Risk of bias
- Heterogeneity in results
- Low quality of studies (due to small sample sizes)

1.3.1.5 Conclusions

The conclusions on the effectiveness of audit and feedback as interventions to implement guidelines are based on one recent Cochrane review of high quality. Overall this intervention leads to small improvements in desired practice and to a lesser extent in patient’s outcomes:

- Audit and feedback as single interventions lead to a (small) increase in desired practice in comparison with no intervention;
- Audit and feedback as core components of a multifaceted interventions produce a larger effect than when used as a single intervention. However there is uncertainty on which interventions should be best combined with audit and feedback.

As observed for academic detailing the intervention is particularly effective for modifying prescription behaviour. Larger effects are observed when the intervention aims at decreasing a particular behaviour and when baseline performance is low.

The characteristics of an effective audit and feedback intervention include:

- The involvement of a supervisor or colleague;
- A high frequency (up to monthly);
- A combination of verbally and written material;
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- The inclusion of clear targets and a concrete action plan. Yet these findings must be interpreted with caution due to the heterogeneity in interventions and results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points for audit and feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A small increase in practice outcomes is observed in single interventions of audit and feedback (compared to no intervention).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A larger effect is observed after a multifaceted intervention with audit and feedback as core component. However, there is no evidence on the interventions that should be best combined with audit and feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2 Distribution of educational materials and reminders

1.3.2.1 Definition

Educational materials

The EPOC taxonomy defines the distribution of educational materials as the distribution of published or printed recommendations for clinical care, including clinical practice guidelines, audio-visual materials and electronic publications (see http://epoc.cochrane.org/epoc-methods). Printed educational materials (PEMs) (e.g. clinical practice guidelines) can be delivered personally (i.e. addressed to a specific individual), through mass mailings or passively delivered through broader communication channels (printable documents on the internet, mass media) (Grimshaw 2004). The advances in electronic technologies led the electronic educational materials become more widespread in clinical practice: the access to this information will influence its impact on the providers (McGowan 2010).

Reminders

Reminders can be considered as an educational material adapted to the individual patient’s encounter. The EPOC taxonomy classifies them in an apart category defined as “Patient or encounter specific information, provided verbally, on paper or on a computer screen, which is designed or intended to prompt a health professional to recall information”. (See http://epoc.cochrane.org/epoc-methods).

Information on the mechanisms behind each implementation strategy can be found in the full text of the reviews. Only some brief concepts are mentioned in the discussion as plausible explanation for the found results. This section on the distribution of educational materials is divided in printed educational materials, electronic educational materials in general (including internet-based learning) and reminders.

1.3.2.2 Results of search strategy

Six reviews were selected on educational materials and reminders: one review on printed educational materials (Giguère 2011), two reviews on electronic educational materials (Damiani 2010 and McGowan 2010), one review on reminders (Shojania 2011) and two more general review (Medves 2010 and Akbari 2011).

1.3.2.3 Effectiveness of printed educational materials

One review on printed educational materials (PEM) was selected: Giguère 2011 only found studies on PEM as a single intervention. No studies addressed the comparison of multifaceted interventions including PEM. The review included 45 primary studies (14 RCTs and 31 interrupted time series). An overview of the main findings is presented in Table 2.

Medves 2010 made no differentiation between studies using printed or electronic educational materials. Of the 59 included studies, 43 (73.3%) reported significant findings. Several limitations of the review of Medves 2010, such as the lack of detailed reported of the magnitude of effect and the lack of differentiating between single and multifaceted interventions hampers to draw a firm conclusion on the possible effect found in this review.

Akbari 2011 identified which interventions could change primary care outpatient referral rates or could improve referral appropriateness. Seven studies were found on the (passive) dissemination of guidelines by mail, including structured management sheets (in 5 of the 7 studies). The 2 studies which evaluated the passive dissemination of guideline without any additional decision-making tool (such as management sheets) observed no change in the quantity or the quality of referrals. The addition of structured management sheets led to an improved pre-referral management of patients (5 studies). Within these 5 studies, 2 studies incorporated the
dissemination of guidelines in a multifaceted intervention (combination with an educational meeting). In both studies a reduction in number of referrals was found, but it is more difficult to identify which aspect of the intervention contributed to the change in practice outcome. Overall, the authors concluded that referral guidelines are more likely to be effective if structured referral sheets are added.

**Effectiveness of printed educational materials as single intervention**

- **Compliance with desired practice**
  
  A slight increase in compliance with desired practice was found for both dichotomous (+2% weighted median adjusted risk difference (IQR from 0 to 11%) and for continuous outcomes (+13% standard median effect size, range -16 to 36%). Overall, the time series regression analysis showed an improvement between the period before PEM and after PEM dissemination. This improvements ranges from a statistically significant for 27 of the outcomes, contradictory results for 11 outcomes (improvement and deterioration) and only one study showed a significant deterioration. At the time of the introduction of the PEM an overall improvement in professional practice outcome, with a standardized median change in level of 1.69 (range from -6.96 to 14.26) is shown.

- **Patient outcomes**
  
  For patient outcomes the overall median standardised effect size was -0.14 across five continous outcomes. One included RCT (Jousimaa 2002) did not find any significant difference between PEM and computerized guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Adjusted absolute improvement (Risk difference)</th>
<th>Number of participants (studies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted absolute improvement (Risk difference)</td>
<td>Median (Interquartile range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with desired practice</td>
<td>Median 2.0%</td>
<td>294 937 patients (7 studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dichotomous outcomes)</td>
<td>(0.0% to 11.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with desired practice</td>
<td>Median 13.0%</td>
<td>297 patients (3 studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continuous outcomes)</td>
<td>(-16.0% to 36.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effect modifiers

The review considered the following possible effect modifiers:

- Source: source of information, endorsement, tailoring;
- Channel: mode of delivery, frequency of delivery, duration of delivery;
- Message: clinical area, type of targeted behaviour, purpose, level of evidence, educational component;
- Format: format, appearance, length.

However the small number of studies per category and the lack of variability prevented from drawing any conclusion on the association between these effect modifiers and the effectiveness of PEM to change the practice.

1.3.2.4 Effectiveness of electronic educational materials (other than reminders)

The two selected reviews on electronic educational materials handled different aspects of this dissemination strategy:

- McGowan 2010 assessed the accessibility to information: the results must be interpreted with caution, because only two studies were included in this review;
- Damiani 2010 compared computerized clinical guidelines with non-computerized clinical guidelines: 45 studies were included but the statistical analysis is of low quality. No comparisons were made between interventions and the authors did not differentiate between single and multifaceted interventions. Only an analysis of the variables that predict a positive impact of computerized clinical guidelines was performed.

Effectiveness of electronic educational materials compared with printed educational materials

The authors mentioned the study of Jousimaa 2002 already mentioned by Giguère 2011: its objective was to compare the electronic retrieval of information versus PEM. In accordance with the results of above mentioned results of Giguère 2011 (see 1.3.2.3) this study found no statistically significant differences in professional behaviour outcomes.

Effectiveness of electronic educational materials as component of multifaceted intervention

One study compared the effectiveness of electronic educational materials as component of a multifaceted intervention (i.e. interactive workshops that addressed potential barriers) with standard access to the same electronic resource. Compliance with the guidelines improved in both groups but did not differ between intervention and control groups (p-value not mentioned).

Effectiveness of internet-based learning

This search for systematic reviews did not identify studies on internet-based learning. This may be explained by the recent development of this strategy.

One validator suggested to add a systematic review on the effect of Internet-based instruction for health professions learners (not guidelines specific). Large positive effects on practice outcomes were found after internet-based instruction in comparison with no intervention. The effects were recorded for knowledge, skills, behaviours and patient care. However, the inconsistency across studies for all outcomes was large. Still the authors found heterogeneous and small effects when internet-based interventions were compared with non-Internet instructional methods, suggesting a similar effectiveness compared to traditional methods. These results could be useful for the dissemination of clinical practice guidelines but call for further specific research on guideline topic.
Effect modifiers of electronic educational materials

Damiani 2010\textsuperscript{8} divided the studies’ features into the following categories: general system feature, clinical-system interaction features, communication content features, auxiliary features and guidelines features. The features most used in computerized clinical guidelines were automatic provision of recommendation in electronic version as part of clinician workflow (electronic recommendation linked to patient charts), the degree of automation (user automatically receives prompts) and provision of the recommendation in different ways (reminders, alerts).

Backward logistic regression analyses were performed to evaluate the association of each feature with a possible positive effect. Three other variables (publication year, design of the study and quality of the study) were also considered in the analysis. This statistical procedure lacks transparency and the authors present a few positive results only, without referring to a table including all comparisons.

The authors of the review (Damiani 2010\textsuperscript{8}) conclude that the use of computerized clinical guidelines, and in particular the automatic provision of recommendations in electronic form as part of the clinician workflow, seems to have a significant impact on the process of care. However, the results of this review must be interpreted with caution due to possible methodological flaws.

1.3.2.5 Reminders

According to the only selected review of Shojania 2011\textsuperscript{10}, the objective of reminders is to provide information to the healthcare professional in an accessible format at a particularly relevant time. Shojania 2011\textsuperscript{10} defined three criteria for a reminder delivered at the point of care:

- Delivery via the computer system routinely used by the provider targeted by the intervention;
- Accessibility within the routinely used clinical information system;
- Target of the person responsible for the relevant clinical activity.

The following comparisons were based on the results of the 28 included studies:

- Reminder only versus no intervention;
- Reminder as component of multifaceted intervention versus multifaceted intervention without reminder.

**Overall assessment of effectiveness of reminders in single or multifaceted interventions**

- Compliance with desired practice (=process adherence)
  Only a small improvement was found in the group with reminders: a difference of 3.8% (IQR 0.4% to 7.9%) in comparison with the control group. After addition of the studies without reported baseline adherence, the median improvements in process adherence slightly increased to 4.2% (IQR 0.8% to 18.8%) for all process outcomes.

- Patient outcomes (=clinical outcomes)
  The clinical endpoints also showed a small improvement in the intervention group (median absolute improvement of 2.5% (IQR 1.3% to 4.2%)).

**Effectiveness of reminders as single intervention**

Based on the 18 comparisons, a median improvement in process adherence of 5.7% (IQR 2.0% to 24.0%) was found (see Table 3).
Table 3 – Reminders: summary of findings from Cochrane meta-analysis for the no-intervention comparison – description of outcomes adapted from Shojania 2009\textsuperscript{10}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Adjusted absolute improvement (Risk difference)</th>
<th>Number of comparisons (studies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with desired practice (dichotomous outcomes)</td>
<td>Median 5.7% (2.0% to 24.0%)</td>
<td>18 comparisons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of reminders as component of multifaceted intervention

Only a small median improvement of 1.9\% (IQR 0.0\% to 6.2\%) was found in 14 comparisons. The effect of reminders as single intervention was even more pronounced than the effect of reminders as components in multifaceted interventions (p=0.04). A plausible explanation for this non-expected difference, is the possible ceiling effect in multifaceted interventions with reminders.

Effect modifiers of reminders

No significant effects were found in a number of characteristics of computer reminders on the degree of improvement after a reminder intervention. The analysed characteristics were: type of quality problem (underuse versus overuse versus a given process of care), patient specific reminder, provision of explanation for the alert, development in consultation of recipients, type of delivery. A trend towards a larger effect was found in reminders with a required active response (12.9\%, IQR 2.7\% to 22.7\%) compared to no response required (2.7\%, IQR 0.6\% to 5.6\%), but this trend could not be supported by a statistical difference (p=0.09). An additional analysis was performed on the differences between push (i.e. users automatically received the reminder) and pull reminders (users need to perform some action to receive it): better practice outcomes were achieved after push reminders.

1.3.2.6 Limitations of studies

Printed educational materials:
- Included studies with 90\% physicians;
- Primarily in outpatient practices.

Electronic educational materials:
- Only 2 studies on accessibility;
- No patient outcomes mentioned;
- Questionable data analysis and Incomplete reporting.

Reminders:
- Heterogeneity of the interventions;
- Variable degree of reporting interventions, outcomes.
1.3.2.7 Conclusion

Effectiveness of educational materials as single intervention

Printed educational materials have a very small beneficial effect on professional practice: the clinical significance of these improvements is not known.

No change in professional behaviour was found with electronic educational materials compared with printed material. This result must be interpreted with caution as it is based on two studies only. The effectiveness of computerized clinical guidelines compared to other interventions remains doubtful.

Computer reminders achieved small improvements in process adherence e.g. for prescription behaviour changes.

Effectiveness of educational materials as component of multifaceted intervention

There is no data on the effectiveness of PEMs as component of multifaceted interventions. One study on electronic educational materials as component of multifaceted intervention concludes that the effect on professional behaviour is similar to the effect of electronic material as a single intervention.

A paradoxical effect was noted for the reminders: their impact as single intervention was even more pronounced than the effect of reminders as components in a multifaceted intervention.

Effect modifiers

No firm conclusions can be drawn on the impact of the characteristics of PEM on its effectiveness. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that a specific feature of computerized material would influence its effectiveness: only electronic recommendations linked to patient records could have a positive impact.

In interventions with reminders, no significant associations were found between the characteristics of the reminder and their impact. Only a larger (but non-significant) effect was found for reminder interventions which required an active response from the physician.

Key points for educational materials

- Printed educational materials as single interventions have a very small effect on professional practice: the clinical significance of this effect is not known. There is a lack of data on the effectiveness of printed educational materials as components of a multifaceted intervention.
- Electronic educational materials produce similarly a small effect, either when used as single interventions or when embedded in multifaceted interventions.
- Reminders have a higher impact on clinical practice than printed or electronic educational materials. Their effect within multifaceted interventions seems smaller than their effect as single interventions.

1.3.3 Educational meetings (including interprofessional education)

1.3.3.1 Definition

The Cochrane review from Forsetlund 2012 defines educational meetings and workshops as follows: educational meetings may include courses and workshops in various formats, with interactive or didactic (lecture-based) sessions. Interprofessional education (see definition in 1.3.3.3) is classified in this report under the category of educational meetings.

Information about theories and the mechanisms behind each intervention can be found in the full text of the review: this discussion only mentions brief concepts as plausible explanations for the results.

The search strategy retrieved two systematic reviews on educational meetings:
- Forsetlund 2012 (an updated version of O’Brien 2001 and 2008) (continuing education meetings and workshops);
- Reeves 2009 (interprofessional education).
In addition, one more general systematic review, covering different dissemination strategies, was found and added in the results sections where possible (Medves 2010\textsuperscript{11}).

1.3.3.2 Effectiveness of educational meetings

Forsetlund 2012\textsuperscript{13} examined the effects of education meetings on professional practice and patient outcomes and investigated factors that might influence their effectiveness. They included RCTs involving health professionals in postgraduate training in activities such as conferences, lectures, workshops, seminars, symposia or courses.

The review reported statistically significant results for the following comparisons:

- Any intervention in which educational meetings are a component compared to no intervention (overall assessment);
- Educational meetings as single intervention compared to no intervention;
- Educational meetings as single intervention compared to other interventions;
- Educational meetings as component of a multifaceted intervention compared to educational meetings alone.

**Effectiveness of educational meetings: overall assessment**

The effectiveness was assessed by comparing both single and multifaceted trials in which educational meetings were a component compared to no intervention (80 trials in total).

- Increase in compliance with desired practice

For dichotomous outcomes the weighted median adjusted risk difference was 6% (IQR 1.8% to 15.9%), based on 36 comparisons from 30 trials. For continuous outcomes, the median percentage change was 10% (IQR 9% to 24%), based on 8 trials with baseline data.

- Changes in patient outcomes

Improvement in desired outcomes was found for dichotomous outcomes (3% weighted median adjusted risk difference (IQR 0.1% to 4.0%) based on 5 trials) and for continuous outcomes (4% of median percentage change (IQR 0% to 11%) based on 9 comparisons from 8 studies).

Medves 2010\textsuperscript{11} reported significant findings in 47 (74.6%) of the 63 studies found on educational meetings. The lack of details on the magnitude of effect in this review made it difficult to compare these results with the results of the review of Forsetlund 2012\textsuperscript{13}.

**Effectiveness of educational meetings as single intervention compared to no intervention**

- Increase in compliance with desired practice

Educational meetings compared to no intervention seem to increase compliance with desired practice. Results were positive for dichotomous outcomes (+6% weighted median adjusted risk difference (IQR 2.9% to 15.3%) based on 21 comparisons from 19 trials) and continuous outcomes (+10% weighted median adjusted risk difference (IQR 8% to 32%) based on 5 comparisons from 5 trials) (see Table 4).

- Changes in patient outcomes

A median improvement of 3.0% (IQR -0.9% to 4.0%) was observed for dichotomous patient outcomes based on 3 trials. For continuous patient outcomes the weighted median adjusted risk difference was 8% (IQR 0% to 12.0%) based on 6 trials.
Table 4 – Educational meetings: summary of findings from Cochrane meta-analysis for the no-intervention comparison – description of outcomes adapted from Forsetlund 2012\textsuperscript{13}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Adjusted absolute improvement (Risk difference)</th>
<th>Number of studies (comparisons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with desired practice (dichotomous outcomes)</td>
<td>Median +6.0% (2.9% to 15.3%)</td>
<td>19 (21 comparisons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with desired practice (continuous outcomes)</td>
<td>Median 10.0% (8.0% to 32.0%)</td>
<td>5 (5 comparisons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effectiveness of educational meetings as single intervention compared to other interventions**

Two trials in the review of Forsetlund 2012\textsuperscript{13} compared to educational meetings with an office meeting to improve services for early detection of cancer and with an educational outreach visit respectively. Decrease in compliance for the educational intervention group was observed in the two comparisons, respectively -8.0% and -1.4% of the adjusted risk difference.

**Effectiveness of educational meetings as component of a multifaceted intervention compared to educational meetings alone**

Only one study in the review of Forsetlund 2012\textsuperscript{13} compared one-day small group discussions combined with an office system and facilitator with one-day small group discussions only. For the multifaceted intervention group, there was a 12% adjusted relative percentage increase in compliance with desired practice.

**Characteristics explaining the heterogeneity (effect modifiers)**

In this Cochrane review, the 36 comparisons from the 30 trials were included in univariate meta-regression analyses. The four most statistically significant explanatory factors (P<0.03) were:

- attendance at the meetings (P<0.01): higher attendance at educational meetings was associated with larger adjusted risk differences (RD);
- interactive versus didactic meetings (P= 0.03): mixed interactive and didactic education meetings were more effective than interactive/didactic meetings alone;
- complexity of the targeted behaviour (P= 0.02): the more complex the behaviour, the smaller the effect;
- seriousness of the outcome (P= 0.02): the more serious the outcome, the greater the effect on the targeted behaviour.
1.3.3.3 Effectiveness of interprofessional education

In the updated version of a previous Cochrane review (Reeves 2009\(^1\), previous review of Zwarenstein 2000), interprofessional education is defined as any type of educational, training, teaching or learning session in which two or more health and social care professions are learning interactively to improve interprofessional collaboration and/or health/well being of patients/clients. The increasing need for multidisciplinary collaboration leads to an increasing interest in this kind of educational encounters (as stated by the stakeholders, see chapter 3).

In the review only comparison with no education intervention was found (based on 6 studies). Comparisons to other educational interventions could not be retrieved in the primary studies.

In this review the providers’ performance indicators are defined as process outcomes (e.g. skills development, changes in practice style, interprofessional collaboration, teamwork) and the patient outcomes are described as clinical outcomes (health status measures, disease incidence, duration or cure rates, mortality, complication rate, satisfaction etc).

Only two studies assessed the effectiveness of interprofessional education in a single intervention: the results are included in the overall assessment of effectiveness.

Effectiveness of interprofessional education in single or multifaceted interventions: overall assessment

- Compliance with desired practice (process outcomes)

In the majority of the studies an improvement is seen in patient care and in collaboration between health professionals. More details on the heterogeneity in results are explained in the comparisons as single and multifaceted intervention. Three studies reported that the gains were sustained over time, ranging from 8 to 21 months.

- Patient outcomes

Patient satisfaction improved after an interprofessional educational intervention.

Effectiveness of interprofessional education as single intervention compared to no intervention

Within the 6 included studies, two studies (both RCTs) compared an interprofessional education (a communication skills training program or interactively seminars on recognition and management of depression in primary care). Both studies found no improvement, neither in patient satisfaction scores after the communication skills training program nor in improved recognition of depressive symptoms by the clinicians.

Effectiveness of interprofessional education as component in multifaceted interventions

In 4 of the 6 included studies, interprofessional education is one of the components of a multifaceted intervention. Other interventions were team restructuring, tools (posters, cue cards and questionnaires), audit and feedback and consumer-directed interventions. All four studies showed a (significant) improvement in the intervention group compared to the control group both in practice (change in behaviour) as in patient outcomes (patient satisfaction).

Effect modifiers

Due to the heterogeneity in study designs, no clear conclusions can be drawn on which factors affected the change in practice or in patient outcomes. The mechanisms behind the efficacy of this intervention remain unclear and need further investigation in more rigorous studies.

1.3.3.4 Limitations of studies

Many studies had a high risk of bias (20/81 studies) and moreover:

- only a small amount of studies (30) provided data that could be included in meta-regression analyses;
- interventions were inadequately described in many studies.
1.3.3.5 Conclusions

These conclusions of the effectiveness of educational meetings are based on one Cochrane review whose search strategy ended in 2007 (Forsetlund 201213). As stated by the authors, “the nature of educational meetings is highly variable in terms of content, the number of participants, the degree and type of interaction, length, frequency, and the targeted practices”13. The effect of educational meetings as single intervention or within multifaceted interventions showed a positive effect on professional practice. However the improvements in desired practice and in patient outcomes are small.

A multifaceted intervention with interprofessional education showed improvements in practice and patient outcomes in contrary to interprofessional education as single intervention (based on the review of Reeves 200914). However, the efficacy of this intervention remains unclear due to the heterogeneity between studies and their methodological limitations (small number of studies, different formats of educational interventions, different number of participants between interventions, etc.). The mechanisms of how interprofessional education can affect change remains unclear.

Key points for educational meetings and interprofessional education

- Educational meetings as single intervention compared to no intervention showed some small improvements in practice outcomes. This effect was not recorded when educational meetings were compared with other interventions.
- Educational meetings have a higher impact when included as a component of a multifaceted intervention.
- Interprofessional education did not produce any improvement in practice and patient outcomes. However, a multifaceted intervention with interprofessional education showed improvements in practice and patient outcomes.

1.3.4 Educational outreach visits (academic detailing)

1.3.4.1 Definition

The Cochrane review on this topic (O’Brien 2007)15 defines educational outreach visits (EOV) as “a trained person from outside the practice setting who meets with healthcare professionals in their practice settings to provide information with the intent of changing their performance. The information given may include feedback about their performance. The intervention may be tailored based upon previously identified barriers to change. The person delivering the EOV may be from the same organisation, if it is a multi-site organisation, but not from the same practice site.” Educational outreach visits are also referred as “university-based educational detailing”, “academic detailing”, “practice facilitation” and “educational visiting”.

More information about theories and the mechanisms behind this intervention can be found in the full text of the review.

1.3.4.2 Results of search strategy

The search strategy retrieved one Cochrane systematic review on educational outreach visits that updates the former version of O’Brien 1997 (O’Brien 200715) and a more recent KCE report dedicated to the impact of academic detailing on primary care physicians (search until 2009)27. An additional review was recommended by a validator (Qureshi 200231) but the search strategy is outdated compared to the two included reviews and all primary studies mentioned in the review of O’Brien 200715. Therefore the results are only mentioned in the section on the overall assessment.
1.3.4.3 Effectiveness of educational outreach visits

The Cochrane review only includes RCTs with measures of professional performance in a healthcare setting or healthcare outcomes. Few studies documented statistically significant changes in patient outcomes: their details will be found in the full text of the review. The review considers the following comparisons:

- Effectiveness of any intervention with EOVs as component: overall assessment;
- EOV as single intervention versus no intervention;
- Multifaceted intervention with EOV as component compared to another intervention;
- Any comparison of different types of EOVs.

Effectiveness of any intervention in which EOVs were a component (including educational materials for all comparisons) compared to no intervention (including educational materials): overall assessment

- Increase in compliance with desired practice

For dichotomous outcomes, the weighted median adjusted risk difference was 5.6% (IQR 3% to 9.0%), based on 34 comparisons (from 28 trials). For continuous outcomes, effects were greater than for dichotomous outcomes. The median percentage change increased up to 21% (IQR 11% to 41%), based on 18 comparisons (from 17 trials). These results are in line with the review of Qureshi 2002\(^\text{31}\): a positive effect was found but the impact varied greatly between studies. Both authors also questioned the clinical relevance of these small and varying changes in effect.

In the KCE report on academic detailing, the majority of the studies showed positive effects: in 55% (in 42 of the 77 studies) a positive effect was found, in 32% (in 25 of the 77 studies) mixed results were found including both positive as no effect. Only 10 of the 77 studies showed no effect of the intervention.

- Changes in patient outcomes

In fourteen trials patient outcomes were reported, but only a few studies (exact number of studies not specified in the review) reported patient-level improvements. In the majority of the studies the lack of power made it difficult to detect an important difference at patient level.

No patient outcomes were reported in the studies included in the KCE report.

Effectiveness of EOVs as single intervention compared to no intervention

- Increase in compliance with desired practice

For dichotomous outcomes, the weighted median adjusted risk difference was 5.0% (IQR 3.0% to 6.2%), based on 18 comparisons (16 trials). Once again, for continuous outcomes effects were greater than for dichotomous outcomes with a median of 23% (IQR 12% to 39%), based on 15 comparisons (from 14 trials) with baseline data (see also Table 5).

- Changes in patient outcomes

The two trials reporting patient outcomes did not find any improvement.
Table 5 – Educational outreach visits: summary of findings from Cochrane meta-analysis for the no-intervention comparison – description of outcomes adapted from O’Brien 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Adjusted absolute improvement (Risk difference)</th>
<th>Number of studies (comparisons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with desired practice (dichotomous outcomes)</td>
<td>Median 5.0% (3.0% to 6.2%)</td>
<td>16 trials (18 comparisons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with desired practice (continuous outcomes)</td>
<td>Median 23.0% (12.0% to 39.0%)</td>
<td>14 trials (15 comparisons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of any intervention in which EOVs were a component (compared to another intervention)

- Increase in compliance with desired practice

These comparison interventions included audit and feedback and reminders. The narrative review included 12 comparisons (from 8 trials) where EOVs appeared to be slightly more effective than audit and feedback alone.

- Changes in patient outcomes

One trial in the review found an improvement in blood pressure control after clinicians received an EOV including audit and feedback and a reminder (RD 5.9%, 95% CI -0.3 to 12.2).

The review in the KCE report revealed that the majority of the multifaceted interventions and single interventions produced positive effects (in 86% and 93% of the studies respectively). Multifaceted interventions have a consistent positive effect for improving physicians’ prescribing, whereas a moderate positive effect was found on other measures.

Comparisons of different types of EOVs

- Increase in compliance with desired practice

The narrative review did not conclude anything about these 6 studies evaluating different types of visits in head-to-head comparisons: EOVs given individually versus EOVs given to a group, case studies versus statistical information, EOV plus telephone support compared to EOV alone, comparison of different types of visitors.

- Changes in patient outcomes

No patient outcomes were reported in the review.

Characteristics explaining the heterogeneity (effect modifiers)

The meta-regression produced limited results concerning effect modifiers possibly because of a small amount of comparisons (31) and a large number of explanatory factors (8) (targeted behaviour, baseline compliance, number of clinicians included at each visit, number of visits, complexity of behaviour, seriousness of outcome, risk of bias, contribution of educational outreach visits as components of intervention). The targeted behaviour (prescribing compared to other behaviours) was the only factor for which the estimate (-7.08) was statistically significant (P= 0.002).
The KCE report on academic detailing and this Cochrane review concluded that there is a small but consistent effect for improving physicians’ prescribing behaviour whereas the effect on other professional behaviours is more variable.

1.3.4.4 Limitations of studies

The number of included was low, with high risk of bias, with limited attention for patient outcomes.

1.3.4.5 Conclusions

The conclusions are drawn upon one Cochrane study updated in 2007 and the more recent KCE report on academic detailing. Educational outreach visits (with or without the addition of other interventions) seem to be effective in improving practice but the size of the effect if usually small. There is furthermore a variability of the effects according to the outcomes under study. The modification of prescription behaviour is more successful than changes in other behaviours.

Key points for educational outreach visits

- Small improvements in practice outcomes were found after educational outreach visits with or without additional interventions.
- The effect of these visits on patient outcomes is not demonstrated; only very few studies reported these outcomes.
- Educational outreach visits as a component of a multifaceted intervention have a consistent positive effect on prescribing behaviour of physicians.

1.3.5 Local opinion leaders

1.3.5.1 Definition

The Cochrane review from Flodgren 2011 mainly cites the work of Rogers to define an opinion leader (Rogers 1995): “an individual who is able to influence other individuals’ attitudes or overt behaviour informally, in a desired way with relative frequency, and who are at the centre of interpersonal communication networks”. The underlying theories are developed in the review.

1.3.5.2 Results of search strategy

The search strategy retrieved only one systematic review on local opinion leader (Flodgren 2011) which is an extension of the earlier review by Doumit et al. (Doumit 2007). This review added the specific aim to investigate the role of a multidisciplinary opinion leader team compared to a single opinion.

1.3.5.3 Effectiveness of local opinion leaders strategy

This Cochrane review (with narrative reviews) included RCTs evaluating the effectiveness of local opinion leaders and described the following comparisons:

- Effectiveness of opinion leaders: overall assessment;
- Effectiveness of local opinion leaders compared to no intervention;
- Effectiveness of local opinion leaders alone compared to a single intervention;
- Effectiveness of local opinion leaders with one or more additional intervention compared to the one or more additional intervention(s) only;
- Effectiveness of local opinion leaders as part of multifaceted interventions (opinion leaders + at least one more intervention) compared to no intervention.
Effectiveness of opinion leaders: overall assessment

- Increase in compliance with desired practice

The overall assessment analyses the effectiveness of opinion leaders with or without other interventions compared to no intervention or other intervention.

For (presumed) dichotomous outcomes, the weighted median adjusted risk difference was 12% (range from 6 to 14.5%) based on 17 comparisons (from 15 studies) (see Table 6).

- Changes in patient outcomes

No results in patient outcomes were mentioned in the review.

Table 6 – Opinion leaders: summary of findings from Cochrane meta-analysis for the overall assessment – description of outcomes adapted from Flodgren 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Adjusted absolute improvement (Risk difference) Median (Interquartile range)</th>
<th>Number of participants (studies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with desired practice (dichotomous outcomes)</td>
<td>Median 12.0% (6% to 14.5%)</td>
<td>748 + 20 settings (15 studies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of local opinion leaders compared to no intervention

The narrative review included 5 trials with four of high risk of bias. The median adjusted risk difference was very limited.

Effectiveness of local opinion leaders alone compared to a single intervention

The narrative review included 2 trials (one with high risk of bias) comparing interventions with opinion leaders to standardized lectures and audit and feedback. An increase in compliance with desired practice was noted (median adjusted RD of +0.14).

Effectiveness of local opinion leaders with one or more additional intervention compared to the one or more additional intervention(s) only

The narrative review included 4 trials (three with high risk of bias). An increase in compliance with desired practice was noted (median adjusted RD +0.10).

Effectiveness of local opinion leaders as part of multifaceted interventions (opinion leaders + at least one more intervention) compared to no intervention

The narrative review included 7 trials with a 10% absolute improvement in performance for the local opinion leader intervention when combined with other interventions (e.g. audit and feedback, chart reminders, educational meetings, academic detailing).
Characteristics explaining the heterogeneity (effect modifiers)

Three characteristics might explain the effectiveness of opinion leaders:

- the methods used by researchers to identify opinion leaders;
- the use of a multidisciplinary opinion leader team versus single opinion leader to deliver the intervention;
- the methods used to deliver education and the frequency of opinion leader involvement.

Limitations of studies

Most included studies had a high risk of bias with furthermore:

- Results not appropriately analysed;
- Activities of opinion leaders not clearly described;
- Questionable identification methods of local opinion leader.

Conclusions

The authors of the Cochrane review demonstrated an overall positive effect of opinion leaders, although the results varied across trials and also within trials where multiple outcomes were assessed. Quality of trials and high risks of bias remain major issues.

Key points for opinion leaders

- Interventions with opinion leaders improve the compliance with desired practice but data are lacking on the comparison with other dissemination interventions.
- The modalities of the interventions involving opinion leaders (e.g. intensity, content) to produce optimal effects are unknown.

1.3.6 Effectiveness of professional interventions in multifaceted interventions

1.3.6.1 Definition

In multifaceted interventions, different dissemination strategies are combined in order to multiply the effect of each single dissemination strategy.

1.3.6.2 Results of search strategy

The structure of this section is slightly different from the previous sections.

- First this chapter summarizes the results of these previous sections where a given intervention was included in multifaceted interventions;
- Second, this section summarizes the results of 3 additional reviews of reviews on the efficacy of EPOC interventions (Grimshaw 2004 and Prior 2008). The third review (Bloom 2005) was recommended by one of the validators;
- Finally, reviews that focus on specific groups of health professionals are also discussed in this section (Hakkenes 2007, Menon 2009, Van der Wees 2008, Chaillot 2006, Weinmann 2007 and Brusamento 2012): most of them put emphasis on multifaceted interventions.

1.3.6.3 Effectiveness of multifaceted interventions: summary of findings of the previous sections

Multifaceted interventions appeared to be more effective than single interventions for audit and feedback, educational meetings, interprofessional education, educational outreach visits and opinion leaders. In contrast, the interventions with reminders showed a more pronounced effect in single interventions compared to multifaceted interventions. No data were found on the effectiveness of printed educational materials in multifaceted interventions. Overall, the optimal combination of dissemination strategies is unclear: no firm conclusion can be drawn on the best modalities (e.g. components, frequency) of a multifaceted intervention improve the effect of a clinical guideline.

1.3.6.4 Effectiveness of multifaceted interventions: insights from 3 reviews of literature reviews

First extensive publication on that topic from Grimshaw 2004

This review from 2004 identified 235 studies on dissemination strategies with a majority of the studies (73%) on multifaceted interventions. Some improvements in the process of care could be found after the use of educational materials, audit and feedback and reminders as single interventions compared to no intervention. Inconclusive results were found
for the other single interventions. More improvements were found with multifaceted (versus single) interventions but the effective components could not be identified.

- Multifaceted interventions versus no-intervention control group
A total of 117 studies evaluated 68 different combinations of interventions in different care settings (primary care, mixed setting, inpatient, ambulatory care setting, long-term care setting, emergency setting, specialist outpatient clinic and military medical centre). They targeted different behavioural changes (general management, prevention, prescribing, test ordering, procedures, financial management and referral). The number of combined interventions ranged from 2 up to 7. The majority of the studies showed an improvement in performance, both in process and outcome measures. The heterogeneity in results hampered to draw any firm conclusion on the efficacy of multifaceted interventions. Some studies showed only a small improvement, questioning the clinical significance of these improvements in performance.

- Multifaceted interventions versus intervention control group
A total of 61 studies evaluated 58 different combinations of interventions in different care settings (primary care, ambulatory care, inpatient settings, mixed settings and emergency setting). They targeted different behavioural changes (general management, prevention, prescribing, test ordering and discharge planning). The number of combinations of interventions ranged from 2 up to 6. Results were similar to those found in the comparisons with no intervention: a trend towards an improvement in performance across the included studies, both in the process and in the outcome measures. The level of evidence is low, due to heterogeneity in results, ranging from no difference to small and greater differences within and across studies.

The authors conclude that across all comparisons multifaceted interventions do not appear to be more effective than single interventions and the effects of multifaceted interventions do not seem to increase with the number of component interventions. The authors conclude that there is a lack of evidence to support decisions about which guideline dissemination strategy or combination of strategies are more likely to be efficient in improving care.

**Review from Prior 2008** on dissemination strategies for clinical guidelines

Prior et al. identified 33 reviews on this topic (search till 2007). They found that most primary studies included in the identified reviews were of low quality (inadequate sample size and power, inadequate statistical analysis, baseline differences between intervention groups). Multifaceted interventions were supported by the largest body of evidence and resulted consistently in significant improvement in guideline compliance and behavioural change (effect ranged up to 60%). However the studies indicating a positive effect of multifaceted interventions could not identify which and how many components were optimal. Some improvements were even seen in studies using ineffective dissemination strategies. The authors found the following strategies to be effective (without differentiating between single or multifaceted interventions): decision support systems, educational meetings, educational outreach visits, patient-specific interventions (designed to influence practitioner behaviour via information provided to patients) and reminders. Traditional educational strategies and passive guideline dissemination were found to be ineffective.

**General review of Bloom et al. on continuing medical education**

One validator suggested adding the review of Bloom 2005 to get an overview of interventions of continuing medical education that are effective to improve the physicians’ practice and patient outcomes. Didactic techniques and printed educational materials showed no or small effects on practice outcomes whereas interactive programs exhibited moderate to high effects. These interactive programs included audit and feedback, reminders, academic detailing, educational outreach programs and local opinion leaders. The effects on patient outcomes were less pronounced but a similar pattern was noticed: the amount of interactivity of the dissemination strategy determined the size of the impact. The authors concluded that continuing medical education alone is insufficient to change clinical practice behaviour and resulting patient health outcomes: different strategies should be combined to increase the effect.
1.3.6.5 Effectiveness of multifaceted interventions for specific groups of health professionals

- Dissemination of guidelines on the management of chronic diseases in primary care
  Brusamento 2012\textsuperscript{20} focused on the effectiveness of strategies for guidelines on the management of chronic diseases in primary care in EU member states (21 studies). The authors found slightly greater improvements with multifaceted interventions compared to single interventions. Overall, the studies were of poor quality and a variation in effect size was found between the included studies. Only eight studies reported patient outcomes and two of them only showed a significant improvement. Five studies showed improvement in practice outcomes, but not in patient/health outcomes. Due to the variety in effects and inconsistency in results, the authors could not identify which strategy was the most appropriate to facilitate the use of guidelines on the management of chronic diseases.

- Dissemination strategies in allied health professions
  Hakkenes 2007\textsuperscript{21} included 14 studies and found small improvements after single interventions (6 studies). Educational interventions, including distribution of educational materials and educational meetings were the most frequently used. The multifaceted interventions (7 studies) were not more effective than single intervention strategies. The improvements were noted for practice outcomes but not for patient outcomes.

- Multifaceted interventions for rehabilitation clinicians with educational meetings as core component
  Two reviews (Van der Wees 2008\textsuperscript{19} and Menon 2009\textsuperscript{18}) analysed the effect of multifaceted interventions including educational meetings (with opinion leaders or experts) as core component. The comparators were (passive) dissemination of guidelines or standard in-service educational meetings. Both authors focused on strategies specific for rehabilitation clinicians (e.g. physiotherapists). Both reviews found only 5 publications, describing 3 separate randomised trials. The effect on professional practice was evaluated by the adherence to the recommendations of the guidelines (low back pain or whiplash guidelines). Heterogeneous results were found between the studies, but overall some improvement in professional practice was noted after a multifaceted intervention with educational meetings as core component. The two trials which evaluated the effect on patient outcomes did not find any difference between the intervention and the control groups.

- Dissemination strategies for healthcare teams and team-based practice
  Medves 2010\textsuperscript{11} found overall significant changes in knowledge, practice and patient outcomes in 64 of the 88 included studies. The most common reported dissemination strategy was the distribution of educational materials. The majority of the studies (44/60, 73.3%) reported significant findings. But the direction of the significance (positive or negative association between dissemination strategy and outcome) was not explained in the review. The authors concluded that multifaceted interventions, without specification of components, are more appropriate in multidisciplinary settings.

- Dissemination strategies in psychiatry
  Weinmann 2007\textsuperscript{22} reviewed 18 studies (search until 2006). Heterogeneous results were found for practice outcomes (no effect in half of the studies, significant in 7 out of 18 studies). Multifaceted interventions were associated with the best practice outcomes. In the 13 studies that reported patient outcomes, only 4 studies found significant improvements with better results for multifaceted interventions. The authors suggest that multifaceted interventions should include one of the following components: ongoing support or feedback, use of specific psychological models to overcome obstacles, social marketing techniques.

- Dissemination strategies in obstetrics
  Chaillet 2006\textsuperscript{6} included 9 studies on multifaceted interventions: all of them showed the efficacy for changing behaviours. The combination of strategies in the context of obstetrics seems more effective than a single intervention. However, the efficacy depended on the components of the multifaceted strategy: educational strategies seemed to be the core component to improve users’ knowledge of guidelines and feedback increased the effects of a multifaceted intervention. The authors recommend the use of multifaceted strategy with audit, feedback and opinion leaders as core components to achieve a change in behaviour.
1.3.6.6 Characteristics explaining the heterogeneity (effect modifiers)

As stated above, Grimshaw 2004 concluded that the efficacy of multifaceted interventions did not increase with the number of component interventions.

Brusamento 2012 identified one study which assessed barriers to implementation of clinical guidelines. Lack of time, knowledge, financial incentives and reluctance to change prescription routine were the most common identified barriers. Also the baseline compliance may influence the success of guideline uptake: if the baseline compliance is high, the effect of the dissemination strategy will be limited.

Other factors, for example social and/or demographic barriers may hamper or facilitate the effect of a dissemination strategy (Prior 2008): younger clinicians would be more likely to adapt their practice behaviour.

In the evidence report of Marinopoulos 2007 (suggested by one of the validators) the influence of characteristics of the audience and external factors on continuing medical education was described. Related to the characteristics of the audience, such as age, gender and race, no definitive conclusion could be reached due to the heterogeneity of the educational interventions and characteristics examined. The small number of studies on external factors and its related lack of adequate power hampered to draw definitive conclusions on the influence of external factors on the effectiveness of continuing medical education.

Conclusions

Most reviews that focused on one EPOC interventions or that focused on specific groups of health professionals concluded that multifaceted interventions produce a larger effect than single interventions. An exception is the reminder that seems more effective in single interventions. These results are in line with the effects of multifaceted interventions highlighted in the review of Prior 2008. Grimshaw in 2004 was more cautious on the effectiveness of multifaceted interventions.

However there is a lack of evidence on which would be the crucial components or optimal combination of strategies that would most likely improve the adherence to guidelines. Moreover, the ideal number of interventions to be included in multifaceted interventions cannot be defined.

Key points for multifaceted interventions

- As stated in previous sections, audit and feedback, educational strategies and/or opinion leaders have a greater impact on the practice in multifaceted interventions than in single interventions. Reminders seem to be more effective as single interventions.
- Three reviews of systematic reviews end up with slightly different conclusions on the effectiveness of multifaceted interventions. Grimshaw (an older review, published in 2004) concluded that multifaceted interventions did not appear to be clearly more effective than single interventions. More recent reviews concluded that a dissemination strategy should be multifaceted with active participation of the participants.
- Authors agreed that the optimal number and nature of the component interventions were unclear.
1.3.7 Barriers and facilitators for guideline dissemination and implementation

A literature review on effects modifiers and barriers was out of scope of this study. Yet interesting information was found on that topic and is displayed below in order to inform decisions on dissemination strategies:

- the results of a meta-review on the topic;\(^{23}\)
- a summary of the information found in the reviews specific for each strategy.

1.3.7.1 Barriers and facilitators: results from search in literature

The meta-review of Francke 2008\(^{23}\) summarized the potential barriers and facilitators for successful dissemination of clinical guidelines. Based on the results of 12 systematic reviews (including Grimshaw 2004\(^{4}\)) the following characteristics were identified:

- Characteristics of the guidelines
  The most frequently reported factor (also by the Belgian stakeholders in chapter 3) is the complexity of the content. Guidelines that are easy to understand, easy to be tried out, that do not require specific resources have greater chance of being used in clinical practice. Less frequently described factors are a preference for evidence-based guidelines (compared to guidelines with no clear scientific basis) and the active participation of the target group and experts during development.

- Characteristics of the dissemination strategies
  As stated above, Grimshaw 2004 was more cautious about the effectiveness of multifaceted interventions than authors of more recent reviews. Most of them found a higher impact when combining different strategies. Another factor related to the effectiveness of dissemination strategies is their closeness to clinical decision-making, resulting in a better integration in the process of care delivery.

- Characteristics of the professionals
  The adoption of guidelines is also determined by the (lack of) awareness, the (limited) familiarity with and the (lack of) agreement with the guidelines. In addition, age and/or experience are potential facilitators/barriers: young or less experienced professionals are more likely to adopt a guideline.

- Characteristics of the patients
  Two main barriers for the implementation of a guideline are also the patient’s resistance and complex needs of patients with comorbidities.

- Environmental characteristics
  Potential influencing factors are: (limited) time, (limited) personnel resources, work pressure and (negative) attitude or (limited) support from peers or supervisors.

These results must be interpreted with caution due to the lack of data of high quality: only 2 of the 12 reviews included by Francke 2008\(^{23}\) were scored as high quality studies.

An additional systematic review and meta-analysis (Baskerville 2012\(^{25}\)) on practice facilitation within primary care settings found an overall effect size of 0.56 (95%CI 0.43 to 0.68) in favour of practice facilitation (p<.001). Primary care practices are 2.76 more likely (95%CI 2.18 to 3.43) to adopt evidence-based guidelines through practice facilitation. No relationship between duration of intervention and effect size was found. Other effect modifiers increased the effect of practice facilitation interventions: tailoring to the context and needs of the practice (larger effect size of 0.62, 95%CI 0.48 to 0.75, p=.05), number of practices per facilitator (a negative association with effect size, p=.004) and intensity of intervention (positive association with effect size, p=.03).
Dijkstra 2006 (suggested by one of the validators) adjusted in his review on dissemination strategies for guidelines in hospitals for co-operating interventions components in a multifaceted intervention. The effects of educational materials, reminders and feedback remained statistically significant but the effects of educational meetings and patient-mediated interventions disappeared. The revision of professional roles and organisational interventions appeared to be strong components in the intervention strategies. For inpatient care, the academic hospitals showed greater improvements compared to community general hospitals, whereas for outpatient care, the community hospitals performed better. The results may be biased due to the small number of studies and the limited organisational data within the studies. On organisational level, the barriers and facilitators for effective interventions are still unclear.

1.3.7.2 Barriers and facilitators: analysis from effect modifiers of each EPOC intervention

The first sections on the effectiveness of the dissemination strategies concluded that their effect depended on the direction of change required, the baseline performance and the demographic characteristics:

- If the recommendations of the guideline are in line with the clinical practice of the physician, he will be more convinced to adopt them, in contrast to situations where a more radical change in behaviour is expected;
- When a physician is already well performing according the recommendations, only small effects of the dissemination strategies will be noted;
- The younger or less experienced he is, the higher adoption rate. Also the effect of an intervention will be increased if a supervisor or colleague is involved in the audit and feedback.

Other effect modifiers found in the section on distribution of educational materials emphasised the potential positive effects of electronic dissemination strategies: automatic provision of recommendations integrated in clinical work process, high degree of automation and different ways of electronic dissemination (alerts, reminders etc). Also the requirement of an active response to a (electronic) reminder (and the so-called push reminders) could increase the degree of improvement in clinical care. The effect of an education meeting can be increased by higher attendance rates, a mix of interactive and didactic, the non-complexity of targeted behaviour and the seriousness of the outcome.

Finally, a significant effect modifier is the type of targeted change: educational outreach visits, for example, have a potential impact on physicians’ prescription behaviour but smaller and less consistent changes are found for other desired practice changes.

1.3.7.3 Effectiveness of tailored interventions to overcome the identified barriers to change

Baker 2010 reviewed 26 studies that compared tailored interventions with control groups (no intervention or intervention not tailored to the identified barriers). Tailored interventions follow an investigation into the factors that explain current professional practice and any reason for resisting change. Tailored interventions are similar to the marketing strategy defined by the EPOC taxonomy (see synthesis). The authors found that they are more likely to improve professional practice compared to no intervention or passive dissemination of guidelines (OR (Odds Ratio) 1.52, 95% CI 1.27 to 1.82) but evidence is lacking on the most effective approach to identify the barriers and to select the most appropriate interventions.
1.3.7.4 Conclusion

Several factors play a role in the dissemination and implementation of clinical guidelines:

- the characteristics of the message (a.o. clear, understandable);
- the active participation of the clinician (development, dissemination);
- the combination of dissemination strategies;
- the link with clinical work: messages tailored to the clinical situation, electronic dissemination strategies integrated in the work process of the clinician.

This overview of literature focused on the effectiveness of different dissemination strategies and it is possible that specific reviews on these effect modifiers were missed. The focus on barriers and effect modifiers would require a specific search strategy, complemented with interviews with the end users of the clinical guidelines (cf. KCE recommendations in the synthesis).

Key points for facilitators and barriers

- The following factors may be facilitators or barriers for the dissemination and implementation of a clinical guideline: characteristics of the guidelines, characteristics of the dissemination strategy, characteristics of the professionals, patients and environment.
- Taking into account these factors may improve the dissemination and implementation i.e. multifaceted interventions with different strategies, tailored to the characteristics of the clinicians and the patients.
- Electronic dissemination strategies have the advantage to be incorporated in the work process of the clinicians and to combine different strategies as for example reminders, electronic educational materials.
1.4 Literature: summary of the main findings

1.4.1 Overview of the results

The Table 7 is an overview of the efficacy of the different EPOC interventions, found in the included reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPOC intervention</th>
<th>Included SRs</th>
<th>Number of included studies</th>
<th>Main conclusion</th>
<th>Limitations of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>Ivers 2012&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Practice outcomes: small improvements</td>
<td>Heterogeneity in results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaillet 2006&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Patient outcomes: minimal discernible effect in dichotomous outcomes, small positive effect in continuous outcomes</td>
<td>Low quality of studies (small sample sizes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total of 173</td>
<td>Other: a larger effect is obtained when audit and feedback are core components of a multifaceted intervention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of printed educational materials</td>
<td>Giguère 2011&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Practice outcomes: a small beneficial effect but with unknown clinical significance</td>
<td>Heterogeneity of interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medves 2010&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Patient outcomes: range from small negative effect to no differences</td>
<td>Variable degree of reporting interventions and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akbari 2011&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Total of 133</td>
<td>Other: no data on effectiveness of multifaceted interventions</td>
<td>Focus on physicians and outpatient practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of electronic educational materials</td>
<td>Damiani 2010&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Practice outcomes: no effect</td>
<td>Only 2 primary studies in review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McGowan 2009&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Patient outcomes: no effect</td>
<td>Low quality of studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total of 47</td>
<td>Other: no difference between single and multifaceted interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminders</td>
<td>Shojania 2011&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Total of 28</td>
<td>Practice outcomes: small improvements</td>
<td>Heterogeneity of interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient outcomes: small improvements</td>
<td>Variable degree of reporting interventions and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other: the effect of reminders is more pronounced in a single intervention compared to its effect as component of a multifaceted intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPOC intervention</td>
<td>Included SRs</td>
<td>Number included studies</td>
<td>Main conclusion</td>
<td>Limitations of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational meetings</td>
<td>Forsetlund 2012&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>• Practice outcomes: small improvements</td>
<td>• High risk of bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medves 2010&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>• Patient outcomes: small improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total of 144</td>
<td>• Other: effects similar to other types of continuing medical educations (such as audit and feedback or educational outreach visits).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interprofessional education</td>
<td>Reeves 2009&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Total of 6</td>
<td>• Practice outcomes: small improvements</td>
<td>• Few studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational outreach visits</td>
<td>O’Brien 2007&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>• Patient outcomes: small improvements</td>
<td>• Heterogeneity in results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KCE-report 2010&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>• Other: effect is more pronounced in multifaceted interventions</td>
<td>• No clear description of interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total of 146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local opinion leaders</td>
<td>Flodgren 2011&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Total of 18</td>
<td>• Practice outcomes: overall positive effect but variation within and across studies</td>
<td>• Only a few studies on patient outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Patient outcomes: not reported</td>
<td>• Low quality of primary studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Other: similar improvements found in single and multifaceted interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifaceted interventions in EPOC interventions</td>
<td>Ivers 2012&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>• Practice outcomes: multifaceted interventions are more effective than single interventions</td>
<td>• Combination of strategies not clearly described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaillet 2006&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>• Patient outcomes: not reported</td>
<td>• Lack of data on patient outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giguère 2011&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>• Other: no data on effectiveness of printed educational materials in multifaceted interventions, reminders as single intervention more effective than in multifaceted intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medves 2010&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Damiani 2010&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McGowan 2009&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shojania 2011&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forsetlund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPOC intervention</td>
<td>Included SRs</td>
<td>Number included studies</td>
<td>Main conclusion</td>
<td>Limitations of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Multifaceted interventions in synthesis reviews | Grimshaw 2004\(^4\) Prior 2008\(^7\) | 235 Total of 268 | • Practice outcomes: positive improvements versus no difference between single and multifaceted interventions  
• Patient outcomes: not reported  
• Other: modalities of multifaceted interventions unclear | • Lack of data on patient outcomes  
• Combination of strategies not clearly described |
| Multifaceted interventions for specific health professionals | Brusamento 2012\(^20\) Hakkenes 2008\(^21\) Medves 2010\(^11\) Weinmann 2007\(^22\) Chaillet 2006\(^6\) | 21 14 18 33 Total of 174 | • Practice outcomes: multifaceted interventions are more effective than single interventions  
• Patient outcomes: not reported  
• Other: one review found no difference between single and multifaceted interventions for allied health professionals | • Lack of data on patient outcomes  
• Combination of strategies not clearly described |
1.4.2 Effect of computerized decision-making systems (reminders) on clinical practice: insight from other reviews

The results on the effectiveness of reminders focus here on the dissemination of clinical guidelines. However, more literature is available on the computerized clinical decision support systems (e.g. reminders). A selection of 6 systematic reviews on this topic can be seen as a source of inspiration for the overall effectiveness of this dissemination strategy. Six domains of clinical practice were covered: preventive care (Souza 2011), chronic disease management (Roshanov 2011), diagnostic test ordering behavior (Roshanov 2011), acute care management (Sahota 2011), drug prescription (Hemens 2011) and drug monitoring (Nieuwlaat 2011). For the outcomes on clinical practice, an improvement was found in more than half of the included RCTs (ranging from 52% to 63%).

For specific topics a clear effect was demonstrated, e.g. the monitoring of vitamin K antagonists, monitoring of glycemia. The patient outcomes were not frequently assessed (in about one third of the RCTs). When these outcomes were assessed, only very limited improvement was found (between 15 and 30% of change i.e. in a few RCTs). The authors mentioned the number of included RCTs with an effect on outcomes but the size of improvement and in particular the clinical significance were not further detailed.

1.4.3 Other interventions for guideline dissemination

Next to the professional interventions, described in this part of the report, other interventions, such as financial, patient, organizational and regulatory interventions, are also included in the EPOC taxonomy. Within the financial interventions a distinction is made between:

- provider interventions, including fee-for-service, prepaid, capitation, provider salaried service, prospective payment, provider/institution incentives, provider/institution grant/allowance, provider/institution penalty, formulary;
- patient interventions: premium, co-payment, user-fee, patient incentives, patient grant/allowance, patient penalty.

Within organisational interventions a distinction is made between:

- provider orientated interventions: revision of professional roles, clinical multidisciplinary teams, formal integration of services, skill mix changes, continuity of care, satisfaction of providers, communication and case discussion;
- patient orientated interventions: mail order pharmacies, presence and functioning of adequate mechanisms for dealing with patients’ suggestions and complaints, consumer participation in governance of health care organisations.

Structural interventions include: changes to setting/site of service delivery, changes in physical structure/facilities/equipment, changes in medical record systems, changes in scope/nature of benefits/services, presence and organisation of quality monitoring mechanisms, ownership/accreditation/affiliation status of hospitals/other facilities, staff organisation.

A regulatory intervention is defined as any intervention that aims to change health services delivery or costs by regulation or law. An overlap with organisational and financial interventions is possible. Within the regulatory interventions the changes in medical liability, management of patient complaints, peer review and licensure are included.

Within the scope of this report, the focus was on the effectiveness of professional interventions. However, for specific policy recommendations, is this scope of this literature overview too narrow and an overview of the literature including all EPOC interventions would be preferred. Nevertheless the more specific focus on professional interventions, this overview of literature gave a first impression of the potential barriers, facilitators and dissemination strategies which are useful for the Belgian health services.
1.4.4 Limitations of findings

The introduction mentioned the limitation of the scope to professional interventions. The most recent interventions (e.g. internet-based learning) were not included given the lack of reviews on this topic. The sections above emphasized further the low quality of the studies included in the selected systematic reviews.

Two further points should be mentioned as well:

- Potential bias due to overlap of primary studies in different reviews
  The review of the literature was restricted to an overview of systematic reviews, without additional search for primary studies. The lack of data extraction on the level of each included primary study per review could bias the results. Some primary studies included in different reviews may result in a potential overestimation of the power of the original authors’ conclusions (Bloom 200532).

- Lack of information on the cost of dissemination strategies
  This report focused on the efficiency of EPOC strategies compared to each other for the dissemination of guidelines. However, the economic outcomes were not taken into account. Two authors found inconclusive results on that topic. Grimshaw 20044 noted that the lack of economic evaluations of high quality resulted in a paucity of data on the cost and efficiency of guideline dissemination strategies. Vale 200726 also reviewed the economic evaluations of dissemination strategies (search until 1998). None of the 63 included studies gave accurate information on costs related to guideline development and dissemination. Therefore no clear conclusion can be drawn on the cost-effectiveness of dissemination strategies.

Key points for the interpretation of the results

- The systematic reviews included in this review focused on professional interventions, mostly studied in the literature.
- These reviews are of high quality but all authors emphasized the need to interpret the results with caution given the low quality of constituent studies.
- A major caveat is the interpretation of the results in terms of changes in clinical practice: numerous studies conclude to a statistically significant change whilst the clinical relevance and the impact on patient outcomes remain questionable.
2 THE BELGIAN LANDSCAPE OF CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES

The previous chapter provided an overview of the systematic reviews on the efficacy of CPG (Clinical Practice Guidelines) dissemination and implementation strategies.

The figure below (Figure 2) shows the structuring of the main parts of the study i.e. between the literature review (chapter 1), the description of the Belgian landscape (this chapter) and the discussion about avenues of improvement (chapter 3).
Figure 2 – Structuring of the main parts of the study

**LITERATURE SEARCH**
Identification of strategies for dissemination and implementation
*(chapter 1)*

**DEVELOPMENT OF INTERVIEW GUIDE**
*(appendix 2.3)*

**RESULTS**
- Overview of the Belgian CPG landscape
  *(chapter 2.2.3 – map in appendix 2.4)*
- CPG development, validation and dissemination in Belgium
  *(chapters 2.2.4 – 2.2.6)*
- SWOT analysis of CPG dissemination and implementation
  *(Appendix 2.5)*
- Identification of barriers, facilitators and suggestions
  *(chapters 2.2.7 – 2.2.8)*

**GROUP DISCUSSION**
strategies for improvement
*(chapter 3)*

**SELECTION OF ORGANISATIONS AND INFORMANTS OF THE FIELD STUDY**
*(chapter 2.2.2)*

**INTERNET SEARCH AND EXPERT CONSULTATION**
Identification of stakeholders in CPG dissemination and implementation
*(chapter 2.2.1)*
This second chapter describes the Belgian landscape of CPG with the following objectives:

- to describe the different organizations and the links between them;
- to identify the strategies used for CPG dissemination and implementation in Belgium (see results in sections 2.2.3 to 2.2.9);
- to describe the stakeholders’ experiences in a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis (see Appendix 2.5).

Financing and development of guidelines are included in the description of this landscape as they strongly influence the dissemination and implementation strategies.

2.1 Methodology

2.1.1 General design

First, the research team drafted an inventory of the main stakeholders involved in CPG financing, development and dissemination. Based on this inventory, a first map of the Belgian CPG landscape was drawn, visualizing the connections between them.

Second, the identified stakeholders were asked to complete a mail questionnaire to identify strategies for CPG development and dissemination. They further reflected on these strategies during semi-structured interviews. The results of these interviews allowed creating SWOT analyses about CPG development and dissemination in Belgium. The SWOT analyses and the map of the CPG landscape were refined with the interviewees’ comments.

Finally, the research team wrote six statements for the improvement of CPG dissemination in Belgium for discussion with 2 groups of stakeholders (see next chapter).

2.1.2 Research population

2.1.2.1 Identification of organizations

Health care professionals who are actively involved in CPG financing, development and dissemination were eligible as respondents. Commercial stakeholders, such as pharmaceutical companies and for profit publishers were excluded because the focus of this research was dissemination of evidence based guidelines with a scientific purpose with the only objective to improve the quality of care.

The researchers first created a non-exhaustive list of the main stakeholders in CPG development and dissemination in Belgium (appendix 2.1). This list does not include organizations who give informative advice to end users as for example the Superior Health Council or Flemish agency for Care and Health.

The list was completed by a member of CEBAM (Belgian Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine), by KCE researchers, by colleagues from the Federal Public Services (FPS/SPF/FOD) and from the National Institute for Health and Disability Insurance (NIHDI/RIZIV/INAMI).

The organizations were contacted by email in order to collect basic characteristics:

- Involvement in CPG financing, development and dissemination;
- Targeted health care profession(s);
- Language of the CPG;
- Average number of CPGs per year;
- Cooperation with other stakeholders.
2.1.2.2 Selection of a sample of organizations

In a second step, 28 stakeholders’ organizations were purposively selected for participation to the interviews. The selection was based on the following characteristics: language, types of health professions (e.g. general practitioners, specialists, nurses, midwives, physiotherapists, and paramedics), types of activities (e.g. health professionals associations, academic detailing, and financing organizations) and volume of activities (absence versus high activity related to the dissemination of guidelines).

The team selected medical and paramedical professionals, representatives of professional organizations, health authorities, sickness funds, university colleges and universities. The organisations indicated the person to interview according to the expertise in guidelines. Respondents were invited by phone or by email. If an appointment for a face-to-face interview was too difficult, a telephone interview was proposed as an alternative.

2.1.3 Identification of strategies for CPG dissemination

Before the interviews, each participant received an e-mail questionnaire to provide information on the organization he/she represented and the strategies for CPG dissemination used by the organization. The questionnaire is added in Appendix 2.2. The participants returned the completed questionnaires before the interview so that the interviewers could complete or deepen the information during the encounter.

2.1.4 Interviews

Semi-structured face-to-face interviews with the thirty selected stakeholders were performed between March and April 2013, on the time and location most suitable for the interviewees. Native speaker-researchers (CD and SS) interviewed in the participants’ native language (French or Dutch). The interview guide (in French and Dutch in appendix 2.3) was based on the EPOC [The Cochrane Effective Practice and Organization of Care Group] taxonomy of professional interventions (see the synthesis) and on the findings from the literature review (see chapter 1).

The development process of guidelines (including validation) was included as it has an impact on CPG dissemination.

The following topics were addressed:

- if applicable, the method(s) of development and validation of CPG;
- the interventions for dissemination used by the organization;
- the experience on the efficiency and efficacy of these interventions;
- the difficulties and opportunities to improve CPG dissemination;
- the cooperation with other stakeholders.

The interview data were analyzed by thematic analysis. The researchers independently analyzed the first two interviews for crosschecking and intermediate adaption of the script. After their consensus on a codebook, the audio and text codification was used for further analysis. Coding was checked after five extra interviews to assure consensus on emerging codes. Using constant comparisons, codes were grouped into categories and subcategories. Field notes, taken during the interviews, were used to complete the image of the categories. The narrative report was illustrated with key text fragments. The analysis was regularly discussed by the whole research team. The quotes (in French and Dutch) are only mentioned in the French and Dutch version of this report.

2.1.5 Map of the CPG landscape in Belgium

Each interview started with the question for interviewees to show the position of their organization in the landscape of CPG in Belgium on a map (see appendix 2.4). All comments on the proposed landscape were collected and used to refine the figure. After amendments, the interviewees were asked by mail to evaluate this landscape again and the researchers further refined the map to include their proposals.

2.1.6 SWOT analysis

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT analysis) for CPG development, dissemination and adherence to CPG were derived from the analysis of the interviews. Interviewees received the SWOT analysis by email to validate the results of the interviews and to report points of disagreement or incompleteness. Their final input was used to finalize the SWOT analysis (see appendix 2.5).
2.2 Results

2.2.1 Inventory of the stakeholders

First, the research team gathered information on Belgian organizations involved in the financing, developing or dissemination of CPG. The exhaustive inventory of CPG stakeholders classifies the stakeholders into four groups: medics, paramedics/midwives/physiotherapists, authorities and others (see appendix 2.1).

This inventory was the basis to select the stakeholders for the interviews and to draw a first draft of the map of the Belgian CPG landscape (see appendix 2.4).

2.2.2 Selection of the interviewees

Table 8 summarizes the main characteristics of the interviewees, representing a selection of the large number of CPG stakeholders in Belgium. The information was gathered from one or two persons representing the organization (detailed information about the interviewed organizations, see appendix 2.6).

Table 8 – Overview of the main characteristics of the interviewed organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>French speaking organization</th>
<th>Dutch speaking organization</th>
<th>National organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical professions</td>
<td>SSMG</td>
<td>Domus Medica</td>
<td>Belgian Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Société Scientifique de Médecine Générale</td>
<td>General practitioners</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bacts.org">http://www.bacts.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ssmg.be">http://www.ssmg.be</a></td>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.domusmedica.be">http://www.domusmedica.be</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vlaamse Vereniging voor Psychiatrie (VVP)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dermanet.be">http://www.dermanet.be</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.vvp-online.be">http://www.vvp-online.be</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>French speaking organization</th>
<th>Dutch speaking organization</th>
<th>National organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Other health professionals    | Union Professionnelle des diplômés en Diététique de Langue Française (UPDLF)  
http://www.updlf-asbl.be/dieteticien/  
AIIB-VUKB  
Association des Infirmières Indépendantes de Belgique  
http://www.aiib-vukb.be  
Association Scientifique et Ethique des Logopèdes Francophones (ASELF)  
http://aself.be/ | Vlaamse Organisatie van Vroedvrouwen (VLOV) HTTP://www.vlov.be  
Wit-Gele Kruis van Vlaanderen  
http://www.witgelekruis.be  
Vlaamse Vereniging Intensieve Zorgen Verpleegkundigen (VVIZV)  
http://www.vvizv.be/nl/home | AXXON  
Kinesitherapie België  
http://www.axxon.be |
| Authorities                   | Belgian Antibiotic Policy Committee (within the FOD/SPF)  
http://www.bapcoc.be  
Direction générale de l’Organisation des Etablissements de soins (DG1 - FOD/SPF)  
DG2 : Direction générale Soins de Santé primaires et Gestion de Crise  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>French speaking organization</th>
<th>Dutch speaking organization</th>
<th>National organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Others | Collaboration Internationale des Praticiens et Intervenants en Qualité Santé (CIPIQ-S) | Kind & Gezin | https://kce.fgov.be  
NIHDI (RIZIV/INAMI): National Institute for Health and Disability Insurance  
http://www.riziv.be/homenl.htm  
http://www.inami.fgov.be/homefr.htm  
BCFI/CBIP  
Belgisch Centrum voor Farmacotherapeutische Informatie  
http://www.bcfi.be  
Christelijke Mutualiteit  
http://www.cm.be  
CEBAM  
Belgian Centre for Evidence Based Medicine  
Belgian Branch of the Dutch Cochrane Centre  
http://www.cebam.be/nl/Paginas/default.aspx  
EBMPracticeNET  
http://www.ebmpracticenet.be/Pages/default.asp  
FARMAKA  
Independent Centre for Drug Information  
http://www.farmaka.be |
2.2.3 Various perceptions of the Belgian landscape of guidelines

The participants had different reactions on the map that was proposed by the researcher. Some participants did not change or add much, sometimes declared that they had no (clear) view on who is (or not) involved in CPGs in Belgium. Others had a broader vision and changed the map by adding organizations, drawing arrows between organizations or commenting on organizations that should not be there according to them. A few interviewees started drawing a new map, suggesting a different approach of visualizing the landscape. The team gathered this information in one document but the final result may still be not exhaustive as it depends from the suggestions of the interviewees.

2.2.4 Guidelines development in Belgium: definition, methods and perception of the strategies

2.2.4.1 Definition of clinical practice guidelines

The official definition of CPG (see synthesis) is: “systematically developed statements to assist practitioner decisions about appropriate health care for specific clinical circumstances” (Institute of Medicine Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines, 1992). However interviewees had different views on that topic. Some interviewees (for instance Domus Medica) considered a CPG as the product of a strict methodology. Other organizations put emphasis on the practical use of these tools, with less attention for the development methodology. Finally, some organizations as for instance the Belgian Centre for pharmaceutical Information (BCFI/CBIP) do not name their product “clinical practice guidelines”, the border is difficult to define.

2.2.4.2 Choice of the guideline topic

Topics for CPG were chosen using different approaches. CPG developers chose a subject either themselves, occasionally influenced by RIZIV/INAMI or FOD/SPF (e.g. for the KCE, the general practitioners (GP) associations, the pharmacists’ association). The National Council for the Promotion of Quality (CNPO/NRKP) can play a role to suggest topics to the developers (e.g. to the KCE with the aim to use later the evidence for developing feedbacks). Sometimes the developers perform a survey among users to identify fields of priority (e.g. College of Geriatrics, pharmacists, CIPIQ-S (Collaboration internationale des Praticiens et Intervenants en Qualité dans le domaine de la santé)).

Interviewees also reported on the use of local consensus processes in order to choose a topic. It is an interesting and practical approach based on the participation of the professional users in the guideline development, which could lead to a higher level of adherence according to the interviewees. This user’s participation, in counterpart, could be difficult as the professional users are mostly volunteers.

2.2.4.3 Authors of clinical practice guidelines

The affiliations of authors are important for the quality of the guideline. Authors often work for the organization (e.g. Wit-Gele Kruis, Kind & Gezin, Domus Medica) or for academic institutions (e.g. authors from the BAPCOC-Belgian Antibiotic Policy Coordination Committee). They are often academics, PhD or Master students. Many participants declared that for the selection of authors “everyone knows someone”.

Difficulties related to the authorship

The obstacles frequently reported were time constraints, poor financial resources and lack of motivation due to the complexity and burden of the development procedure. Some interviewees stated that CPG development is quite a challenge and a learning process one has to go through. BAPCOC reported that authors are often inexperienced and many of them do not participate more than once due to the heavy procedure of developing CPG. Even if it is paid, it is insufficiently recognized.
2.2.4.4 Methods of CPG development

Development and/or collaboration

In general, the guidelines developers can be subdivided into two groups.

- Organizations that develop guidelines (BAPCOC, Wit-Gele Kruis, College of Geriatrics, College of Oncology, Domus Medica, BCFI/CBIP, Kind & Gezin, SSMG, nurses (CIPIQ-S), KCE, pharmacists (APB), FARMAKA).

- Organizations that collaborate with other ones that develop guidelines (physiotherapists (AXXON), midwives (VLOV), intensive care nurses (VVIZV), psychiatry association (VVP).

Some illustrations of international collaborations are:

- the adaptation of Finnish Duodecim CPG by EBMPracticeNET: EBMPracticeNet also participates in a consortium (Austria, Norway, Finland) to update guidelines;

- the use of French CPG for Medical Imaging by the College of Medical Imaging;

- European guidelines for dieticians by UPDLF (Union Professionnelle des diplômés en Diététique de Langue Française);

- BICEP (Belgian Interuniversity Collaboration for Evidence-based Practice): this collaborating centre of the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) is committed to produce high quality systematic reviews related to nursing subjects. JBI is an international not-for-profit institute that collaborates internationally with over 70 centres across the world. Their mission is to provide health professionals with the best available evidence to inform their decision-making at the point of care.

Development methods

Two types of methods are reported as broadly used to develop CPG:

- A strict, predesigned method (e.g. KCE, Domus Medica, SSMG, CIPIQ-S, BAPCOC, BCFI, APB). The interviewees stated the importance to strive to find the highest possible level of evidence from the literature (e.g. with the use of validated search strategies). Some developers mentioned the explicit use of tools to define that level of evidence (e.g. GRADE [Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation]) and the quality of the evidence reporting (e.g. AGREE-Appraisal of Guidelines Research and Evaluation instrument) strategies;

- A literature search combined with expert opinion and/or on a consensus model (e.g. dermatologists), especially when few studies are available on the topic.

Expert consultation

Anyhow, all organizations consult experts at some point in the development process (or at the end) either to add their individual opinion or in search of consensus of opinion.

Difficulties related to the development of guidelines

Interviewees experienced several difficulties concerning the development. They stated that the workload is demanding, the procedure often long lasting, resulting in old data when published, and the development process (too) rigid. Other difficulties experienced are lack of time, manpower and financial resources. Many CPGs are developed by professionals on top of their work and during free time.

Some participants report a lack of qualitatively good literature in their field (Wit-Gele Kruis, Dermatologists) but other ones describe an excess of literature.
2.2.4.5 Testing CPG for feasibility

All interviewees acknowledged the importance to test a guideline amongst end users, either in clinical settings or in Continuous Professional Development groups. Yet most organizations experienced a lack of time and resources to do so. The College of Geriatrics, Domus Medica, SSMG, APB and CIPIQ-S test their CPGs for feasibility on the field, for example in geriatrics wards, or submit them in LOK/GLEM groups (Lokale Kwaliteitskringen/Groupes Locaux d’Évaluation Médicale - mandatory small groups for quality assessment for physicians).

2.2.4.6 Updating the CPG

Participants reported the importance of a regular updating of their CPG. However, this is sometimes impossible due to a lack of manpower, financial means and lack of dedicated time within the organization. The same reasons are mentioned for adapting CPG to the local situation e.g. adapting Dutch NHG (Nederlands Huisartsen Genootschap) guidelines to the Flemish context.

2.2.4.7 Collaborations with other CPG stakeholders

Interviewees talked about various types of collaboration: with other CPG developers but also with people disseminating, implementing or financing CPG.

In general, the participants emphasized the multidisciplinary aspect of collaboration. Collaborations could be non-structural, based on coincidence (sporadic sharing of interest for a topic) or structural (e.g. BAPCOC & Domus Medica, Wit-Gele Kruis & CIPIQ-Ś, Domus Medica & SSMG, RIZIV/INAMI & FOD/SPF, EBMPracticeNET & Werkgroep Eerstelijnsrichtlijnontwikkelaars) (See maps of the Belgian Landscape, appendix 2.4).

Participants reported these collaborations in general as positive and fruitful. Many thoughts were dedicated to future collaborations in demand, e.g. VLOV, Physiotherapists & EBMPracticeNET, VVP & Trimbosinstituut Netherlands, dieticians & doctors & nurses.

Collaborations could be national or international:

- Nationally, some CPG developers collaborate with other developers (e.g. within Werkgroep Eerstelijnsontwikkelaars, Domus Medica & BAPCOC; CIPIQ-S with Domus Medica and SSMG). Collaborations are also established with universities, professional organizations, LOK/GLEM’s, patient organizations, informal caregivers, CEBAM (as methodological expert), federal institutions like FODSPF, RIZIV/INAMI, KCE or with disseminators like EBMPracticeNET. A remarkable observation was that Flemish organizations more often collaborate with international organizations, rather than with French-speaking Belgian organizations (e.g. VVP & Trimbosinstituut Netherlands). The interviewees suggested that this was more explained by a similar culture than the language.

- International collaborations are e.g. between Flanders (Domus Medica) & The Netherlands (NHG), between Belgium (KCE) & UK, within a network of professional organizations (e.g. AXXON & World Confederation for Physical Therapy; UPDLF & European Federation of the Associations of Dietitians), within a network of centres that promote evidence (Belgian Interuniversity Collaboration for Evidence-based Practice (BICEP) & Joanna Briggs network).

Difficulties related to collaborations between CPG stakeholders

The participants noted some difficulties within collaborating organisations. Language was reported as an obstacle, just as organizational and structural differences between e.g. the Belgian and Dutch health care system (for instance for GPs). One interviewee described collaboration as a constant “dragging and pulling”. Furthermore forcing one’s opinion on the partner, a top-down approach, agenda’s that do not match and an unorganized way of collaborating and financial expectations were reported. Some interviewees (e.g. physiotherapists) noted that they had to make some efforts in order to be heard as a professional group among other CPG stakeholders.
Facilitating factors related to collaborations between CPG stakeholders

Interviewees reported following aspects to facilitate the collaborations: good agreements, win-win situations, collaboration with organizations experienced in developing evidence-based CPG, needing each other as partners and sharing a common concrete objective.

Key points for the perception of stakeholders (definition, development and collaborations):

- Participants’ views on how to define a CPG differ;
- Topics for CPG are either chosen by the organization itself (occasionally influenced by the financing organizations) or by the end users (health care professionals);
- Organizations develop CPG either themselves or in collaboration with other CPG developers or focus on the translation/adaptation of CPG;
- CPG are either developed in a strict, predesigned way or based on a literature search in combination with expert opinion/consensus model;
- Belgian organizations acknowledge the importance of testing, updating CPG and/or adapting CPG developed abroad. However, most of them experience a lack of time and resources;
- Collaborations between stakeholders vary: with CPG developers of another discipline, with disseminators, with various financing institutions;
- Collaborations are national or international, either non-structural, based on coincidence or structural. They are in general experienced as positive but difficulties occur as well.

2.2.5 Validation of CPG: from consensus to official procedure

The term “validation” can refer to a validation of the methodology and/or to a validation of the content. This term means that the CPG meets certain quality criteria (methodology) and that it is recommended to be used by health care workers in clinical practices (methodology and content).

Two types of procedures could be identified:

- Informal procedure: organizations rely on a consensus model, expert opinion/consensus and/or testing for feasibility (e.g. Wit-Gele Kruis, College of Geriatrics, College of Oncology, BCFI, College of Medical Imaging, APB).
- Formal validation by CEBAM (Belgian Centre for Evidence Based Medicine): organizations follow a strict development method with a formal validation of the methodology and content by CEBAM (e.g. Domus Medica, SSMG, CIPIQ-S, BAPCOC, KCE).

CEBAM validates approximately five guidelines each year since 2002. Most of the CPG validated by CEBAM were developed by the GPs’ organizations (Domus Medica, SSMG) and BAPCOC. CEBAM also now validates CPGs developed by KCE.

Pharmacists mentioned that some parts of their CPG were too specific to be validated by CEBAM. EBMPracticeNET, a dissemination platform linked to CEBAM, declared they only disseminate CPGs that passed the CEBAM validation procedure.

A remarkable observation is that some organizations never heard about CEBAM. CEBAM itself made it clear that for a better, more EBM approach of CPG development in the future, a CEBAM validation should function as a condition to receive public funding.

Difficulties related to formal validation procedures

Organizations practicing a more informal way of validation acknowledged the value of a formal validation but reported a lack of time and financial resources as obstacles. In general, a formal validation means excessive paperwork for the interviewees and various procedures, which took a lot of time. Many participants consider a formal validation as a slow process. Authors have to cope with numerous (rounds of) remarks on their work, which is experienced as demotivating.
Opportunities related to formal validation procedures

Some developers considered the CEBAM validation as a quality label. Interviewees found important that scientists and governmental institutions could rely on this information. Domus Medica also mentioned the interaction with CEBAM on methodological support and on resolving points of discussion.

To facilitate a validation process, the interviewees suggested a clear definition of CPG (cfr. BCFI). They declared that the validating institution should be independent and the validation instrument generally accepted (e.g. AGREE). Organizations who have their CPGs validated should be rewarded (e.g. accreditation) according to several participants.

**Key points for the validation of guidelines:**

- The term “validation” refers to the validation of the content and/or of the methodology. The procedure can be:
  - formal: by an external body like CEBAM, with a focus on the validation of the methodology;
  - informal (consensus model, expert opinion, testing on the field): usually mentioned as more directed to content validation.

- A formal validation procedure is perceived as a quality label. Obtaining this quality label requires many resources and is not feasible for some organisations.

- The topic of the CPG may influence the feasibility and importance of the validation.

2.2.6 Dissemination of CPG: many strategies in Belgium

This section presents the strategies mentioned by the interviewees along with their advantages and disadvantages. These strategies are classified according to the EPOC taxonomy (see the synthesis’ introduction).

Most organisations disseminate with paper documents and/or website. Other strategies sometimes complete the dissemination process.

For a schematic overview of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of each EPOC intervention in Belgium, see appendix 2.5.

2.2.6.1 Distribution of educational materials

The EPOC taxonomy refers to educational materials as the “distribution of published or printed recommendations for clinical care, including clinical practice guidelines, audiovisual materials and electronic publications. The materials may have been delivered personally or through mass mailings. Paper and electronic documents are considered as educational materials”.

**Paper documents**

- **Advantages**
  - The dissemination with paper documents was not questioned, most interviewees mentioned it first. Quoted advantages were the habit and the pleasure to manipulate paper documents and the possibility to read them anywhere, without any additional device. Interviewees reported that the use of a standardised format helps the user to keep them in sight and find them easily when needed.
  - **Different formats**

Guidelines are presented to the professionals through different kinds of paper documents: brochures, leaflets, pocket documents as well as articles in periodicals, professional journals and newsletters. These documents are sent to the professionals by post, either with the financial help of national institutions (FOD/SPF Public Health, RIZIV/INAMI), or with support of their professional association.

The interviewees did insist on the practical use of these documents. Even if the presentation of the whole CPG is necessary as a reference document, it seems of equal or even greater importance to the participants to provide synthesised, clear and practical information. This could be preferably presented in separated documents like pocket documents, charts or algorithms that can be easily handled at the point of care.

The interviewees emphasized the clarity of the information i.e. essential and short messages and a vocabulary adapted to the target group.

Additional documents for patients or their caregivers were also quoted by the interviewees i.e. to help the communication. They are provided to the beneficiaries during the encounter.
Electronic documents

CPG are also presented under electronic format on governmental or professional association websites. Applications for new electronic devices such as smartphones or tablets are developed as well. Electronic mails were also mentioned.

Some interviewees mentioned EBMPracticeNET as a disseminator of electronic CPG and considered this organization as the first step towards a common dissemination platform. EBMPracticeNET is an initiative of the NIHDI to gather all Belgian organisations involved in evidence-based medicine and to develop a national electronic point-of-care information service. The website provides Belgian healthcare professionals with a database of Belgian CPG (validated by CEBAM) and international CPG, links to other EBM information and a clinical decision support system, which is linked to electronic health records.

The platform “Wetenschap en Praktijk” is another example of initiative that gathers stakeholders interested in the development and dissemination of evidence for nursing practice. The website (www.portal4care.be) displays guidelines from various organisations to promote evidence-based nursing practice in Belgium.

- Advantages
  The choice of using the electronic format to disseminate CPG was not questioned by the interviewees; they see it as a common way of proceeding in addition to paper documents or alone. Quoted advantages were the increasing habit to use computers and related devices. According to the participants it is fast, easy to use and attractive to more and more people, especially the younger ones.
  The small cost of producing and disseminating the electronic material makes them a good alternative to paper documents, according to the interviewees. Websites are an easy and cheap way to reach many people.
  However, disseminators seemed to prefer to reach one specific target group. The mailings present the disadvantages of wrong addresses as for the post. Registration to access information on specific websites is one mean but this may be an obstacle for the user. A link with the electronic patient record (medical or pharmaceutical) can give a direct access to the appropriate CPG information in relation to symptoms, diagnosis, treatment and prevention (cf. reminders). The interviewees who use it (e.g. EBMPracticeNET) or would like to use it (dieticians, nurses) think that the reminders are precious tools with many opportunities.

- Different formats
  Concerning the content of this material, interviewees also mentioned the importance to propose and present various levels of information (CPG itself, synthesis, decision algorithms). They declared that this is facilitated by the technological properties of the material: use of links to present the CPG in a progressive way, use of links to redirect towards complementary documents and possibility of downloading documents for patients. Printing the documents was also mentioned as a favourable aspect for those who prefer to manipulate paper documents.

- Some problems with electronic dissemination
  The problem of mailing lists has been mentioned above. Moreover, not all professionals use electronic devices, especially during home visits and unexpected failures are an additional threat.
  The access to the correct and useful information requires skills, time and energy. The electronic systems become more and more powerful and the huge amount of information is a threat. Interviewees stated that the disseminator has to be cautious when selecting the information and presenting it in a logical way (e.g. following the clinical reasoning process).
  The availability of a good search tool is needed. The presentation of the information in a common format avoids downloading different kinds of software. The centralisation of all CPG and CPG-related information on a common platform was described as a need to increase the GCP accessibility.

  Regular updating of the information is a final important point.
2.2.6.2 Educational meetings

The term “educational meetings” refers, in the EPOC taxonomy, to “healthcare providers who have participated in conference, lectures, workshops or traineeships”. Face-to-face meetings and e-learning modules are within this section because both strategies answer to this definition.

Face-to-face meetings

The educational meetings reported by the interviewees are:

- meetings or conferences where a session is devoted to CPG-related presentations;
- seminars organised around one CPG;
- formal training within the framework of continuous medical education (e.g. LOK’s/GLEM’s).

The choice of this strategy is guided by the opportunity to get “accreditation” points.

Advantages

Participants mentioned as advantage of these meetings the dissemination of the EBM-approach among large scientific, professional and educational communities. GCP developers (SSMG for example) prepare modules with ready-to-use materials, activities and questions. These standardised, reproducible presentations assure a good quality of disseminated information, according to participants.

Disadvantages

The main disadvantage mentioned is the time spent in these meetings. They bear a large cost for organisers and attenders. According to interviewees, attenders should benefit of an educational leave and be replaced in their job. This is not easy to achieve for self-employed professionals.

E-learning modules

Advantages mentioned by the respondents are that professionals can choose the place and time to connect as well as the information collected and the duration of the session. It is attractive to young people. Possibility to evaluate and provide feedback to the trainee was also mentioned.

However, interviewees quoted also obstacles such as lack of personal relationships and face-to-face meetings, inducing difficulties regarding control and motivation. The low cost of use was usually put in the balance with the high cost of development.

2.2.6.3 Local consensus processes

EPOC taxonomy describes consensus processes as follows: “participating providers are included in discussion to ensure that they agreed that the chosen clinical problem was important and the approach to managing the problem was appropriate”.

The interviewees did not mention this strategy although it is used by the NIHDI (but probably not considered as a strategy to disseminate CPG).

2.2.6.4 Educational outreach visits

This dissemination strategy consists of “a trained person who meets with providers in their practice settings to give information with the intent of changing the provider’s practice. The information may have included feedback on the performance of the provider(s)” (cf. EPOC taxonomy).

Only a few interviewees reported the use of this strategy but several participants also did mention it as an opportunity for the future. Interviewees described outreach visits as an efficient and effective way to reach physicians since it is a one-on-one encounter with the emphasis on personal, individual contact. The fact that this strategy is being used by the pharmaceutical industry is an argument to copy this strategy for the dissemination of guidelines. It could be used in a more systematic approach and applied to a broader field as for instance diagnosis, prevention and behavioral therapy, according to an interviewee. Outreach visitors could also use these visits to advertise e.g. CEBAM Digital Library for Health.
2.2.6.5 Local opinion leaders

EPOC defines it as the 'use of providers nominated by their colleagues as 'educationally influential'. The investigators must have explicitly stated that their colleagues identified the opinion leaders. In some cases, interviewees mentioned that some professionals were trained for the new CPG and afterwards explained to their colleagues.

Participants stated opinion leaders are better known by colleagues than an external trainer; this could increase the credibility and adherence to CPG. The interviewees mentioned that the process in cascade has the advantage to multiply the number of informed professionals but it might be a challenge to maintain the accuracy of the information.

2.2.6.6 Patient-mediated interventions

This strategy consists in 'new clinical information (not previously available) collected directly from patients and given to the provider e.g. depression scores from an instrument' (EPOC). The interviewees did not report the use of this strategy.

2.2.6.7 Audit and feedback

This strategy is defined in the EPOC taxonomy as the provision of 'any summary of clinical performance of health care over a specified period of time. The summary may also have included recommendations for clinical action. The information may have been obtained from medical records, computerized databases, or observations from patients'.

The interviewees mentioned rarely feedback on clinical performance linked to CPG. They mentioned feedback as an opportunity to promote the culture of quality of care. The professional's reflection is guided through a quality assurance cycle. The personal profile compared to what is recommended offers a way to discover the CPG and to reflect on his own practice. It is an individual approach that is quantifiable and answers “why” and “how” questions.

Sense of control and obligation were quoted as disadvantages.

2.2.6.8 Reminders

This consists in ‘patient or encounter specific information, provided verbally, on paper or on a computer screen, which is designed or intended to prompt a health professional to recall information. This would usually be encountered through their general education; in the medical records or through interactions with peers, and so remind them to perform or avoid some action to aid individual patient care. Computer aided decision support and drugs dosage are included’. (EPOC)

The interviewees insisted on the insertion of reminders within multiple approaches to provide information. Besides repetition, little notes or adverts are occasionally mentioned as reminders by interviewees. Letters or small inserts in periodicals remind readers to look for a new publication concerning a CPG. Using the electronic technology, they are inserts in website.

In the most sophisticated form, they are associated with the electronic patient record, appearing at a regular pace following a predetermined calendar or associated with specific diagnosis or treatment. This strategy is currently under development by EBMPracticeNET.

According to the interviewees, the quality of these reminders is shortness and clarity. They also insisted on the importance of this strategy to reach the individual professional: it should be the most frequently consulted medium by the target population.

The interviewees quoted as possible disadvantage a negative perception of control, as for the feedbacks.

2.2.6.9 Marketing

The EPOC definition of this strategy is the “use of personal interviewing, group discussion (“focus groups”), or a survey of targeted providers to identify breaks to change and subsequent design of an intervention that addresses identified breaks”. The interviewees did not report the use of this strategy.
2.2.6.10 **Mass Media**

This strategy is defined, in the EPOC taxonomy, as “the varied use of communication that reached great numbers of people including television, radio, newspapers, posters, leaflets, and booklets, alone or in conjunction with other interventions and targeted at the population level”.

Interviewees evoked using general press, television and social networks to reach a large population for topics of broad interest such as prevention or public health messages. An advantage is that patients and professionals receive the same message: this could trigger a discussion between them. However, the interviewees mentioned as a disadvantage the uncertainty about who gets reached.

2.2.6.11 **Multifaceted intervention**

While describing the dissemination process, the interviewees always mentioned the use of more than one EPOC strategy. Most organisations disseminate CPG using paper publication and a website. The other EPOC strategies are not so commonly used.

Many organisations use various routes to reach the target population but there is often a lack of clear strategy.

---

**Key points dissemination strategies in Belgium:**

- Most organisations use paper and electronic based publications. Other strategies sometimes complete the dissemination process;
- Educational meetings refer to face-to-face meetings (conferences, seminars, formal trainings) and e-learning modules (a new way to disseminate guidelines);
- Interviewees did not report much about educational outreach visits or feedbacks as dissemination strategies; they still mentioned them as interesting strategies;
- Reminders can be useful strategies if short, clear and delivered in a good format, just in time;
- Mass media such as general press, television and social networks can be used for topics of broad interest like when informing patients.

---

2.2.7 **Difficulties to disseminate and implement CPG**

Obstacles specific to each strategy have been described in the previous sections. This section highlights difficulties independent of the choice of strategy.

**Cost of dissemination**

Cost of dissemination is by far the most cited obstacle, except for electronic dissemination. The costs include materials for dissemination, post as well as human resources to provide information and training. Reproduction of paper documents such as educational material, supports to educational meetings, reminders are also very expensive, according to the participants.

Electronic documents are a good alternative though not yet always used. Moreover, it was mentioned that computers or other electronic devices are sometimes not available for health professionals during their work.
Global lack of dissemination plan

Not having a specific, well-stated dissemination plan was reported as a difficulty. Some organizations seem not to have thought about developing dissemination plan, others had a plan but lacked of time and/or financial resources to implement it.

Ignorance of the Belgian landscape

Another difficulty reported by interviewees is the lack of overview of the Belgian dissemination landscape. Many organizations disseminate guidelines but few seem to know "who is doing what". Participants stated that this results in a lot of work that is, unnecessarily, being done twice (or even more).

Reaching the target population

Reaching the target population is always a challenge according to the interviewees. On one hand they say that this is related to organizational difficulties (old list of addresses, heterogeneity of the target population). On the other hand, this would be due to a lack of knowledge about the evidence-based approach: the target population is not aware of the importance of the scientific basis of the guidelines and therefore not sensitive to it.

Image of the developer and/or of disseminator

An obstacle often quoted by the interviewees is the image that the professional has of the CPG developing and/or disseminating organization. In this respect, interviewees state that professionals' associations would have a more positive impact on professionals than governmental institutions, which represent for the professionals a form of control and power. Suspicion of economic-oriented goals of public institutions was also mentioned.

Image of the guidelines

Furthermore, interviewees mentioned the often “bad image” of the guidelines themselves, being too scientific and not linked to their practice.

Too much information kills information

The interviewees quoted the excessive provision of scientific knowledge and continuous innovations as a major break to dissemination. This problem comes from an exponential increase of available and accessible information. This situation is worsened by the excessive dissemination of information, the lack of practical information and sometimes divergent messages. The professionals discard or file the information because they have no time in the clinical setting. The importance of reminders, of short and clear messages has been repeatedly mentioned to overcome this difficulty.

Key points difficulties to disseminate guidelines:

- Global lack of dissemination plan;
- High costs of dissemination;
- Ignorance of the Belgian users landscape;
- Difficulties to reach the target population;
- Perception of the users about the value of guidelines;
- Information overload.
2.2.8 Facilitating factors to disseminate and implement CPG

The interviewees pinpointed various facilitating factors for the dissemination of guidelines on two levels: facilitating factors on the organizational level (financing, structural organization) and on the individual level.

Involvement of health professionals in the guidelines development

The interviewees find it essential to involve the professionals in the process of guidelines development and dissemination: choosing the topic, developing and disseminating the CPG. This is a condition to provide useful and practical information. This bottom-up approach is more acceptable by the professionals than a top-down approach.

Comprehensible language

The disseminators should pay attention to the use of a language adapted to the target population, to develop concise and clear messages and to use the correct and adapted mean of communication. As an illustration the CLEAR instrument (Common Language Evidence-based Advices and Recommendation) was developed by KCE to reach this goal.

More frequent multidisciplinary consultation and testing of documents should provide a more efficient approach of dissemination.

Incentives for continuing professional development

The interviewees declared that the professionals should be encouraged to continue to learn. “Accreditation points” are the incentives most often cited by the interviewees. Financial incentives are usually discarded as opposite to our culture. Offering structural support was perceived as an important factor.

Accessibility of information

Easily accessible, accurate information is perceived as a positively motivating factor for professionals. According to interviewees, this can be done by presenting up-to-date information, by proposing a good search on the website and by centralising the information. In general, interviewees underline the importance of further digitalization and state that information on websites should be provided for free.

One interviewee who emphasized the importance of the user-friendliness of messages further expressed his concern that user-friendly guidelines could decrease the quality of information.

Combination of strategies

Finally, most interviewees stated that a strategy would never work alone: a combination of strategies (different for each topic) was cited to overcome the above mentioned difficulties.

Key points facilitating factors to disseminate CPG:
- Involvement of more-than-one discipline;
- Comprehensible language;
- Incentives for continuing professional development;
- Easily accessible information;
- Combination of strategies.

2.2.9 Suggestions to improve CPG dissemination and implementation

2.2.9.1 Creation of a coordinating, national group

Interviewees agreed that the current CPG landscape (developers, disseminators) is fragmented: there is a need for coherence in the domain of CPG. Yet there are already some initiatives as for example the platform “Wetenschap en Praktijk” for the nurses: this platform brings together stakeholders interested in the production and dissemination of guidelines for nurses and midwives. One website (www.portal4care.be) gives access to guidelines from various institutions (e.g. KCE, FPS) for topics that relate to nursing/midwife’s practice.

A further suggestion by the stakeholders is the creation of a unique national coordinating group. This committee of experts would represent the main institutions involved in CPG development and dissemination. The terms used by interviewees to describe this group of experts (committee, think-tank, and dome) refer to the variety of representatives from paying, developing and disseminating institutions. This group would ensure a more coherent landscape, since participation in different CPG groups is nowadays more often based on coincidence than on structured planning.
2.2.9.2 A common database of CPG

Another suggestion to rationalise CPG development and dissemination was to centralise the information concerning CPG: topics covered, need for update, topics under development. The aim is to use resources efficiently and avoid duplicate work.

A common database of all guidelines (finished or under process) should be set up at the federal and interregional levels. This database would be a tool for the coordinating group of experts that would decide on priorities and on a common plan of actions.

EBMPPracticeNet is an illustration of this concept as it currently gives priority to the (limited) collection of validated Belgian guidelines and offers a collection of EBM Finnish guidelines translated in French and Dutch, adapted to the Belgian context.

2.2.9.3 Larger budgets

Perception of the participants

In general, participants’ vision on budget was vague with uncertainty on that topic. Most interviewees did not to know the size of the budget and/or how the budget was calculated and/or spent. Yet the interviewees were perhaps not the best persons within the organization to answer to accounting questions.

Budgets are most commonly provided annually or per project. Some organizations receive financing from FOD/SPF or RIZIV/INAMI but other ones rely on their own budget to develop guidelines.

Most participants described difficulties concerning “too limited” budgets. Some participants compared their situation with other European countries with higher budgets for CPG development. One participant stated that developing one CPG of high quality costs approximately € 200 000 euros but few Belgian organizations have this budget. Another interviewee declared that the government encourages organizations to develop CPG, but provides them with a budget that is only sufficient for two CPGs. Interviewees insisted on the need for more resources to develop and disseminate CPG in the future.

Yet one participant stated that organizations would need to learn how to partition the budgets in more creative ways.

Complementary information from stakeholders

The research team contacted the National Institute for Health and Disability Insurance (NIHDI) and the Federal Public Services (SPF/FOD) to get a more precise idea of the budget spent on guidelines in Belgium. The institutions provided the requested information but the figures did not allow drawing any conclusion: the financing of guidelines is indeed embedded in more global budgets that cover other activities of the scientific associations. Some illustrations are:

- the yearly budget received by the GP associations for their guidelines related activities (€ 50 000 and € 200 000 for SSMG and Domus respectively);
- budget from the NIHDI for the Digital Library for Health (€ 650 000 in 2012);
- NIHDI budgets (2012) for EBMPPracticeNet (e-platform with validated guidelines - € 250 000) and for the licence of the Duodecim guidelines (Finnish guidelines that will be translated into French and Dutch for Belgian health professionals - € 300 000).

2.2.9.4 Collaboration with European organizations

The interviewees also questioned the idea of developing CPG in Belgium. They argued that other countries have more manpower and finances and that we could translate/adapt CPG from European countries to the Belgian context. The same idea came repeatedly: the synergy between people and institutions should be promoted, organized and valorised.

2.2.9.5 The standardization of CPG development processes and standards

Another suggestion was the development of a global framework on “how to develop CPG”. This would increase standardisation of information, which would lead to an easier dissemination and better implementation. To achieve the same goal, collaboration between institutions involved with CPG development should be increased.
2.2.9.6 **The involvement of all health sectors**

In the future, a stronger involvement of the secondary and tertiary care is needed to improve CPG development, dissemination and implementation, according to the interviewees. Several participants also mentioned that the current landscape mainly focuses on physicians and thought that it should cover in the future other auxiliary disciplines. Patient organizations should be more actively involved in the whole CPG process, e.g. in the development of CPG or in the testing for feasibility. A suggestion was to expand the “working group of primary care developers” to other professionals from the second and third lines of care in order to have all GCP developers in one committee.

2.2.9.7 **A centralized CPG-related information for the professionals**

Centralisation of information on an electronic platform for all professionals would decrease the time for searching information as well as for disseminating the information between professional groups. Some interviewees mentioned EBMPracticeNET as an appropriate candidate to fulfil this task: this platform is planning to gather all primary care players in the CPG landscape by the end of 2015; and from 2016 onwards to extend its field to the secondary care. EBMPracticeNet considers itself as the national platform where CPG are disseminated adequately and are being linked to EBMMeDS (Evidence Based Medicine Electronic Decision Support), which is connected to the patient files. EBMPracticeNET functions currently as a gate-keeper, only posting CPG on their website that passed a CEBAM validation.

2.2.9.8 **Clear dissemination Strategies**

Having a plan to disseminate information, standardising it, multiplying the strategies used were among the most important suggestions of interviewees. Analysing and transferring strategies from the pharmaceutical industry was also suggested to improve dissemination.

2.2.9.9 **New professionals’ attitude towards CPG**

Interviewees emphasized the need for improving the professionals’ attitude towards CPG. An EBM approach should be encouraged by all means, starting during the basic education and going on by e.g. continuous medical education, conferences and lectures. Many other factors have been mentioned by the interviewees concerning the professional like difficulty to change the practice, lack of time because of heavy workload, lack of motivation, risk to lose patients or patient's confidence while applying new CPG, lack of incentives to modify the practice. The professionals often question the feasibility to apply guidelines and nothing is offered to compensate for the extra time and energy needed.

2.2.9.10 **A cautious move to electronic support systems**

Concerning the organizational aspects, interviewees quoted the need to adapt the environment to apply CPG: the equipment necessary to apply guidelines is sometimes missing (e.g. software packages), the team should modify the organization of the work, someone should take the responsibility of this adaptation. Expectations by the interviewees on the future of Electronic Decision Support Systems are high. However, several participants emphasized that professionals also need to improve their skills to code the patient’s information in the medical record. Some interviewees expressed their concerns on the readiness of doctors and other professionals for this tool.

2.2.9.11 **A health care system in line with CPG philosophy**

According to the interviewees, the whole health care system should be organised in line with a CPG philosophy. Reimbursement of patients should be for example in accordance with CPG; EBM should be promoted with positive incentives or reduction of incentives if not followed. Controversial influence of pharmaceutical industry was mentioned.

2.2.9.12 **The evaluation of CPG impact on practice**

Only few experiences relate to the evaluation of the impact on the practice. All interviewees regret that so much time, energy and financial resources were spent to develop and disseminate CPG without knowing whether these strategies have an impact on change of practice or not.
Key point suggestions to improve CPG dissemination:

- A coordinating, national group for a comprehensive, uniform CPG landscape;
- A common CPG database that centralises information and helps end users to find the right information (cf. example of EBMPracticeNet);
- Adapted budgets for an effective development and dissemination of guidelines;
- Collaboration with European organizations for a more efficient use of resources;
- New dissemination strategies adopted by professional organizations;
- Changing professionals’ attitudes towards CPG;
- Evaluation of impact of CPG on practice helps to discover the efficiency of the CPG processes.

2.2.10 SWOT analysis: dissemination of CPG

SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) was performed to reflect the main results of the interviews, with a focus on dissemination of clinical practice guidelines (see appendix 2.5). The EPOC-taxonomy was used to categorize the strategies used by the participants of the interviews. For each item of the EPOC-taxonomy strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats are described in bullet style to present a clear overview.

A first draft of the SWOT was mailed to the interviewees, in order to collect feedback and refine the SWOT. These SWOT tables covered broad views from the interviewees, with widely different strategies and visions.

2.3 Belgian landscape: summary of the main findings

This study showed a wide range of perceptions on CPG development, dissemination and financing.

Different CPG definitions

Perceptions on the CPG definition differed among the participants: some participants saw a CPG as the product of a strict method of development, others focused more on the practical and feasible aspect of CPGs to define them.

Belgian CPG versus importation of guidelines

Participants had different views on the need to develop Belgian CPG. Many interviewees questioned the current landscape for development of Belgian CPGs, mentioning a lot of work being done twice (or more) and a lack of resources and manpower as obstacles. For the future, these participants suggested a focus on the adaptation of the vast body of European guidelines.

Validation is an equivocal concept

The concept of validation was perceived as an equivocal concept. Several participants stated that only a CEBAM validation could be considered as a valid quality label. Other organizations considered validation as expert opinion and/or consensus and/or test for feasibility.

A wide range of dissemination strategies

The use of dissemination strategies differed among the organizations. The systematic review indicated that a specific, multifaceted approach for CPG dissemination is advisable, depending on the topic and the target group: the opinions of the interviewees were in line with these findings.

Yet some organizations only use one strategy (mostly website) for each topic and target group. Other ones use multiple strategies, as e.g. website and periodical or training sessions. A few participants described a well-defined dissemination plan, where the choice of (multifaceted) strategies depends on the topic and the target group.

Most of the interviewees had thought of better or more innovative ways to disseminate. However, only a few of them were able to implement/use these new strategies. The main difficulty mentioned was lack of time and financial resources.
Unclear views on budgets
In general, the participants’ knowledge of budgets for CPG activities was limited. They agreed on the need for centralization of decision-making within the Belgian CPG landscape.

Need for standardization
A clear need for standardization in the methodology was found in the interviews. Development and validation processes of CPG now differ and should be standardized to assure a similar approach by all stakeholders. Participants urged to a national organization that provides a global dissemination plan.

Need for centralization
Information on guidelines should be centralized in one database, with all available guidelines and those in progress.

The role of the patient
Displaying the information for the patient as well should foster the use of guidelines by patients and health care providers. A guideline can help shared decision-making. Therefore it is important that patients would easily find reliable sources of information to have accurate information.

These results provide a meaningful insight into the Belgian landscape of CPG dissemination: they were used in combination with the literature findings to build the statements proposed to the stakeholders and discussed in the following section.

3 STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE THE DISSEMINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF GUIDELINES IN BELGIUM

Chapter 2 gave an overview of the Belgian landscape. It reported the main stakeholders, the professional interventions used to disseminate/implement guidelines and a SWOT analysis of the Belgian situation as perceived by the stakeholders. These results were compared to the data from the systematic reviews (chapter 1) to identify the gaps between the Belgian situation and the solutions proposed in the literature.

As a final step, the research team presented six statements (see appendix 3.1) to representatives of the main organisations at stake. The objective was to collect practical and political considerations about these proposals to improve dissemination and implementation of CPGs in Belgium and to get innovative ideas about how these proposals could be concretely implemented.

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 Development of the statements

The development of the statements benefited from the collaboration of A. Heselmans, a Belgian researcher whose PhD analysed the barriers and facilitators of electronic implementation of GCP in primary care.

The statements covered the following topics:
- Towards a national platform of CPG to inform users;
- Multidisciplinary approach;
- Adaptation of international guidelines versus national production;
- Value of a quality label;
- Multifaceted interventions;
- Integration of guidelines in professional education.
3.1.2 Participants

Participants of the group sessions represented the main organisations at stake in the CPG landscape in terms of:

- End users in the health system, i.e. general practitioners, physicians from other specialties, nurses, physiotherapists and other health professions;
- Their role: funding bodies, disseminators, users, education.

The French speaking group had 9 participants with the following affiliations (some cumulated several functions): physicians (pneumology, French speaking society of general practice (SSMG)), sickness funds, college of specialists (radiology), CEBAM, nurses (CIPIQ-S, National nurse Federation (FNIB)), association of dieticians, association of physiotherapists (AXXON), Federal Public Service (Public Health).

The Dutch speaking group had 8 participants with the following affiliations (also here some cumulated several functions): physicians (geriatrics, radiology, Dutch speaking society of general practice (Domus Medica), nurses (Wit-Gele Kruis, Platform Wetenschap en Praktijk), CEBAM, EBMPracticeNET, Public federal Service.

The delegate from the National Health and Disability Insurance could not attend the meeting; his written comments were discussed in both groups. The Appendix 2.6 provides further details on the stakeholders' affiliations.

3.1.3 Stakeholder meetings

Two simultaneous stakeholder meetings in small groups (8 to 9 people) were followed by a plenary session. The stakeholders received the SWOT analysis and the statements one week before the meeting. The separate start stimulated the active participation of the stakeholders due to the session conducted in their native language (French or Dutch) and the small size of the groups. All ideas were considered, in particular the most innovative ones, even if not all participants did agree with them.

Each group had one or two moderators and two observers who took notes. The common part facilitated a general discussion between the stakeholders who shared the results from the other group.

All discussions were audio taped. The researchers drafted a synthesis of the discussion points. This draft was sent to the participants to get a feedback on missing information; their feedback was integrated.

3.1.4 Ethical considerations

All interviewees signed an informed consent and declaration of confidentiality. An informed consent was given to the respondents so informing them about the purpose and course of the study. Permission was asked before audio-taping the interviews.

3.2 Results

3.2.1 Discussion on a national platform of clinical practice guidelines

Statement 1: One national platform ensures an efficient dissemination of guidelines that are adapted to the Belgian clinical landscape

One guideline platform with user-friendly format

The French and Dutch speaking participants agreed on a bi- or trilingual electronic platform to present guidelines. It should be easy to access with effective search engine. The guidelines should be presented with their level of evidence and their origin. The participants mentioned characteristics detailed in the literature review (see chapter 1): material should be presented under various formats, favouring interactivity with the users. The information should be brief and to the point (“cook book format”).

Participants stated that public funding is needed to assure independency of this platform: the option of private funding (e.g. by pharmaceutical industry) was excluded.

Which guidelines online?

The Dutch-speaking group argued that the platform should allow users to compare CPGs. According to EBMPracticeNET representatives, CEBAM or another international validation procedure is a condition to disseminate a guideline on the platform. This position raised questions of other participants: they questioned the refusal of non-validated Belgian
guidelines and the online publication of guidelines whose validation procedure abroad might be sometimes questionable as well. Participants from the first line of care emphasized that some non-validated guidelines might still be useful tools for the clinician. In this case their publication on a website should be coupled with information on their validation status (i.e. the AGREE score as mentioned above). This differs from a Clearinghouse concept where no information on the validation/accreditation process can be found.

Conditions for success
Help from specialists in teaching/learning approaches as well as in communication would increase the impact of the guidelines. However, adherence to guidelines is heavily related to EBM culture and training among the professionals, according to the participants.

One participant illustrated the need for multifaceted approaches to implement guidelines. The ones developed by the college of radiology were first disseminated with little impact. A national initiative from the NIHDI (website and written documents) further attempted to improve the use by physicians, including general practitioners. After a few years, coupling this dissemination to obligatory procedures (e.g. use of a formulary) resulted in a better use by the clinicians.

Besides the availability of guidelines on one national platform, their link with the software of the health professional would greatly facilitate their use in daily practice. Some participants argued that the correct use of patient records is limited at present. This hampers the use of EBM in integrated software packages.

Translation of information for patients
Finally, the groups mentioned that information should be accessible and understandable for patients: a suggestion was a specific platform for the patients’ information.

3.2.2 Discussion on the value of a quality label

Statement 2: All guidelines should benefit from a quality label

What is a quality label?
The participants argued that validation should look at content and methodology: the objective is to check that no better evidence does exist. In general, participants agreed on desirability of a quality label that makes possible for the end user to evaluate the quality of the guideline. High validation standards mean validation by an independent organization that operates in collaboration with independent validators with expertise.

Both groups mentioned the importance of well-referenced information: origin of information and level of evidence. One participant suggested that AGREE scores of the validated guidelines should be accessible on the website for the end users.

One size does not fit for all: alternatives are welcome
The requirement of a quality label is not synonym of CEBAM validation for some participants. In particular for more technical specialties with fast scientific developments, other validation procedures might be more suitable e.g. an adaptation of validation procedures performed abroad.

The possibility to have different types of validation procedures was further discussed. An illustration is a new CEBAM specific procedure for guidelines where little or no evidence is available (e.g. domestic violence). Another suggestion was to develop a new “light validation” procedure that requires less manpower and time, for “light” clinical issues.

One participant advocated a multidisciplinary GCP development/validation as follows: “geen betweterig EBM-puritanisme maar gezamenlijk ervaring opdoen via heldere en correcte EBM-methodologie” (no EBM-puritanism but building a common experience through clear and correct methodology).

Resources for validation
Resources for validation were discussed by a few participants: they mentioned that the CEBAM-budgets are currently too limited to validate all Belgian guidelines. Together with concerns for manpower and timing, this was a reason to propose the “light validation” mentioned above.
Another participant proposed to create a validation fund that could be used for validation of Belgian guidelines.

Finally, a participant proposed that validation would be a condition for obtaining subsidies by funding bodies, in order to assure quality of a CPG.

### 3.2.3 Discussion on the need for a multidisciplinary approach

**Statement 3: Multidisciplinary work is a priority for future health care: all health professionals’ organizations need to be involved in CPG activities**

**Multidisciplinary work: a basis for sharing common EBM practice**

Participants stated that multidisciplinary work requires communication. The EBM approach can foster this attitude. Developing attitudes of respect, listening to the others and absence of hierarchy in a health care team should be taught to students early in their curriculum. The current monodisciplinary culture does not favour this tendency. They argued that monodisciplinary guidelines need to fit in clinical pathways that require a multidisciplinary approach.

**Training, time and culture**

Developing and disseminating multidisciplinary CPGs requires the involvement of experts from all disciplines. The problem of training for collaboration was mentioned several times in both groups (see also 3.2.6). EBM is quite a new concept for some professional groups and these may lack expertise at present. Furthermore the development of (multidisciplinary) guidelines is time-consuming. Finally, the monodisciplinary culture of professionals often prevents them from working in multidisciplinary groups.

**Need for clear messages**

- According to the participants, the content of CPG needs to be clear and non-contradictory. A unique source of information for the health disciplines (as for example one platform or a unique guideline for a specific topic) can therefore be more adequate than several sources.

### 3.2.4 Discussion on the adaptation of international guidelines versus national production

**Statement 4: Adapting existing guidelines from other countries is preferred to « de novo » guidelines development in Belgium**

**More efficient?**

There was general agreement that time and money would be saved, when guidelines developed abroad or by an international group of national experts are used. Clinical questions have sometimes to be reformulated for the Belgian context. This needs additional work and therefore, the benefit of this approach can be somewhat limited.

Some participants mentioned that the skills required for a valid adaptation/translation of guidelines are similar to the skills needed for a “de novo” development. So, the process of adaptation/translation can be perceived as an intensive, time-consuming process. Participants also mentioned the risk of over-adapting, creating a scenario of “adapt from adapt from adapt”, which could result in dilution of the primary evidence. This in turn might hamper the quality of the final product.

In conclusion the “de novo” development is time-consuming but this may hold for updating and translating a CPG as well.

**Adaptation and testing needed**

Adapting international guidelines to the national context can be done in different ways: using the formal ADAPTE methodology, based on expert consensus and/or tested by field professionals to detect difficulties related to their applicability. However, some participants found that the last options (testing CPG by field and expert consensus alone) were not sufficient to
validate guidelines. Unfortunately the ADAPTE methodology is unknown to some professions that should become aware of this strategy.
All stakeholders agreed upon the fact that feedback from professional end users is needed to improve the final Belgian adaptation.
All guidelines should be properly translated into French and Dutch as many end users do not master the English language.

**An alternative: collaboration to an international group**

Some professionals mentioned the lack of guidelines for their specialty and the lack of manpower within their professional organisations to develop guidelines. There are some initiatives to create European databases of guidelines. Examples are the GIN network and the collaboration of Belgian dieticians within the European Federation of the Associations of Dieticians.

**3.2.5  Discussion on the effectiveness of multifaceted interventions**

**Statement 5: Multifaceted interventions among professionals with a strong focus on electronic dissemination should be the future**

This statement was not discussed. However, some participants mentioned some conditions for successful implementation i.e. compatibility between professionals' software, user-friendly search engine, language, coupling between guideline and feedback on practice.

**3.2.6  Discussion on the need for integration of guidelines in professional education**

**Statement 6: Training of students and professionals in healthcare is a corner stone to increase adherence to guidelines**

There was a consensus on this statement and the participants insisted on the major role of medical faculties. The importance of training was mentioned various times in the afternoon, including the training of students to search for EBM information: without knowing the EBM concepts and being trained to use them, professionals cannot benefit from the points previously discussed.

As a summary, the main points suggested by stakeholders are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders’ involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders from different disciplines need to be involved in the development of guidelines to share a common EBM approach: this multidisciplinary approach as well as EBM culture are corner stones of health professionals’ curricula.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Validation**

- A quality label is important for the health professional who will use the guideline;
- The need for alternative validation procedures would ensure the viability of the Belgian validation system and answer to the necessity to validate diverse guidelines’ contents.

**Guidelines from abroad**

- The stakeholders acknowledged the interest of adapting international high-quality guidelines to the Belgian context;
- The experience shows however that this adaptation also needs time and skills that should not be underestimated in comparison with the “de novo” development of guidelines.

**Platform**

- A unique platform that displays the guidelines in two (or three) languages together with the validation status and underlying level of evidence could foster the dissemination and use of guidelines.

In a nutshell, some innovative ideas and suggestions for the future:

- Working together in international consortia to decrease costs and efforts for Belgium;
- A “light” procedure for validation;
- A platform that displays all guidelines used by health professionals (including guidelines validated abroad) with validation status;
- A platform for patients.
3.3 Summary of the main findings: analysis of the current situation and proposals for the future

This study showed a wide range of perceptions regarding the Belgian CPG landscape, CPG development and dissemination, the difficulties and opportunities of dissemination strategies of CPG in this country. Also, many suggestions for improvement were identified.

3.3.1 A patchy landscape

The Belgian CPG landscape of stakeholders is broad and scattered. Drawing an accurate map of the stakeholders was a challenging job and many stakeholders had difficulties to position themselves within this landscape. Furthermore, many stakeholders represent different organizations with slightly different focus and many of them have various overlapping functions. The communication and financing flows are unclear in the eyes of the stakeholders interviewed in this research.

3.3.2 “Guidelines”: what’s in a name?

The official definition from the Institute of Medicine defines a CPG as a systematic method to develop statements to assist practitioners’ decisions. Yet some organizations mention the importance of a strict EBM methodological approach but other organizations use less formal methods to develop tools that will assist practitioners in their decisions (i.e. more informal literature review combined with expert based opinions).

The interviews highlighted the pros and cons of both approaches. The first one (evidence-based) minimises risks of biases, personal opinions, conflicts of interest and offers a scientific material of high quality; this approach still requires highly skilled collaborators and consumes large resources (time and money). The second more informal approach is faster, can encompass more recent evidence and is more in harmony with the local health context. The major drawbacks are the risks of biases and opinion based statements that might diverge from the scientific evidence.

3.3.3 Value of international guidelines

The stakeholders report an increasing interest for guidelines developed in other countries. The attitude towards these guidelines differs between stakeholders. In particular the adaptation to the Belgian context raises questions. Some stakeholders advocate for the use of the strict ADAPTE procedure to produce high quality guidelines. However this procedure is highly demanding (in terms of resources and skills): its application would give birth to a restricted set of fully adapted guidelines (with loss of other useful clinical guidelines).

3.3.4 One dissemination platform

A single platform to disseminate guidelines would have the following characteristics.

- It is advisable that the platform would present the best guideline for a specific clinical topic. A large supply of guidelines (“Clearinghouse”) that disseminates all available guidelines and leaves the sorting to the end users was not a valid option;
- Information on the validation status (i.e. by CEBAM or other official institutions like NICE) is desirable;
- Comprehensive but easily accessible key information, in particular for health professionals on the field;
- Focus on multidisciplinary work: the platform should display information for all relevant professional groups, to base common work on the evidence;
- Reliable sources of information for the patients: they should find easily reliable sources of information to identify the accurate information.
3.3.5 Dissemination strategies: more than papers

The dissemination strategies mentioned during the interviews mostly referred to the dissemination of paper/electronic materials and educational meetings. Yet the literature highlighted the interest to combine methods. More active approaches that could be promoted in Belgium are in particular reminders, audit and feedback and opinion leaders as they have a limited but significant impact on the clinical practice of the health professionals (see chapter 1).

The stakeholders mentioned that the main barriers to the dissemination of CPG were the lack of dissemination plans in organizations, the high costs for dissemination and the low availability of information at the point-of-care. Easy accessible CPGs, presented in a short and understandable way, integrated in the patient record, disseminated by a combination of strategies are a challenge for the future.

3.3.6 Public source of financing

The stakeholders agreed on the need for public financing to limit the undesirable influence of commercial stakeholders. Moreover a lack of resources pushes organizations to use less stringent development methods.

3.3.7 Strengths and limitations of the field study

The field study involved a broad variety of representatives of the Belgian CPG landscape. They were first selected from an exhaustive inventory and the data collection used different techniques, including the drawing of the landscape, a questionnaire, interviews and group discussions. The question is to know to what extent this study captured the entire span of the opinions of the stakeholders.

Through the use of audio-taping, data-analysis by independent researchers, continuous comparisons, and regularly feedback loops from respondents, the researchers strove for objectivity in the analysis. This field study allowed stakeholders to report their personal opinion and the position of the organization that they represent: the distinction between both views may not be always clear. On one hand their position is synonym of conflicts of interest but on the other hand they are best placed to reflect on the context where they operate. Therefore, the researchers carefully reported the variety of opinions and tried to be as objective as possible (e.g. by using records, transcripts and double analysis).

The focus on stakeholders versus end users could be considered as a limitation of this study. This analysis has only been done ten years ago in a population of French speaking general practitioners. They valued the guidelines published by the French-speaking society of general practitioners (SSMG) in particular guidelines on diagnosis and therapy. About half of the respondents stated that they used them in practice. The interest for guidelines decreased with an increasing number of years of practice, as described in the literature (see effect modifiers in 1.3.7). Suggestions for implementation favoured the discussion in peer groups.

Future research should be carried out by professional societies to tailor the dissemination and implementation strategies to the audience of specific health professionals groups. Furthermore research should pay attention to the patients’ position as well, as main stakeholders in the use of guidelines.
4 GENERAL DISCUSSION

The summary of this scientific report is published in the synthesis. This document pulls together the results of the three main sections and proposes actions to improve the future of guideline dissemination in Belgium.

KCE recommendations to the Belgian stakeholders are published at the end of the synthesis.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1. SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Appendix 1.1. AMSTAR criteria definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMSTAR Criteria ID</th>
<th>Criteria Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>'a priori' design provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>duplicate study selection/data extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>comprehensive literature search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>status of publication as inclusion criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>list of studies (included/excluded) provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>characteristics of included studies documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>scientific quality assessed and documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>appropriate formulation of conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>appropriate methods of combining studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>assessment of publication bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>conflict of interest statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1.2. Critical appraisal of the systematic reviews: AMSTAR scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>AMSTAR criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akbari, 2011</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, 2010</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baskerville, 2012</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borgermans, 2010 (KCE-report)</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brusamento, 2012</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaillet, 2006</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damiani, 2010</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulko, 2007</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flodgren, 2011</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsetlund, 2009</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francke, 2008</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giguère, 2012</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimshaw, 2004</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakkennes, 2008</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>AMSTAR criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivers, 2012</td>
<td>y y y y y y y y NA can’t answer 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGowan, 2009</td>
<td>y y y y y y y y NA NA can’t answer 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medves, 2010</td>
<td>y y y y y y y y NA NA can’t answer 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menon, 2009</td>
<td>y y y y n y y y y NA can’t answer 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien, 2007</td>
<td>y y n y y y y y Can’t answer y can’t answer 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior, 2008</td>
<td>y y y y y y y y NA NA can’t answer 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves, 2008</td>
<td>y y y y y y y y NA NA can’t answer 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shojania, 2009</td>
<td>y y y y y y y y y NA can’t answer 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale, 2007</td>
<td>y y y y n n y y NA NA can’t answer 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Wees, 2008</td>
<td>can’t answer y y y y y y n can’t answer NA N 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinmann, 2007</td>
<td>y y y y n y y y y NA NA can’t answer 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1.3. Data evidence tables

#### Table 9 – General characteristics of included studies (alphabetically ordered)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Akbari, 2011¹² (update from 2008) | **Title:** Interventions to improve outpatient referrals from primary care to secondary care  
**Aim:** to estimate the effectiveness and efficiency of interventions to change outpatient referral rates or improve outpatients referral appropriateness  
**Studies included:** n=17 studies  
**Date limits:** until October 2007 | **Type of study:** SR  
**Design of studies included:** RCTs, CCTs, CBAs and ITSs  
**Searches in:** EPOC register, Medline, Embase, CINAHL | Referral is the management option in most diseases, therefore any intervention aiming to influence clinical behaviour could have indirect effects on the quality and quantity of referrals. Comparisons in this SR:  
- Passive dissemination of guidelines  
- Dissemination of guidelines with structured management sheets  
- Secondary care provider-led educational activities  
Only the effectiveness of prosseional educational interventions are presented in this report. | Effectiveness of passive dissemination of guidelines (n=2 trials)  
- No change in quantity or quality of referrals  
Effectiveness of passive dissemination of guidelines with structured management sheets (n=5 trials)  
- Overall: Improved pre-referall management of patients  
- 2 multifaceted interventions: reduction in quantity  
- 3 single interventions: no effect on quantity of referrals but improvement in quality (increase in appropriate referrals)  
Secondary care provider-led educational activities (n=3 trials):  
- In 2 trials: effect on quantity and improvement of quality of referrals  
Authors’ conclusion: Referral guidelines are more likely to be effective if local secondary care providers are involved in dissemination activities, structured referral sheets are used, | AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, NA, NA, can't answer  
Notes: no pooling possible, small number of studies |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Baker, 2010\(^{24}\)  
(update from 2009) | **Title:** Tailored interventions to overcome identified barriers to change: effects on professional practice and health care outcomes  
**Aim:** to assess the effectiveness of interventions tailored to address identified barriers to change on professional practice or patient outcomes  
**Studies included:** n=26 studies  
**Date limits:** until October 2009 | **Type of study:** SR + MA  
**Design of studies included:** RCTs  
**Searches in:** EPOC register, Medline, Embase, CINAHL (until 2007), PsychInfo, AMED (until 2007), BNI, HMIC | Tailored strategies are defined as strategies to improve professional practice that are planned taking into account of prospectively identified barriers to change. Barriers may be identified by various methods (observation, focus group discussions, interviews, surveys, analysis of organisation or system). Comparisons in this SR:  
- Interventions tailored to address identified barriers to change versus no intervention (comparison A)  
- Interventions tailored to address identified barriers to change versus intervention not tailored to the barriers (comparison B)  
- An intervention targeted at both individual and social or organisational  
- Results excluded for meta-regression (n=14 trials):  
  - 8/14 trials: benefit from tailored interventions  
  - 2/14 trials: benefit for some outcomes  
  - 4/14 trials: no improvement over control arms for study’s primary outcomes  
  - Meta-regression (n=12 trials):  
    - Overall effectiveness is modest  
    - Pooled odds ratio of 1.54 (95% CI 1.16 to 2.01) from Bayesian analysis, pooled odds ratio of 1.52 (95% CI 1.27 to 1.82) from classical analysis (both p<0.001)  
    - Both approaches show benefit with tailored interventions  
    - Comparison A: OR 1.58 (95% CI 0.96 to 2.59)  
    - Comparison B: OR 1.56 (95% CI 1.27 to 1.90)  
    - Sign heterogeneity between | AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, can’t answer  
Notes: 9 studies with low risk of bias, 15 trials with moderate risk of bias and 2 with high risk of bias, wide variations in effectiveness, barriers, methods, clinical settings, targeted behaviour. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|          |                                        |                                 | barriers versus interventions that are targeted at only individual barriers | OR at follow-up (p<0.001) | • none of study attributes (risk of bias, level of tailoring etc) sign associated with reported effectiveness (p-values not mentioned)  
• subgroup analyses for level of tailoring: pooled OR of 1.63 (95% CI 0.64 to 4.18) in high level of tailoring versus pooled OR of 1.44 (95% CI 1.26 to 1.66) in moderate tailoring. High level of tailoring showed greater but non sign effect size than moderate.  
Authors’ conclusion: Interventions tailored to prospectively identified barriers are more likely to improve professional practice than no intervention or dissemination of guidelines. However, the methods to identify barriers need further development and research is required to determine the effectiveness of tailored interventions. |
| Baskerville, 2012²¹ | Title: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Practice Facilitation within Primary Care Settings  
Aim: to examine the overall effect size of Practice facilitation or outreach is a multifaceted approach that involves skilled individuals who enable others, through a range of intervention components and approaches, to address the | Type of study: SR + MA  
Design of studies included: RCTs and CCTs  
Searches in: MEDLINE, Thomsons | Effectiveness of interventions:  
• Overall effect size on behavior change: sign in favor of intervention (p<.001), overall moderate effect size point estimate of 0.56 (95% CI:0.43-0.68), OR=2.76 | AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, can’t answer | Notes: no stat |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practice facilitation and possible moderating factors on change in evidence-based practice behaviour</td>
<td>Scientific Web of Science database, reference lists</td>
<td>challenges in implementing evidence-based guidelines within the primary care setting. Comparisons in this SR:</td>
<td>(95% CI: 2.18-3.43)</td>
<td>heterogeneity but differing outcome measures, settings, diversity of guidelines + risk for publication bias (only positive results published)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies included: n=23, n= 1398 participating practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit and feedback: n=22 studies</td>
<td>• Relationship between duration of intervention and effect size: not sign (p=.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date limits: 1980-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consensus building and goal setting: n=20 studies</td>
<td>• An intervention tailored to the context and needs of practice: sign larger overall effect size of 0.62 (95% CI: 0.48-0.75) (p=.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meetings (includes quality circles and learning collaboratives): n=11 studies</td>
<td>• Scatter plot on number* of practices vs effect size: sign negative association (β=-0.02) (p=.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information only: n=1 study</td>
<td>• Scatter plot on intensity of intervention vs effect size: sign positive trend (β=0.008) (p=.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Authors’ conclusion:** Primary care practice are 2.76 times more likely to adopt evidence-based guidelines through practice facilitation. The findings support the need to tailor to context, to incorporate audit and feedback with goal setting and to consider intensity of interventions.

---

**Borgermans, 2010**<sup>23</sup>(KCE report)**

**Title:** Impact of academic detailing on primary care physicians

**Aim:** to analyze the impact of academic detailing on the practice of GPs in Belgium and

**Type of study:** SR

**Design of studies included:** SRs, RCTs, CCTs, before/after studies, retrospective studies and time series

**Searches in:**

**Effects of AD on clinical outcome measures:**

- N=42 (55%) positive effect, n=25 (32%) mixed results (pos and no effect), n=10 (13%) no effect

**AMSTAR evaluation:** Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, can’t answer

**Notes:** no
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brusamento, 2012&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>to assess the effectiveness of individual, face-to-face academic detailing among GPs and other physicians in primary care</td>
<td>MEDLINE, Cochrane database of systematic reviews, Embase, Eric, Psychinfo, Econlit</td>
<td>of AD into change professional behaviour consistent with medical evidence, support patient safety en to foster cost-effective medication choices. A key-component is that academic detailers, management, staff and program developers do not have any financial links to the pharmaceutical industry.</td>
<td>Modification of prescription behaviour:  - Heterogenous results ranging from no cost-savong to cost-effective  - Effectiveness of AD compared to other educational strategies  - Generally effective for improving appropriate care and prescribing  - multifaceted interventions: 48% positive effect, 14% no effect, 38% mixed results, 0% negative effect  - single intervention: 76% positive effect, 7% no effect, 17% mixed results, 0% negative effect</td>
<td>Authors’ conclusion: Most studies in the literature show an effect of AD on the targeted care processes but the size of the effect if usually small. Cost-effectiveness is not demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Studies included:** n=87  
**Date limits:** until September 2009  

**Type of study:** SR  
**Design of studies included:** RCTs, cluster-RCTs, CCTs, controlled-before-and-after, ITS (with at least 3 pre-and post-intervention time points)  
**Comparison of single or multifaceted interventions versus control group (number of interventions varying from 2 to 5):**  
- (prescriber) Feedback: n= 9 studies  
- (guideline)  

**Comparisons of single or multifaceted interventions (only narrative description per study):**  
- Single intervention strategy (7 studies): no to small improvement in performance indicators  
- Overall assement of  

**AMSTAR evaluation:** Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, NA, NA, can’t answer  
**Notes:** different levels of risks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim: to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies to implement clinical guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studies included: n=21 studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date limits: 2000-2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Searches in:** Embase, Medline, CENTRAL, Eppl-Centre and Clinicaltrials.gov

**Methodological characteristics**

- Dissemination (by mail): n= 5 studies
  - Computer decision support system: n= 2 studies
  - Reminder system: n= 2 studies
  - (formal) Training session: n= 4 studies
  - Educational material: n= 10 studies
  - Interactive workshops: n=8 studies
  - Outreach visits: n=5 studies
  - Structural interventions: n=2 studies
  - Small seminars: n=1 study

**Intervention (strategies)**

**Results**

- Multifaceted intervention (14 studies): 6 studies no effectiveness, 2 fully achieved expected outcomes, 2 most of outcomes, 4 partially effective

- Multifaceted interventions with feedback to GPs (9 studies): 4 studies no improvement, 3 studies improvement in less than half of the indicators and 2 studies improvement in most of the outcomes

- Multifaceted interventions with educational materials for GPs (8 studies): only in 1 study significant improvement (in hypertension control)

- Multifaceted interventions with interactive workshops (8 studies): in 2 studies effective results in intervention groups (on reduction of mortality and proportion of patients managed)

**Critical appraisal**

Authors’ conclusion: There are only a few rigorous studies which assess the effectiveness of a strategy to implement guidelines. The results are not consistent in showing which strategy is the most appropriate. In 4 studies fully effective intervention, in 8 studies partially effective and in 9 studies no evidence of effectiveness of bias, no pooling of data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chaillet, 2006<sup>3</sup> | **Title:** Evidence-based strategies for implementing guidelines in obstetrics: A systematic review  
**Aim:** To estimate effective strategies for implementing clinical practice guidelines in obstetric care and to identify specific barriers to behaviour change and facilitators in obstetrics.  
**Studies included:** 32 (one of the included studies compared two different strategies compared with a control group. This study was considered as two different studies in the analysis).  
**Date limits:** from January 1990 to June 2005. | **Type of study:** SR  
**Design of studies included:** cluster RCTs, RCTs, controlled before-after study, interrupted time series studies.  
**Searches in:** The Cochrane Library, EMBASE, and MEDLINE | Audit and feedback: an external or internal systematic and critical analysis of the quality of the medical care with feedback to local providers  
Multifaceted interventions: tailored intervention involves two or more interventions targeting different specific barriers to change  
Targeted behaviors: clinical prevention services antenatal care and breast-feeding, diagnosis (fetal distress monitoring), management of labor or obstetric complications (preeclampsia), and procedures, particularly cesarean deliveries.  
Comparison in this SR:  
- Audit and feedback: n=11 studies  
- Multifaceted interventions: n=9 studies | Audit and feedback:  
- Positive effect in 9/11, mixed results in 1/11  
Multifaceted interventions:  
- Positive effect in 9/9  
- Prospective identification of barriers to change carried out in all studies  
Overall:  
- Proportion of effective strategies significantly higher among the interventions that include a prospective identification of barriers to change compared with standardized interventions (93.8% versus 47.1%, n=33, P=.004).  
Authors’ conclusion: Audit and feedback and multifaceted interventions are generally effective. Moreover, multifaceted interventions showed higher potential to change behavior than single strategies. | AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, Y, N, Y, Y, ?, NA, can’t answer |
| Damiani, 2010<sup>6</sup> | **Title:** The effectiveness of computerized clinical guidelines in the process of care: a | **Type of study:** SR  
**Design of studies included:** Observational and | Effectiveness of CCG:  
- Positive effect proportion 0.64 (p=0.053)  
Multivariable analysis: | | AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, N, Y, Y, N, NA, can’t answer |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Flodgren, 2011¹² | **Title:** Local opinion leaders: effects on professional practice and health care outcomes  
**Design of studies included:** RCTs  
**Searches in:** Cochrane EPOC Group Trials Register, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, MEDLINE, EMBASE, HMIC, Science Citation Index, Social Science | experimental studies  
**Searches in:** Pubmed/Medline, Embase and Cochrane Controlled Trials Register | the clinician’s workflow and its integration with medical records  
Comparisons in this SR:  
• Effectiveness of CCG  
• Multivariable analysis  
CCGs features in 5 categories: general system features, clinician-system interaction feature, communication content features, auxilliary features, guidelines features | • Statistically significant predictors of positive impact: automatic provision of recommendation in electronic version as part of clinician workflow (OR=17.5; 95% CI 1.6-193.7) and publication year (OR = 6.7; 95% CI: 1.3-34.3)  
• Marginally significant: justification of recommendation via provision of reasoning (OR 14.8, 95% CO 0.9-224.2) | can’t answer |

Notes:  
- Low quality statistical analysis, no comparisons between interventions, no differentiation between single and multifaceted interventions, only significant results presented

---

¹² Flodgren, 2011: Title: Local opinion leaders: effects on professional practice and health care outcomes
Design of studies included: RCTs
Searches in: Cochrane EPOC Group Trials Register, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, MEDLINE, EMBASE, HMIC, Science Citation Index, Social Science

Opinion leadership is the degree to which an individual is able to influence other individuals’ attitudes or overt behaviour informally in a desired way with relative frequency. Opinion leaders are people who are seen as likeable, trustworthy and influential.

Comparisons in this SR:

Results (median adjusted RD) (dichotomous outcomes)
- Overall: +0.12, range -.15 to +0.72
  ➤ 12% absolute improvement in compliance
- Opinion leaders compared to no intervention: +0.09, range -0.15 to +0.38
  ➤ 9% absolute
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studies included:</strong>&lt;br&gt;n=18 studies (n=15 for calculation)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Date limits:</strong> up to February 2005 (SIGLE), April 2009 (EPOC Specialised Register) or May 2009 (MEDLINE and EMBASE), 2009 (The Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials)</td>
<td>Citation Index, ISI Conference Proceedings and World Cat Dissertations, reference lists</td>
<td>• Opinion leaders compared to no intervention&lt;br&gt;• Opinion leaders alone compared to a single intervention&lt;br&gt;• Opinion leaders with one or more additional intervention compared to one or more additional interventions only&lt;br&gt;• Opinion leaders as part of multifaceted interventions compared to no intervention</td>
<td>• Improvement in performance&lt;br&gt;• Opinion leaders alone compared to a single intervention: +0.14, range +0.12 to +0.17&lt;br&gt;⇒ 14% absolute increase in compliance&lt;br&gt;• Opinion leaders with one or more additional intervention(s) compared to the one or more additional intervention(s): +0.10, range -0.08 to +0.25&lt;br&gt;⇒ 10% improvement in performance&lt;br&gt;• Opinion leaders as part of multiple interventions compared to no intervention: +0.10, range -0.04 to +0.72&lt;br&gt;⇒ 10% improvement in performance</td>
<td>different interventions, variety of different settings and different outcomes, no clear description of role of the opinion leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Forsetlund, 2012<sup>2</sup> | **Title:** Continuing education meetings and workshops: effects on professional practice and health care | **Type of study:** SR<br>**Design of studies included:** RCTs<br>**Searches in:** EPOC | Educational meetings are commonly used for continuing medical education with the aim of improving professional practice and, | Results (mean adjusted RDs and % change):<br>• Any intervention in which educational meetings were a | AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, can't answer, can't |

Forsetlund, 2012<sup>2</sup>

Title: Continuing education meetings and workshops: effects on professional practice and health care

Type of study: SR

Design of studies included: RCTs

Searches in: EPOC

Educational meetings are commonly used for continuing medical education with the aim of improving professional practice and, Results (mean adjusted RDs and % change):

• Any intervention in which educational meetings were a

AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, can't answer, can't
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>outcomes</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To assess the effects of educational meetings on professional practice and healthcare outcomes. <strong>Studies included:</strong> n=81 studies <strong>Date limits:</strong> from 1999 to March 2006.</td>
<td>Trials Register, Embase, Scopus</td>
<td>thereby, patient outcomes. Educational meetings include courses, conferences, lectures, workshops, seminars, and symposia. Comparisons in this SR:</td>
<td>component compared to no intervention (overall assessment)</td>
<td>Notes: 20/81 studies high risk of bias and not included in analysis, inadequate description of interventions, many potential factors that could explain heterogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any intervention in which educational meetings is a component compared to no intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Practice outcomes (dichotomous): range from -2.0% to 36.2%, median improvement 6% (IQ range 1.8% to 15.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Educational meetings compared to no intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Practice outcomes (continuous): range from 0% to 53%, median % change 6% (IQ range 9% to 24%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Educational meetings compared to other interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Patient outcomes (dichotomous): range from -0.9% to 4.6%, median improvement 3.0% (IQ range 0.1% to 4.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any intervention in which educational meetings are a component compared to educational meetings alone</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Patient outcomes (continuous): range from -1% to 26%, median % change 4.0% (IQ range 0% to 11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interactive educational meetings compared to didactic (lecture-based) educational meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Educational meetings alone compared to no intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any other comparison of different types of educational meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Practice outcomes (dichotomous): range from -2.0% to 29.3%, median improvement 6% (IQ range 2.9% to 15.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Practice outcomes (continuous): range from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- 0% to 50%, median % change 10% (IQ range 8% to 32%)
- Patient outcomes (dichotomous): range from -0.9% to 4.0%, median improvement 3.0% (IQ range -0.9% to 4.0%)
- Patient outcomes (continuous): range from -1% to 26%, median % change 8.0% (IQ range 0% to 12%)
- Educational meetings compared to other interventions
  - Practice outcomes (only 2 trials): adjusted RD -0.8% and -1.4% decrease in compliance
  - Patient outcomes: not reported
- Any intervention in which educational meetings were a component compared to educational meetings alone
  - Practice outcomes (no MA): 12% adjusted relative % increase in patients receiving blood testing (1 trial)
  - Patient outcomes: not reported
## Study ID | References, aims and short description | Methodological characteristics | Intervention (strategies) | Results                                                                 | Critical appraisal |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

- Interactive educational meetings compared to didactic (lecture-based) educational meetings
- Practice outcomes (2 trials): adjusted RD 1.4% (1 trial)
- Patient outcomes: not reported
- Any other comparison of different types of educational meetings: no results reported

Authors’ conclusion: Educational meetings alone or combined with other interventions, can improve professional practice (small to moderate improvements) and healthcare outcomes for the patients (small improvements). The effect is most likely to be small and similar to other types of continuing medical education, such as audit and feedback, and educational outreach visits. Strategies to increase attendance at educational meetings, using mixed interactive and didactic formats, and focusing on outcomes that are likely to be perceived as serious may increase the effectiveness of educational meetings. Educational meetings alone are not likely to be effective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Francke, 2008<sup>19</sup> | **Title**: Factors influencing the implementation of clinical guidelines for healthcare professionals: a systematic meta-review  
**Aim**: to gain a better understanding of which factors affect the implementation of guidelines and to provide insight into the ‘state-of-the-art’ regarding research within this field  
**Studies included**: n=12 studies  
**Date limits**: until November 2006 | **Type of study**: SR+MA  
**Design of studies included**: SRs, meta-reviews  
**Searches in**: Pubmed, Cinahl, Cochrane Library, Embase, NIVEL catalogus, GIN-website | Barriers and facilitators are factors that negatively or positively influence the implementation of clinical guidelines.  
Comparisons in this SR:  
- Evidence regarding factors | Results per category:  
- Characteristics of guidelines: complexity, higher adherence to evidence-based guidelines, development by target group and experts  
- Characteristics of implementation strategies: contrary results in different SRs on effectiveness of multifaceted interventions, active professional participation and strategies closely related to clinical decision-making  
- Characteristics of professional: lack of awareness, limited familiarity, lack of agreement with guidelines, age and/or experience  
- Characteristics of patients: resistance of patients, patients with co-morbidities  
- Characteristics of environment: limited time and personnel resources, workpressure, negative attitude or limited support from peers or superiors | AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, can’t answer, can’t answer |
<p>| Notes: low to moderate quality of SRs |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Giguère, 2012<sup>7</sup> (update from 2011) | **Title:** Printed educational materials (PEMs): effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes  
**Aim:** to assess the effect of PEMs on the practice of healthcare professionals and patient health outcomes and to explore the influence of some of the characteristics of the PEMs on their effects on professional practice and patient outcomes  
**Studies included:** n=45 studies (52 PEM interventions)  
**Date limits:** until June 2011 | **Type of study:** SR and MA  
**Design of studies included:** RCTs, quasi-randomised trials, CBAs, ITS  
**Searches in:** Medline, Embase, CENTRAL, HealthStar, CINAHL, ERIC, CAB abstracts, Global Health, EPOC register | PEM interventions, defined as distribution of published or printed recommendations for clinical care and evidence to inform practice, comprising clinical practice guidelines, journal articles and monographs, included: delivered personally (addressed to specific individual), through mass mailings or passively delivered through broader communication channels.  
Comparisons in this SR:  
- PEM versus no intervention (comparison A)  
- PEM versus single intervention (comparison B)  
- Multifaceted intervention with PEM versus multifaceted intervention without PEM (comparison C)  
- Effect modifiers (box) | **Comparison A:**  
- Dichotomous professional practice outcomes (7 trials):  
  - median ARD of 0.02 (range 0 to 0.11) → 2% absolute improvement  
  - in 5/7 trials observed median effect stat. sign.  
- Continuous professional practice outcomes (3 trials)  
- Standard median effect size of 0.13 (range -0.16 to 0.36)  
- Time series regression (54 outcomes from 25 trials): standardized median change in level of 1.69 (range from -6.96 to 14.26) → an overall improvement in professional practice outcomes  
- Patient health outcomes: overall median standardized effect size of -0.14 | **AMSTAR evaluation:** Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, can’t answer, NA, can’t answer  
**Notes:** original search strategy revised, variable quality of RCTs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison C: no studies found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effect modifiers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential influence on effectiveness: source of information, tailoring, clinical areas, type of targeted behaviour, purpose, level of evidence, format</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not much variation: mode, frequency, duration of delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No variation: endorsement, specification of educational components, appearance, length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authors’ conclusions: PEMs may have a small beneficial effect on professional practice outcomes when used alone and compared to no intervention. There is insufficient information to estimate effect on patient outcomes and clinical significance of observed effect sizes is not known. Effectiveness of PEM in multifaceted or compared to other interventions is uncertain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grimshaw, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type of study: Meta-review</th>
<th>Following comparisons of single or multifaceted interventions (up to 6 interventions combinations):</th>
<th>Multifaceted vs no intervention</th>
<th>AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, N, Y, Y, Y, NA, can’t answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aim: To undertake a</td>
<td>Educational materials</td>
<td>MF with educational outreach vs no int: modest improvements: +6%, range -4 to +17.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Study ID

**References, aims and short description**

- Systematic review of the effectiveness and costs of different guideline development, dissemination and implementation strategies + to estimate the resource implications of these strategies + to develop a framework for deciding when it is efficient to develop and introduce clinical guidelines.

**Methodological characteristics**

- **Searches in:** MEDLINE, Healthstar, Cochrane Controlled Trial Register, EMBASE, SIGLE and the specialised register of the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organization of Care (EPOC) group.

**Intervention (strategies)**

- Educational meetings
- Consensus processes
- Educational outreach
- Opinion leaders
- Patient-directed interventions
- Audit and feedback
- Reminders
- Other professional (including mass media and marketing)
- Financial interventions
- Organizational interventions
- Structural interventions
- Regulatory interventions

Only results on multifaceted interventions are extracted for this report.

**Results**

- for RCTs and +7.3%, range -5.6 to +17.4% for CBAs
- educ mat + educ outreach: relatively ineffective; educ mat + educ meetings + educ outreach: modest to moderate effects
- Educ mat + educ meetings vs no int
- Small to modest improvements: +1.9%, range -3.0 to +5.0% for RCTs and +10% for CCTs
- Educ mat + A&F vs no interv
- Modest improvements: +7.4% in RCTs
- Reminders + patient-directed interventions vs no int
- Moderate to large improvements (range 1.3 to 20.0%)
- Educ mat, educ meetings + A&F vs no int
- Small improvements: +3.0% for RCTs
- Educ mat, educ meetings + organ int vs no int
- Small improvements:

**Critical appraisal**

- Notes: no clear description of results, contrary results with other reviews
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multifaceted vs intervention controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Educ outreach vs other int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Modest improvements but less than in single interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educ mat + reminders vs educ mat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More effective than educ mat alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educ meetings + reminders vs educ meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More effective than educ meetings alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educ mat + educ meetings + reminders vs educ mat + educ meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More effective than educ mat and educ meetings alone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of interventions: No relationship was found between the number of component interventions and the effects of multifaceted interventions.

Authors’ conclusion: The majority of interventions observed modest to moderate improvement in care. However, across all combinations, multifaceted interventions did not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hakkennes, 2008 | **Title:** Guideline implementation in allied health professions: a systematic review of the literature  
**Aim:** To evaluate the effects of the introduction of clinical guidelines for allied health professionals to estimate the effectiveness of the guideline dissemination and implementation strategies used.  
**Studies included:** n= 14 studies  
**Date limits:** up to June 2006 | **Type of study:** SR  
**Design of studies included:** RCTs, CCTs, CBAs, interrupted time series studies  
**Searches in:** MEDLINE, CINHAL, EMBASE, PsychINFO, AMED, the Cochrane Controlled Trials Register, DARE | Allied health included the following professions: audiology; dietetics; occupational therapy; orthoptics; orthotics and prosthetics; pharmacy; physiotherapy; podiatry; psychology; radiography; speech pathology; and social work.  
Comparisons in this SR:  
- Single intervention: 6/14  
- Multifaceted intervention: 7/14  
- Mix of single and multifaceted interventions: 1/14  
- Focus on educational interventions: 10/14 | Summary of results:  
- Overall effect:  
  - Process outcomes: small to moderate effects in favour of intervention group  
  - Patient outcomes: small effects and in favour of intervention group  
- Multifaceted interventions:  
  - no more effective than single interventions  
  - effects of the same strategy varied across trials  
- single interventions: results not reported  
Authors’ conclusion: At best the effects were small to moderate with results varying widely across studies. Identification of specific barriers to change needed in the target group. | AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, Y, N, Y, Y, Y, NA, NA, can’t answer  
Notes: heterogeneous quality of studies, incomplete data reporting |
| Ivers, 2012 (updated from) | **Title:** Audit and feedback: effects on | **Type of study:** SR  
**Design of studies** | Comparison of audit and feedback alone or a core of | Comparison A:  
- Compliance with desired | AMSTAR evaluation: Y, |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>professional practice and health care outcomes</td>
<td>included: RCTs Searches in: CENTRAL, MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, Science Citation Index and Social Sciences Citation Index, ISI Web of Science</td>
<td>multifaceted intervention:  - Any intervention in which audit and feedback is the single intervention or is the core, essential feature of a multifaceted intervention, compared to usual care (comparison A) (includes B and C)  - Audit and feedback alone compared to no intervention (comparison B)  - Audit and feedback as the core feature of a multifaceted intervention compared to no intervention (comparison C)  - Different ways of providing audit and feedback (comparison D)  - Audit and feedback combined with complementary interventions compared to audit and feedback alone (comparison E)  - Other interventions compared to audit and feedback practice (dichotomous outcomes) (82 comparisons from 49 studies): 4.3% increase of the weighted median adjusted risk difference (RD) (interquartile range 0.5%-16%), range in adjusted RD from 9% decrease to 70% increase  - Compliance with desired practice (continuous outcomes) (26 comparisons from 21 studies): 1.3% increase of the weighted median adjusted change relative to baseline control (interquartile range 1.3%-23.2%), range in adjusted change relative to baseline control from 50% decrease to 139% increase  - Patient outcomes (dichotomous outcomes) (12 comparisons from 6 studies): 0.4% decrease of weighted median adjusted RD (IQR -1.3% to 1.6%)  - Patient outcomes (continuous outcomes) (8 comparisons from 5 studies): 17% improvement of median adjusted change relative to baseline control (IQR 1.5% to 17%)</td>
<td>Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, NA, can’t answer</td>
<td>Notes: only comparison A (covering all comparisons) mentioned in summary of findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>References, aims and short description</td>
<td>Methodological characteristics</td>
<td>Intervention (strategies)</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Critical appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feedback (comparison F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Characteristics related to intervention to explain variation in effects: sign for format ($p=0.02$), source ($p&lt;0.001$), frequency ($p&lt;0.001$), instructions for improvement ($p&lt;0.001$), direction of change required ($p=0.007$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Characteristics related to recipients: baseline performance ($p=0.007$), profession of recipient ($p=0.561$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Characteristics related to trial design: risk of bias ($p=0.679$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison B:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Compliance with desired practice (dichotomous outcomes) (32 comparisons from 26 studies): 3.0% weighted median adjusted RD (IQR 1.8% to 7.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Compliance with desired practice (continuous outcomes) (14 comparisons from 13 studies): 1.3% weighted median adjusted change relative to baseline control (IQR 1.3% to 11.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison C:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Compliance with desired practice (dichotomous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>References, aims and short description</td>
<td>Methodological characteristics</td>
<td>Intervention (strategies)</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Critical appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes) (50 comparisons from 32 studies): 5.5% weighted median adjusted RD (IQR 0.4% to 16%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Compliance with desired practice (continuous outcomes) (12 comparisons from 11 studies): 26.1% weighted median adjusted change relative to baseline control (IQR 12.7% to 26.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison D (only description per study):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer comparison: small differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation of feedback and inclusion of additional information: no to small differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Source and delivery: no or little differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recipient participation: contrary results (worsening and no sign improvement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison E:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• With reminders: (7 studies): no or little differences (only description per study)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• With educational outreach (academic detailing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Compliance with desired practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>References, aims and short description</td>
<td>Methodological characteristics</td>
<td>Intervention (strategies)</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Critical appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(dichotomous outcomes) (15 studies): 0.7% weighted median adjusted RD (IQR -1.1% to 5.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Compliance with desired practice (continuous outcomes) (4 studies): 27% median adjusted change relative to baseline control (IQR 0% to 40.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plus other educational interventions: no or little differences (only description per study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• With case management or organizational interventions: no or little differences (only description per study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• With financial incentives: no or little differences (only description per study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• With patient-mediated interventions: no or little differences (only description per study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison F:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reminders: no or little differences (only description per study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>References, aims and short description</td>
<td>Methodological characteristics</td>
<td>Intervention (strategies)</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Critical appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| McGowan, 2010 <sup>5</sup> (update from 2009) | **Title:** Electronic retrieval of health information by healthcare providers to improve practice and patient care  
**Type of study:** SR  
**Design of studies included:** cluster RCTs  
**Searches in:** EPOC register, CENTRAL, | Following interventions were considered: provision or increased access to electronically retrievable information (free access to journals or databases), | • Educational outreach: no or little differences (only description per study)  
• Other educational interventions: no or little differences (only description per study)  
• Case management or organizational interventions: no or little differences (only description per study)  
• Financial incentives: less effective at reducing test-ordering (-41%, p<0.05)  
• Patient-mediated interventions: no sign differences (p-value not mentioned) | Authors’ conclusion: The effect on professional behaviour and on patient outcomes ranges from little or no effect to a substantial effect. The quality of evidence is moderate. It is uncertain whether audit and feedback is more effective when combined with other interventions. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aim: to assess the effectiveness of interventions intended to provide electronic retrieval (access to information) to health information by healthcare providers to improve practice and patient care</td>
<td>Medline, AMED, CAB Health, CINAHL, EMbase, ERIC, LILACS, LISA, reference lists, contacts with authors and organizations</td>
<td>provision of electronically retrievable information at point of patient care delivery or elsewhere in the workplace, training component where there was differential provision of electronically retrievable information between groups</td>
<td>consultation practice</td>
<td>Notes: both studies at low risk of bias, no information on patient outcomes, contamination of control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies included: n=2 studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date limits: until July 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparisons in this SR:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Electronic retrieval of information versus no electronic retrieval (or no intervention) in practice (comparison A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Electronic retrieval of information versus access to print based materials only (comparison B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Electronic retrieval of information versus one or more other types of electronic retrieval of information (comparison C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhanced electronic retrieval of information versus assess to electronic resource as part of standard practice (comparison D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison B: 1 trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge and use of Cochrane reproductive health library increased in both countries from 24.8% to 65.5% and from 33.9% to 83.3% in intervention group compared to control group (from 33.5% to 39.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison D (1 trial): knowledge and use of Cochrane reproductive health library increased in both countries from 24.8% to 65.5% and from 33.9% to 83.3% in intervention group compared to control group (from 33.5% to 39.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authors’ conclusion: Overall there was insufficient evidence to support or refute the use of electronic retrieval of healthcare information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Medves, 2010**

**Title:** Systematic  
**Type of study:** SR  
Ten dissemination and  
Effectiveness of implementation  
**AMSTAR**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|          | review of practice guideline dissemination and implementation strategies for healthcare teams and team-based practice | Design of studies included: RCTs, descriptive/case series, comparable cohort studies | implementation strategies found in this SR:  
- Distribution of educational materials (59 studies)  
- Educational meetings (62 studies)  
- Local consensus processes (34 studies)  
- Educational outreach visits (12 studies)  
- Local opinion leaders (16 studies)  
- Patient mediated (14 studies)  
- Audit and feedback (45 studies)  
- Reminders (27 studies)  
- Marketing (18 studies)  
- Mass media (1 study) | strategies on change in knowledge, practice, patient and/or economic outcomes:  
- Distribution of educational materials: 72.3% sign findings + most common strategy  
- Educational meetings: 74.2% sign findings  
- Local consensus processes: 64.7% sign findings  
- Educational outreach visits: 66.6% sign findings  
- Local opinion leaders: 81.3% sign findings  
- Patient mediated: 64.3% sign findings  
- Audit and feedback: 82.2% sign findings  
- Reminders: 85.2% sign findings  
- Marketing: 77.7% sign findings  
- Mass media: 100% sign findings + least common strategy  
- Strategies with significant findings used local opinion leaders, audit and feedback and reminders | evaluation: Y, Y, Y, N, N, Y, NA, NA, can’t answer Notes: heterogeneous sample of studies, variation in number of strategies, limited results presented |

**Aim:** to synthesis the literature relevant to guideline dissemination and implementation strategies for healthcare teams and team-based practice

**Studies included:** n=88 studies

**Date limits:** 1994-2007
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not comparable and small in number Organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional roles (7 studies): narrative description per study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuity of care plan (8 studies): narrative description per study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication and discussion (3 studies): sign changes in knowledge or practice or outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structural intervention:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redesign of medical or health record systems (6 studies): no results presented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient and process outcomes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of knowledge of practitioners (37 studies): sign in 12 studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic outcomes (12 studies): sign findings in 6 studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authors’ conclusion: Team-based care using practice guidelines locally adapted can affect positively patient and provider outcomes. It makes sense to be more effective by involving the whole team and preferable similar dissemination strategies for the whole team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>References, aims and short description</td>
<td>Methodological characteristics</td>
<td>Intervention (strategies)</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Critical appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Menon, 2009<sup>a</sup> | **Title:** Strategies for rehabilitation professionals to move evidence-based knowledge into practice: a systematic review  
**Aim:** To examine the effectiveness of single or multicomponent knowledge translation interventions for improving knowledge, attitudes, and practice behaviors of rehabilitation clinicians.  
**Studies included:** n=12 studies  
**Date limits:** up to June 2008 | **Type of study:** SR  
**Design of studies included:** RCTs, CBAs, case series  
**Searches in:** MEDLINE, CINHAL, AMED, EBM Reviews, PEDRO, Occupational Therapy Seeker, Research and Development Resource Base | **A knowledge translation (KT) intervention is defined as a means of exchanging evidence-based information (e.g. through educational outreach, opinion leader, journal club, lectures, audit and feedback, reminders, online resources) to improve knowledge, attitudes and practice behaviors of health professionals, with the ultimate goal of optimizing patient outcomes and maximizing the potential of the health system.**  
Comparisons in this SR:  
- Multifaceted interventions for improving knowledge  
- Single interventions for improving knowledge  
- Multifaceted interventions for improving attitude towards EBP  
- Single interventions for improving attitude towards EBP  
- Multifaceted intervention for changing practice behavior  
- Single intervention for | **Results per comparison**  
- Multifaceted int for improving knowledge  
- occupational therapists: no evidence  
- physical therapists: moderate evidence of ineffectiveness  
- Single int for improving knowledge  
- occupational therapists: limited evidence  
- physical therapists: no evidence  
- Multifaceted int for improving attitude  
- occupational therapists: no evidence  
- physical therapists: limited evidence for effectiveness  
- Single int for improving attitude  
- occupational therapists: limited evidence for effectiveness  
- physical therapists: limited evidence of ineffectiveness  
- Multifaceted int for changing practice behavior | **AMSTAR evaluation:** Y, Y, Y, N, Y, Y, can’t answer  
Notes: low quality of studies, no clear description of results, no focus on included strategies in interventions |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>changing practice behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• occupational therapists: no evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• physical therapists: strong evidence of effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Single int for changing practice behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• occupational therapists: limited evidence of effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• physical therapists: limited evidence of ineffectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authors’ conclusion: Active multifaceted interventions results in improved self-perceived knowledge as well as positive changes in actual and self-perceived practice behaviors of physical therapists. These gains did not translate into change in physical therapists’ attitude towards EBP. No studies found on multifaceted interventions for occupational therapists, limited evidence suggests that single interventions may improve knowledge, attitudes and practice behaviors.

O’Brien, 2008\textsuperscript{11} (update from 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Educational outreach visits (EOVs): effects on professional practice and health care outcomes</th>
<th>Type of study: SR + MA</th>
<th>Type of face-to-face visits, also been referred to as university-based educational detailing, academic detailing and educational visiting.</th>
<th>Comparison A:</th>
<th>AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, N, Y, Y, Y, Y, can’t answer, Y,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design of studies included: RCTs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dichotomous health professional outcomes (n=37 trials)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>References, aims and short description</td>
<td>Methodological characteristics</td>
<td>Intervention (strategies)</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aim: to assess the effects of EOVs on health professional practice or patient outcomes</td>
<td>Searches in: original search in several electronic bibliographic databases (including Medline and CINAHL); EPOC register, test searches in Medline and Embase, reference lists</td>
<td>Comparisons in this SR:</td>
<td>Desired practice behaviour: median improvement of 5.6% (adjusted RD range from -3% to 64%)(IQR 3% to 9.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies included: n=69 studies</td>
<td>Date limits: until March 2007</td>
<td>• Any intervention with EOVs as component versus no intervention, both with or without printed educational materials (comparison A)</td>
<td>Meta-regression on all explanatory factors: no explanation for variation in adjusted RDs (p=0.08 to 0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meta-regression analysis on primary explanatory factors: targeted behaviour (prescribing vs other behaviour), baseline compliance, number of clinicians included at each visit, number of EOVs</td>
<td>Meta-regression on primary explanatory factors: only sign for targeted behaviour (p=0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meta-regression analysis on secondary explanatory factors: complexity of targeted behaviour, seriousness of outcome, risk of bias, contribution of EOVs as component of the intervention</td>
<td>Bubble and box plots: less variation and small effects for prescribing (median adjusted RD 4.8%, IQR 3.0% to 6.5% for 17 comparisons) compared to other behaviours with wide variation (median adjusted RD 6.0%, IQR 3.6% to 16.0% for 17 comparisons) + effect size of multifaceted interventions slightly larger but not sign (p=0.90) (mean adjusted RD 8.8%, IQR 2.9% to 12.7% for 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• EOVs alone versus no intervention (comparison B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>References, aims and short description</td>
<td>Methodological characteristics</td>
<td>Intervention (strategies)</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          |                                        |                               | Any intervention with EOVs as component versus any intervention including audit and feedback and reminders (comparison C) | comparisons) versus EOV intervention alone (median adjusted RD 5.0%, IQR 3.0% to 6.23% for 18 comparisons) | • Continuous health professional outcomes (n= 17 trials): percentage change: median of 21% (IQR 11% to 41%), range from 0% to 617% | • Patient outcomes (n=6)  
  • Difficult to determine if sufficient power to detect an important difference (narrative description of results per study) |
<p>|          |                                        |                               | Any comparison of different types of EOVs (comparison D) | • Continuous health professional outcomes (n= 19 trials): median adjusted RD of 5% (IQR 3.0% to 6.2%), range from 1% to 20% | • Continuous health professional outcomes (n=15 trials): median adjusted relative percentage change of 23% (IQR 12% to 39%), range from 0% to 617% | • Patient outcomes (n=2 trials): included in comparison A |
|          |                                        |                               |                           |         |                   |
|          |                                        |                               |                           |         |                   |
|          |                                        |                               |                           |         |                   |
|          |                                        |                               |                           |         |                   |
|          |                                        |                               |                           |         |                   |
|          |                                        |                               |                           |         |                   |
|          |                                        |                               |                           |         |                   |
|          |                                        |                               |                           |         |                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior, 2008&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Title: The effectiveness of clinical guideline implementation strategies—a synthesis of systematic review findings &lt;br&gt;Aim: to synthesize the evidence of effectiveness of clinical guideline implementation</td>
<td>Type of study: meta-review &lt;br&gt;Design of studies included: SRs &lt;br&gt;Searches in: Medline, AMED, Cinahl, Academic Search Elite, Cochrane, reference lists</td>
<td>Overview of implementation strategies: &lt;br&gt;• Educational strategies &lt;br&gt;• Traditional educational &lt;br&gt;• Educational outreach &lt;br&gt;• Audit &amp; feedback/ peer review</td>
<td>Multifaceted interventions: &lt;br&gt;• Significant improvements in guideline compliance and behavioral change (ranged up to 60%) &lt;br&gt;• Greater evidence of effectiveness than single interventions &lt;br&gt;• No evidence of any relationship between number</td>
<td>AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, NA, NA, can’t answer &lt;br&gt;Notes: only SRs included, no description of strategies in multifaceted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>References, aims and short description</td>
<td>Methodological characteristics</td>
<td>Intervention (strategies)</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Critical appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multifaceted interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mass media and distribution strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guideline content and construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reminder and decision support systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local opinion leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost-effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only the results on multifaceted interventions are presented in this report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves, 2009 &lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt; (update from 2007)</td>
<td>Title: Interprofessional education (IPE): effects on professional practice and health care outcomes</td>
<td>Aim: to assess the effectiveness of IPE interventions compared to education interventions in which the same health and social care professionals learn</td>
<td>An IPE intervention occurs when members of more than one health and/or social care profession learn interactively together, for the explicit purpose of improving interprofessional collaboration and/or health/well being of patient/clients. Interactive learning requires active learner participation, and active exchange between</td>
<td>Comparison A: no studies found</td>
<td>AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, NA, NA, can’t answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of study: SR</td>
<td>Design of studies included: RCTs, CBAs</td>
<td>Searches in: EPOC register, Medline, CINAHL, ISI Web of Science, reference lists, hand search in journals</td>
<td>Comparison B (n=6 trials): only descriptive results per study, no comparison possible</td>
<td>Notes: one study high quality, other 5 studies moderate quality, small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authors’ conclusion: Although the studies reported some positive outcomes, due to the small number of studies, the heterogeneity of interventions and the methodological limitations, it is not possible to draw generalisable inferences about the key elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>References, aims and short description</td>
<td>Methodological characteristics</td>
<td>Intervention (strategies)</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Critical appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>separately from on another + to assess the effectiveness of IPE interventions compared to no education interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td>learners from different professions. Comparisons in this SR:</td>
<td>of IPE and its effectiveness.</td>
<td>sample size in most of studies limit the sensitivity in detecting an effective intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies included: n=6 studies Date limits: 1999-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shojania, 2009</td>
<td>Title: The effects of on-screen, point of care computer reminders on processes and outcomes of care</td>
<td>Type of study: SR Design of studies included: RCTs Searches in: Cochrane EPOC Group Trials register, MEDLINE, EMBASE and CINAHL and CENTRAL and scanned bibliographies from key articles.</td>
<td>Point of care computer reminders:</td>
<td>Results per comparison</td>
<td>AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, Y, NA, can’t answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aim: To evaluate the effects on processes and outcomes of care attributable to on-screen computer reminders delivered to clinicians at the point of care.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The reminder was delivered via the computer system routinely used by the providers targeted by the intervention</td>
<td>• Effectiveness of on-screen reminders</td>
<td>Notes: heterogeneity of interventions, variable degree of reporting, limited description of complex interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies included: n=28 studies Date limits: up to July 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The reminder was accessible from within the routinely used clinical information system</td>
<td>• All reported process outcomes: 4.2% (IQR 0.8% to 18.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The reminder targeted the person responsible for the relevant clinical activity</td>
<td>• Prescribing behavior: 3.3% (IQR: 0.5% to 10.6%); 3.8% (IQR: 0.5% to 6.6%) for improvements in vaccinations; 3.8% (IQR: 0.4% to 16.3%) for test ordering behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparisons in this SR:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Effectiveness of on-screen reminders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect modifiers for process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- **Shojania, 2009**: The effects of on-screen, point of care computer reminders on processes and outcomes of care.
- **Aim**: To evaluate the effects on processes and outcomes of care attributable to on-screen computer reminders delivered to clinicians at the point of care.
- **Studies included**: n=28 studies
- **Date limits**: up to July 2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>screen computer reminders on process or outcomes of care</td>
<td>• Effect modifiers of on-screen reminders</td>
<td>adherence by study feature:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not significant for (p&gt;0.05): sample size, baseline adherence, country, setting, publication year, design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Significant for (p&lt;0.05): presence of co-intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➤ Median improvement higher in single intervention (5.7% (IQR 2.0% to 24.0%) compared to multifaceted intervention (1.9%, IQR 0.0% to 6.2%), p=0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect modifiers for process adherence by reminder feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Non significant for (p&gt;0.05): targeted problem, patient-specific reminder, delivery of reminder, explanation provided, response required, developed in consultation with recipients, reminder delivered via CPOE system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• sensitivity analysis: no change in results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➤ lack of any significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>References, aims and short description</td>
<td>Methodological characteristics</td>
<td>Intervention (strategies)</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Critical appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Vale, 2007 | **Title:** Systematic review of economic evaluations and cost analyses of guideline implementation strategies  
**Aim:** to appraise the quality of economic studies undertaken as part of evaluations of guidelines implementation strategies  
**Studies included:** n=63 studies  
**Date limits:** 1966-1998 | **Type of study:** SR  
**Design of studies included:** RCTs, cluster RCTs, ITS, other  
**Searches in:** Medline, Embase, HealthSTAR, SIGLE, Cochrane Controlled Trials register, EPOC register | Comparisons in included studies between more than 2 strategies (total of 53 different behaviour change strategies) versus no intervention of only one strategy (use of reminders alone). | Comparisons:  
- Estimation of costs: no study gave reasonable complete information on the estimation of costs for guideline development, implementation and treatment  
- Efficiency of alternative implementation strategies: no meaningful results due to multifaceted nature of many of implementation strategies, multitude of policy issues and weak methodology | AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, N, N, Y, Y, NA, NA, can’t answer  
Notes: form of economic evaluations rarely stated, methodological weaknesses often undermined the effectiveness results, process measures of uncertain validity, more emphasis on |

Authors’ conclusion: Computer reminders delivered at the point of care have achieved variable improvements in target behaviours and processes of care. The small to modest median effects shown in analysis may hide larger effects.

Authors’ conclusion: The paucity of data on resource use, cost and efficiency of guideline implementation strategies has been shown in this review. Studies were of poor methodological quality and did not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| van der Wees, 2008 | **Title:** Multifaceted strategies may increase implementation of physiotherapy clinical guidelines: a systematic review  
**Aim:** to assess the effectiveness of strategies to increase the implementation of physiotherapy clinical guidelines  
**Studies included:** n=5 studies  
**Date limits:** until October 2007 | **Type of study:** SR  
**Design of studies included:** RCTs, CBAs, interrupted time series studies  
**Searches in:** MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINHAL, PEDRO, Cochrane Library | Single or multiple strategies to increase the implementation of physiotherapy clinical guidelines.  
Comparisons in this SR:  
- Multifaceted intervention of an interactive educational meeting administered by opinion leaders followed by an educational outreach visit vs dissemination of the guideline only; interactive educational meetings administered by experts vs dissemination of guideline only; evidence-based educational meeting administered by local opinion leaders vs standard in-service educational meeting | Results for multifaceted interventions:  
- professional practice: (=compliance adherence to recommendations): heterogeneous results between studies  
- patient outcomes: no difference between intervention and control group  
- cost-effectiveness: no difference between intervention and control group | **AMSTAR evaluation:** Y, can’t answer, Y, Y, Y, Y, N, can’t answer, NA, N  
**Notes:** Limited number of trials, variability in findings |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Weinmann, 2007<sup>18</sup> | **Title:** Effects of implementation of psychiatric guidelines on provider performance and patient outcomes: systematic review  
**Aim:** to identify evidence from comparative studies on the effects of psychiatric guideline implementation on provider performance and patient outcomes. Effects of different implementation strategies were reviewed  
**Studies included:** n=18 studies  
**Date limits:** 1996-2006 | **Type of study:** SR  
**Design of studies included:** RCTs, CCTs, BA  
**Searches in:** Medline, Embase, CINAHL, PsycINFO, Cochrane Trials Register | Implementation strategies in this SR classified as:  
- Continuous quality improvement (CQI)  
- Academic detailing (AD)  
- Distribution of educational materials  
- Marketing techniques  
- Audit and feedback  
- Patient-mediated interventions  
- Reminders  
**Comparisons in this SR:**  
- Pure dissemination of guidelines (8 studies)  
- Compared to control group without intervention (6 studies)  
- Different methods of guidelines implementation (3 studies)  
- Uncontrolled BA design (1 study) | Effects on provider performance (18 studies):  
- In 9 studies (6 RCTs, 1 CCT, 2 BAs): no sign effect of the intervention on process measures  
- In 7 studies: sign effect on provider performance but effect size generally modest (except for tobacco counselling rates in 1 study)  
- Better provider performance associated with multifaceted interventions with ongoing expert consultation, AD or CQI with ongoing supervision or hotlines or interventions using marketing techniques and psychological theories to overcome guideline implementation obstacles | AMSTAR evaluation: Y, Y, Y, N, Y, Y, NA, NA, can't answer  
Notes: high quality of studies for allocation concealment, sample size and follow-up but no blinding to allocation, no ITT analysis, underpowered to show small intervention effects. No pooling of data due to heterogeneity |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>References, aims and short description</th>
<th>Methodological characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (strategies)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Critical appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with multifaceted interventions such as reminder systems plus audit and feedback and social marketing principles, AD plus audit and feedback, patient-mediated interventions and family interventions, AD plus case discussions and involvement of a psychiatrist or psychological methods to face guidelines implementation obstacles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authors’ conclusion: There is insufficient high quality evidence to draw firm conclusions on the effects of implementation of specific psychiatric guidelines. We suggest that one of three implementation components may be necessary to improve patient outcomes: ongoing support or feedback with the possibility to use expert consultation; the use of specific psychological models to overcome obstacles to guideline implementation; social marketing techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2. FIELD RESEARCH

#### Appendix 2.1. Inventory of CPG stakeholders in Belgium

This list provides an overview of about one hundred stakeholders (possibly) involved in CPG development, dissemination and/or financing in Belgium. Green = interviewed (n=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>N° of professionals in Belgium</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>N° CPG/year</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac Pathology</td>
<td></td>
<td>College of Cardiac Pathology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiology</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>Belgian Society of Cardiology</td>
<td>Adaptation EU CPG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgian Society for Clinical Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists-FR</td>
<td>7878</td>
<td>Société de Médécine Dentaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists-NL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vlaamse Beroepsvereniging Tandartsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgian Society of Dermatology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Renal Best Practice</td>
<td>414</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3 + position statements</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Medicine and Revalidation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Belgian Society of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geriatrics</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>College of Geriatrics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;high level&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Practitioners-FR</td>
<td>14758</td>
<td>Société Scientifique de Médecine Générale</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Practitioners-NL</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Domus Medica</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gynecology Flanders</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>Vlaamse Vereniging voor Obstetrie en Gynaecologie</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Expert opinion and if possible &quot;evidence based&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gynecology Wallonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Groupement des Gynécologues Obstétriciens de Langue Française de Belgique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hematology</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Belgian haematological society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive care</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>College of Intensive care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal discipline</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>Belgian society of internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT 1: MEDICS Specialty</td>
<td>N° of professionals in Belgium</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>N° CPG/year</td>
<td>Level of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>Belgian Association for the Study of the Liver</td>
<td></td>
<td>medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical imaging and nuclear medicine</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>College of Medical imaging and nuclear medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother and new born</td>
<td></td>
<td>College of Mother and new born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephrology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgian Society Nephrology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgian Neurological Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational medicine</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>Belgian Professional Association of Occupational Physicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncology</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>College of Oncology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>College of Pediatrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumology</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>Belgian Society of Pneumology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrists (NL)</td>
<td>2249</td>
<td>Vlaamse Vereniging voor Psychiatrie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrists (FR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Société Royale de Médecine Mentale de Belgique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Belgian Society of Radiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiotherapy</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>College of Radiotherapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal Failure</td>
<td></td>
<td>College of Chronic Renal Failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive medicine</td>
<td>(=gyn)</td>
<td>College of Reproductive medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized emergency care</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>College of Specialized emergency care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Belgian Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgian Association for Urology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>N° of professionals in Belgium</td>
<td>N° CPG/year</td>
<td>Level of evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association belge des praticiens de l'art infirmier (ACN)</td>
<td>Belgian association of nurse practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Francophone des Infirmier(e)s d'Urgence (AFIU)</td>
<td>French-speaking association of nurses specialised in emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association des infirmiers gradués en pédiatrie (AIGP)</td>
<td>Association of nurses specialised in pediatriy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association des Infirmières Indépendantes de Belgique /Vereinigung Unabhängiger Krankenpflegerinnen Belgiëns (AIIB/VUKB)</td>
<td>Belgian association of self-employed nurses (French-speaking and German-speaking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CompAS</td>
<td>Belgian association of nurses who care for elderly persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutschsprachige Krankenpflegevereinigung in Belgien (KPVDB)</td>
<td>German-speaking association of nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federale Neutrale Beroepsvereniging Verpleegkunde (FNBV)</td>
<td>Neutral association of Flemish nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fédération Nationale des Infirmières de Belgique (FNIB)/Nationale Federatie van Belgische Verpleegkundigen (NFBV)</td>
<td>National federation of Belgian nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVKVV</td>
<td>National Association of Catholic Flemish nurses and midwives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIO</td>
<td>Association of French-speaking nurses specialised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT 2: NURSES/ MIDWIVES</td>
<td>N° of professionals in Belgium</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>N° CPG/year</td>
<td>Level of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Société des Infirmiers(e) de Soins Intensifs / Vlaamse Vereniging Intensieve Zorgen verpleegkundigen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurses specialised in intensive care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlaamse Beroepsvereniging voor zelfstandige verpleegkundigen (VBZV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flemish organisation for self-employed nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlaamse Organisatie van Vroedvrouwen (VLOV)</td>
<td>9147</td>
<td>Flemish Organisation of midwives</td>
<td></td>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlaamse Vereniging Verpleegkundigen Spoedgevallenzorg (VVVS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flemish Association of nurses specialised in emergency care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Flemish nurses specialised in oncology and radiotherapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wit-Gele Kruis</td>
<td>6074 workers, incl 3448 Full-time equivalent nurses</td>
<td>Flemish Organisation of home nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list has been added for the second edition of the report. About 40 nurses/midwives associations exist in Belgium and the inclusion criterion for this table is to have an official mandate to be represented at the Federal Public Services. Three additional associations have either a mandate at the NHIDI (self-employed nurses) or a large size (Wit-Gele Kruis). From 2014 onwards one large organisation only will have official recognition: the Union générale des infirmiers de Belgique – Algemene unie van verpleegkundigen van België, an organisation that gathers 36 of the 40 existing associations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT 3: Other health professionals</th>
<th>Nº of professionals in Belgium</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Nº CPG/year</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audiology</td>
<td>Audio + Speech: 5844</td>
<td>National union for audiologists (UNAS-NUAS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandagists</td>
<td>Bandagist + ortho: 5657</td>
<td>Belgian professional union for orthopaedic technologies (UPBOT-BBOT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieticians-FR</td>
<td>3205</td>
<td>Union Professionelle des diplômés en Diététique de Langue Française (UPDLF)</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>A,B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieticians-NL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vlaamse Beroepsvereniging van Voedingsdeskundigen en Diëtisten (VBVD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergotherapists NL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vlaams Ergotherapeutenverbond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergotherapists FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Association des ergothérapeutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthoptics</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Belgian association for orthoptics (BOV-ABO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgian pharmaceutical association (APB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td>28008</td>
<td>Belgian association for physical therapists (AXXON)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podologues</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Belgian association for podologists (FBP-BVP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech therapists-FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Union Professionnelle des Logopèdes Francophones (UPLF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech therapists-FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Association Scientifique et Ethique des Logopèdes Francophones (ASELF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech therapists-NL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vlaamse Vereniging voor Logopedisten (VVL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAT 4: AUTHORITIES

Specialty

Federal Public Services
National Institute for Health and Disability Insurance including the National Council for Quality Promotion
Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE)
Scientific Institute for Public health
Christian Sickness Funds (Christelijke Mutualiteit / Mutualité Chrétienne)
Neutral Sickness Funds
Socialist Sickness Funds
Liberal Sickness Funds
Independent Sickness Funds
SNCB/NMBS (employees of train society) Sickness Funds
Flemish Government
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N° CPG/year</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleges (Hogescholen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAPCOC</strong> Belgian Antibiotic Policy Coordination Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCFI</strong> Belgian Centre for Farmacotherapeutic Information (Compendia, Transparantiefiches)</td>
<td>3 in 10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BICEP</strong> Collaborating center van het Joanna Briggs Institute that promotes and disseminates the evidence for nursing practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BICS</strong> Belgian Infection Control Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caritas Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEBAM</strong> Belgian Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine: CPG validation, methodological support CPG development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIPIQ-S</strong> (Collaboration Internationale des Praticiens et Intervenants en Qualité – Santé)</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Meta-analysis - level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBMPracticeNET</strong> Online database of Belgian and international guidelines, validated by CEBAM</td>
<td>Total: 940 international CPG + 40 Belgian CPG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVV</strong> Expertisecentrum Val- en Fractuurpreventie Vlaanderen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAGG-AFMPS</strong> Federal agency for medicines and health products <em>(Finances BCFI)</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FARMAKA</strong> Independent Centre for drug information</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Transparantiefiches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITG</strong> Institute for Tropical Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT 5: OTHERS</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>N° CPG/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;G/ONE</td>
<td>Birth and Childhood Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUL (ACHG)</td>
<td>Catholic University of Leuven (NL)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portal4Care</td>
<td>Platform for dissemination of scientific evidence for nursing practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISCI</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Research Centre in nursing science and practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>Catholic University of Leuven (FR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULG</td>
<td>University of Liège</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAD</td>
<td>Vereniging voor Alcohol – en andere drugproblemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlaamse Werkgroep Richtlijn Ontwikkelaars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULB</td>
<td>Free University of Brussels (FR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VUB</td>
<td>Free University of Brussels (NL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VWVJ</td>
<td>Vlaamse Wetenschappelijke Vereniging voor Jeugdgezondheids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2.2. Preparation to interviews: preliminary information

Before each interview, a mail questionnaire was sent to the interviewees collecting information to prepare for the interview.

KCE Project - Preliminary info

“Evaluation of development and dissemination strategies for clinical practice guidelines (CPG) in Belgium”

We would like to thank you for representing your organization in this KCE project. The project evaluates development and dissemination strategies for clinical practice guidelines (CPG) in Belgium. Before interviewing you, we kindly ask you to answer some general questions. The answers will enable us to prepare the interview and to proceed more quickly at the time of the interview. The completed questionnaire can be sent to Sarah.Steckel@ua.ac.be or “Universiteit Antwerpen, t.a.v. Sarah Steckel, CDE R3.34, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk”, preferably two days before the interview. During the interview difficulties and facilitating factors for CPG development and dissemination will be discussed.

WHO ARE YOU?

- Name and Title
- Function in your organization
- Experience with guidelines

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. The organization you represent is ……………………………………………………………
   - Target population
   - Number of members
   - Activities
2. Does your organization develop CPGs?
   - No
   - Yes

3. Does your organization disseminate CPGs?
   - No
   - Yes

4. Does your organization pay other organizations for CPG development/dissemination?
   - No
   - Yes

5. Who is your target population? (=“users” of the CPG)
   - General practitioners
   - Specialist medical practitioners
   - Dentists
   - Nurses
   - Midwives
   - Pharmacists
   - Paramedics: .................................................................
   - Other: .................................................................

6. Which Belgian stakeholders in CPG development and dissemination do you cooperate with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation?</th>
<th>Purpose?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONS ONLY FOR CPG DEVELOPERS
*if your organization does not develop CPG, please proceed to question 15.

7. What method for CPG development do you use?
   o Evidence based practice guideline development
   o Expert consensus based practice guideline development

8. Do you...
   a) develop original CPG’s?
      o No
      o Yes
   b) adapt CPG from the original CPG to be used locally?
      o No
      o Yes

9. How many CPG do you develop annually? ...............since .......

10. Have you developed CPG which are...
    a) Monodisciplinary
       o No
       o Yes
    b) Multidisciplinary
       o No
       o Yes

11. Which of the following criteria do you consider in CPG development?
    a) Training of the authors
       o No
       o Yes: process ? .........................................................
    b) Grading of the level of evidence
       o No
       o Yes: which tool ? ....................................................... 
    c) A strict strategy/ methodology for CPG development
       o No
       o Yes: which one ? ..........................................................
d) Validation of the CPG
   - No
   - Yes: By whom? .............................................................

e) Involvement of experts in clinical practice
   - No
   - Yes

12. Who pays for the CPG development? ...............................................................

13. What is your annual budget for CPG development? ........................................

14. What are the main themes/subjects of the CPG?
   Please give the names of the 5 last ones with publication date (or write down the link where these subjects can be found)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. How many CPG do you disseminate annually? ............ since .......

16. Have you disseminated CPG which are...
   - Monodisciplinary
     - No   O
     - Yes  O
   - Multidisciplinary
     - No   O
     - Yes  O

17. Which dissemination interventions do you use?
   - Distribution of educational materials
   - Educational meetings
   - Local consensus processes
   - Educational outreach visits
   - Local opinion leaders
   - Patient-mediated interventions
   - Audit and feedback
   - Reminders
   - Marketing
   - Mass media
   - Other: ..................

18. Which of the following criteria do you consider in CPG dissemination?
   a) Guidelines have to report on the level of evidence.
      - No
      - Yes
   b) Guidelines have to be developed with a strict strategy/ methodology.
      - No
      - Yes
c) Guidelines have to be validated.
   - No
   - Yes

d) Experts in clinical practice have to be involved in the development.
   - No
   - Yes

e) Other criteria: .................................................................

19. Do you make adaptations to the Belgian context? ...............................

20. Who pays for the CPG dissemination? ..........................................

21. What is your annual budget for CPG dissemination? ............................

22. What are the main themes/subjects of the CPG?
   Please give the names of the 5 last ones with publication date (or write down the link where these subjects can be found)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONS ONLY FOR ORGANIZATIONS WHICH PAY FOR CPG DEVELOPMENT/DISSEMINATION BY OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

23. What type of CPG does the organization pay for?
   - Evidence based practice guidelines
   - Expert consensus based practice guidelines

24. Has the organization paid for CPG which are...
   - Monodisciplinary
     - No
     - Yes
   - Multidisciplinary
     - No
     - Yes

25. Does the organization pay for...
   - Developing original CPG’s?  
     - No
     - Yes
   - Adapting CPG from the original CPG to be used locally?  
     - No
     - Yes

26. Which of the following criteria do you consider in supporting CPG development or dissemination financially?
   a) Guidelines have to report on the level of evidence.
      - No
      - Yes
   b) Guidelines have to be developed with a strict strategy/ methodology.
      - No
      - Yes
   c) Guidelines have to be validated.
      - No
      - Yes
   d) Experts in clinical practice have to be involved in the development.
      - No
      - Yes
   e) Other criteria (e.g. specific topics, populations): .................................................................
27. What are the supervision/follow-up/quality control procedures set up in this context of financing?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

28. What is the annual budget your organization pays for CPG development and dissemination?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you for your time!

Please send the completed questionnaire to Sarah.Steckel@ua.ac.be
“Universiteit Antwerpen, t.a.v. Sarah Steckel, CDE R3.34, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk”, two days before the interview.
University of Antwerp & University of Liège for KCE
Appendix 2.3. Interview guide

This interview guide has been developed using the EPOC taxonomy of professional interventions and the findings from the literature review (see the synthesis). It was translated in French and Dutch by the researchers CD and SS.

Appendix 2.3.1. Before interview

- Preliminary information
- Information sheet, informed consent, declaration of confidentiality

Appendix 2.3.2. Introduction

Hello, my name is Christiane Duchesnes / Sarah Steckel and I work for the University of Liège / Antwerp. First, I would like to thank you for participating in this interview.

The Universities of Antwerp and Liège, by order of KCE, are investigating the Belgian CPG stakeholders’ experience of CPG dissemination and implementation in Belgium. The interviews are part of a larger research project. The aim of the project is to evaluate CPG dissemination and implementation strategies in Belgium. The results of the interviews will be used to create building blocks for scenarios to improve CPG dissemination ad implementation.

We are interested in your experience, not in theoretical best practices and theoretic frameworks of how it should be done. So what we are looking for is what you think about CPG dissemination and implementation strategies, which ones you use (and which ones not), what difficulties you experience and your suggestions for improvement.

The interview will take approximately one hour. If you agree, we will not take a break but continue the interview.

The interview will be recorded, so we can optimize the analysis afterwards. We guarantee that your privacy will be respected. Your name will not appear in the analysis or in the final report. No one will be able to recognize that you have participated in this interview. You always have the right to stop the interview.

May I ask you to sign the Informed Consent and the declaration of confidentiality? In the Information Sheet is stated all the information about the project.

I also would like to state that there are no right or wrong answers. Anything you say is important. Do you have questions or remarks?

If you agree, shall we start with the interview then?

Appendix 2.3.3. Questions

Mind map

We will start this interview by showing you a mind map of the Belgian CPG landscape.

- Where on this map do you locate your organisation?
- Do you agree with the map? What would you change? (place, size of the circles) What would you add?
- Can you draw arrows to indicate collaboration or financing between organisations?

Development process

Methodology

- Which methods do you use? (eg AGREE, ADAPT,..)
- How do you feel about the method?
- What are the good aspects of this method? What is strong about it?
- What is this method based upon? What is the background of this method?
- What are the difficulties of this method?
Authors

- Where do you find the authors?
- What are facilitating factors for finding authors?
- What kind of difficulties do you experience with the authors of CPG?
  For instance, difficulties with the authors…
  - at the origin/begin of the process?
  - During the process?
  - With validation?

Collaboration with other professionals

- What are facilitating factors for a better collaboration with other CPG professionals like payers, developers and disseminators?
- Could you give some examples?
- What kind of difficulties do you experience in the collaboration with other professionals?
- What are the reasons for that in your opinion?

Validation

- How do you validate CPG/let CPG be validated?
- Who validates CPG?
- What is the value of this validation, what does it mean?
- Facilitating factors?
- Could you describe some difficulties in the validation process?
- Examples?
- What are the reasons for this, in your opinion?

Rounding up

We now discussed the development process.
- Do you have some other topics you wish to discuss?
- Would you like to add something?
- What is your most important message?

Dissemination

Dissemination strategies

I saw in the preliminary info that you use for example strategy X and Y.
- Would you describe your dissemination as rather active or passive?
  Could you illustrate this with some examples?
- What is the reason to choose for these strategies?
- In your opinion, which strategies worked well?
  - What are the reasons in your opinion?
- Which strategies worked not so well?
  - What is it due to in your opinion?

Target population (= CPG users)

- Could you describe your target group?
- How many people do you reach?
- How can you measure that?
  - Do you work with process indicators?
- How do you choose the target population?
- What kinds of factors facilitate the collaboration with the users?
  - Examples?
- What kind of difficulties do you see with…
  - The collaboration with the users?
  - Reaching the users?
  - What are the reasons for that in your opinion?
Adherence

CPG are not always well accepted / followed by the professionals.

- How do you experience the following/acceptance of CPG by the professionals?
- In your opinion, what are the reasons?
- Do you have any experience with CPG that were followed well?
  - Do you know the reasons why they were followed well?
- What was different with the CPG that were not well followed?
- Have you got any suggestion to improve adherence?
  - How could the behaviour be changed?

Rounding up

We now discussed the dissemination process.

- Do you have some other topics you wish to discuss?
- Would you like to add something?
- What is your most important message?

Budget

- How is your organisation being financed?
- How is the budget calculated for development of CPG?
- Do you pay particular attention to some financial aspects?
- How would you describe the collaboration with...
  - if payer: …with developer/disseminator?
  - If developer/disseminator: …with the payer?
- Which difficulties are there with...
  - The budget size?
  - Payments?

Vision of the future CPG landscape

- How do you see dissemination in the future? What would have to be changed/adapted for better CPG dissemination? Can you illustrate this?
- How do you think organizational structures in the future of CPG landscape will evolve? (mind map) What will change, or what should be changed to improve CPG dissemination in Belgium?
- Who should collaborate more? Who does not collaborate but should?
- How do the universities fit in?
- How do the scientific organisations fit in?
- How would you rate the professionalism of CPG dissemination in the Belgian landscape?
- Would you say CPG dissemination in Belgium is rather coherent or fragmented? Can you illustrate this? What are the reasons for that in your opinion?
- Where do you see your organisation on this map in the future?

Ending questions

- Do you have any remarks, anything you would wish to add?
- What in this interview do you wish to state specifically?
- What is, general, the most important message that you have?

Appendix 2.3.4. End

I have heard many interesting things about how you experience CPG dissemination and implementation. Your contribution to this research will be of great value. I would like to thank you for your time and for your efforts!
Appendix 2.4. Maps of the Belgian CPG landscape
The following maps were drawn to support the interviews. The reader can find the methods and sequence of data collection in chapter 2. They do not reflect exactly the reality but its perception by the interviewed stakeholders.

Appendix 2.4.1. First draft designed by the research team
The research team drew a first draft of the Belgian CPG landscape, based on their first inventory of stakeholders involved in CPG development, dissemination and financing. This map was presented during the interviews to hear about the interviewee’s perception of the Belgian landscape and the position of their organization. The objective was to propose an overview that could be further filled according to their knowledge of the landscape. These results of the interviewees’ comments were integrated in the further drafts of the maps (see next pages).
Appendix 2.4.2. Maps of the Belgian CPG landscape according to interviewees

This map represents the perception of the stakeholders in relation to the Belgian institutions that finance CPG development or dissemination. Since only a small selection of all possible stakeholders in Belgium has been interviewed, this view is not exhaustive. The red arrows indicate the fluxes of money as they were reported by the interviewees. The National Institute for Health and Disability Insurance, the Federal Public Services and the Flemish Government are reported to be the main funders. Many associations are self-financing.

Figure 3 – Perception of the stakeholders: Belgian institutions that finance CPG development or dissemination
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The next overview identifies the Belgian organizations who stated that they develop clinical practice guidelines. Associations of health professionals are the general practitioners, the pharmacists, the nurses, the midwives, the dieticians, some specialists. Other associations include groups within the Federal Public Services, the Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre and the Belgian Centre of Information on medications.

**Figure 4 – Perception of the stakeholders: Belgian institutions that develop clinical practice guidelines**
The map below shows that one organization only validates guidelines in Belgium i.e. the Belgian Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine.

**Figure 5 – Perception of the stakeholders: Belgian institution that validates clinical practice guidelines**
The last map shows the target populations mentioned by the organizations. This illustrates that some groups of professionals receive CPG either directly (from producers/disseminators) or indirectly (through the EBMPracticeNet Platform). It also shows that these professionals receive information from many organizations hence diluting information.

**Figure 6 – Perception of the stakeholders: dissemination of guidelines by Belgian institutions**
Appendix 2.5. SWOT analysis for CPG dissemination and implementation in Belgium

Appendix 2.5.1. SWOT analysis for development

This SWOT analysis shows the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of the current dissemination system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Professionals are involved in the choice of the topic of CPGs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professionals are involved in testing CPG for feasibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CPG are adapted to the local context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Simple and practical messages are prepared</td>
<td>• Data are old when CPG is published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sometimes authors are inexperienced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Collaboration with various institutions, increasing thus the EBM network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaboration with international institutions for development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities to build up expertise of authors</td>
<td>• If no strict method for development is used, there is a risk of bias and a risk for decreased EBM-working</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2.5.2. SWOT analysis for dissemination

This SWOT analysis is related to factors influencing future dissemination of CPG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Information is accessible</td>
<td>• Reaching the target group of professionals can be difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear information / language / scientific level</td>
<td>• Lack of dissemination plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attractive documents</td>
<td>• Image of developer and/or disseminator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Combination of strategies is possible</td>
<td>• Image of guideline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standardized documents</td>
<td>• The more strategies, the more time-consuming &amp; higher costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Incentives for professionals to acquire new knowledge</td>
<td>• Lack of knowledge of the Belgian landscape of CPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of knowledge of EBM-approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Excessive quantity of information delivered to the professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of time for professionals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2.5.3. SWOT analysis for adherence to CPG

This SWOT analysis is related to factors influencing future adherence to CPG.

**Strengths**
- Adaptation of the information to the user can influence professionals’ adherence to CPG
- Patient’s involvement in CPG ‘culture’ can influence professionals’ adherence to CPG
- Once used to CPG, adherence can be long-lasting

**Weaknesses**
- Professionals’ self criticism
- Professionals’ perception of CPG and EBM-approach
- Professionals’ perception of CPG developer and/or disseminator

**Opportunities**
- Incentives for professionals to change their practice
- Adherence can lead to proper evaluation and improvement of CPG

**Threats**
- Feasibility of CPG at the level of individual practice (cost, time, organisation)
- Feasibility of CPG at the institutional level (cost, equipment, team organisation)
- Feasibility of CPG at the health care and social security system level (reimbursement of patients, incentives)
- Professional does not feel the need for CPG

Appendix 2.5.4. SWOT analysis of specific strategies for dissemination

The Belgian Federal Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE) aims to develop scenarios to improve the dissemination of clinical practice guidelines (CPG) in Belgium. A qualitative interview design was used to describe stakeholders’ experiences on CPG dissemination. The results of the interviews were, consequently, structured in SWOT analysis models (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) for interventions of the EPOC taxonomy on professional interventions (Effective Practice and Organization of Care Group of the Cochrane Collaboration [http://epoc.cochrane.org/]). The SWOT analysis is displayed in the following paragraphs.

**Distribution of educational materials**

Distribution of educational materials is “the distribution of published or printed recommendations for clinical care, including clinical practice guidelines, audio-visual materials and electronic publications. The materials may have been delivered personally or through mass mailings” (EPOC). One illustration is the publication of guidelines in “Huisarts Nu”, the journal of the Flemish association of general practitioners. Other illustrations are the availability of guidelines on various topics on the KCE website, and the dissemination of CPG on the website of EBMPracticeNET.
### Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• User friendliness: target group prefers ‘tangible’ material instead of</td>
<td>• Excessive documents are not liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electronic information that can be read any place, any time (no use of</td>
<td>• Difficulty to reach target population: incomplete list of distribution,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electronic device, no specific skills required), no complexity, simple</td>
<td>not well targeted, only for members of associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process</td>
<td>• Variety and heterogeneity of target population (especially for primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Essential information for the target population: short and simple</td>
<td>care)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>messages rather than large books</td>
<td>• “Old fashioned” material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adaptation of language to the target professionals</td>
<td>• Large costs for material and expedition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarity and “readability” of the information: various levels of</td>
<td>• No quick adaptation or actualisation possible without full reprint and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation (synopsis, simplified material, whole document)</td>
<td>new distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fragmented and progressively distributed information (timely)</td>
<td>• Keeping publication up to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of practical and easy-to-use tools: tables, graphics,</td>
<td>• Currently no award with accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-making algorithms, documents for the patient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Certainty to reach target group</td>
<td>• Target group does not read information, too much information and they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>get tired of reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teams: documentation reaches only head of the department, not target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental burden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Electronic sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Fast delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Simple process, no complexity: professional can read in own time and place, no specific skills required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attractive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Website: links to more information (various levels of information concerning the same topic, various documents, simplified material for patients available for downloading)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reach a large target group at minimal costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No cost for the user</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibility of quick adaptation/actualisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty to reach the target group: missing email addresses, no data set, old email addresses that are no longer used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Excessive information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need of electronic device (pc, notebook, smartphone, tablet) which can result in difficulties in specific conditions (home visits), breakdown of computing system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Website: sometimes obligation to create special accounts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keeping websites up-to-date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requirement of training sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Availability from the Electronic Medical Record (Med), Personal Medication Record (pharmacists).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Check number of users on website: quantifiable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More regular visits of user to website because of easy access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reaching younger generations who are used to the electronic dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of social media (LinkedIn, Facebook, Twitter…)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Domestic use of many kinds of electronic devices, possible applications for smartphones, tablets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibility to find information easily on the internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• User chooses easier what to read and what not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Depending on work setting: no electronic record for nurses, dieticians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No control of who was really reached (wrong, old email addresses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk of missing older generations who are less used to the electronic dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teams: documentation reaches only head of the service, not target professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-uniformity of gathered information (e.g. office-files, XML, PDF) means extra work for downloading specific software</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Believe in “omnipotence” of computers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No centralisation of information which is time-consuming to search</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational meetings

Educational meetings are described as “health care providers who have participated in conferences, lectures, workshops or traineeships” (EPOC). An illustration is the CME (Continuous Medical Education) where the general practitioners invite experts to present the last developments around a specific theme.

Presence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To reach a large target group face to face</td>
<td>• Takes a lot of time to go and to attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality provided by ready-to-use common material for training or</td>
<td>• Professionalism, knowledge, skills of trainee, will and time to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentations (Power Points, activities, questions prepared by the CPG</td>
<td>• Slow process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developer)</td>
<td>• Cost of organisation and attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Competition of topics for accreditation system meetings: often excessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offers with variable contents to LOK/GLEM’s by different suppliers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Use of educational material within educational meetings (e.g. Power Points,</td>
<td>• Target group may not attend the conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaflets, material for demonstration)</td>
<td>• Small attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presentation during a conference, meeting of another purpose: capsule for</td>
<td>• High cost to add educational material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidelines; personal producer’s networks</td>
<td>• Worker’s absence for training must be supported by the institution and by other colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need of topics for accreditation system meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaboration within a community of education (e.g. CME: Continuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Education); collaboration between producers and professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trainers (universities, high schools); integration of Evidence Based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine into the common educational cursus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Response to professionals’ demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E-learning = Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Individual process</td>
<td>• Less control of who uses the tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easy access</td>
<td>• No personal teaching, no face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Efficient</td>
<td>• Less possibility of motivating the learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibility to evaluate the learner and give feedback</td>
<td>• Cost of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexibility of time of access for the learner as well as speed of learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reach large target group</td>
<td>• Requirement of specific skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attractive for young people</td>
<td>• Assumed complexity of tool may deter users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local consensus processes

Local consensus processes are described as “the inclusion of participating providers in discussion to ensure that they agreed that the chosen clinical problem was important and the approach to managing the problem was appropriate” (EPOC). College of Geriatrics and CIPIQ-S (Collaboration Internationale des Practiciens et Intervenants en Qualité dans le domaine de la Santé) made a survey to analyze the professionals’ needs and tested the CPG for feasibility in a second phase. Another illustration is the consensus conferences of the Committee for the evaluation of medical practice in relation to medications (from the NIHDI).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Users opinion is involved</td>
<td>• Time consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Higher adherence because of social processes that help</td>
<td>• Requires good organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concrete applicability since users establish a specific problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respond to professional's needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Systematic approach to identify needs and evaluate whether the management of the problem was appropriate</td>
<td>• Users do not wish to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implication of users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational outreach visits

Educational outreach visits consist of “the use of a trained person who met with providers in their practice settings to give information with the intent of changing the provider’s practice. The information given may have included feedback on the performance of the provider(s)” (EPOC) One illustration is “Farmaka”, the project of academic detailing sponsored by the federal Agency for Medicines and Health Products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face (unlike e.g. paper documents or some types of E-learning)</td>
<td>Takes a lot of time from physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One on one approach: 1 visitor, 1 physician</td>
<td>Possible lack of interest from physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Too much information at the same time that may not be captured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited to pharmaceutical field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opportunities**

- Systematic approach (visitors can systematically visit physicians per region)
- Extend field to diagnosis, prevention, behavioral therapy (now limited to pharmaceutical topics)
- Advertising tools can be discussed (e.g. CEBAM Digital Library)

**Threats**

- Physician decides which subject he allows to discuss
- Physician decides time frame which is often too short
- Superficial, insufficient information (visitor gets often paid per subject)

Local opinion leaders

This category can be described as “the use of providers nominated by their colleagues as ‘educationally influential’. The investigators must have explicitly stated that their colleagues identified the opinion leaders.” (EPOC) One illustration is the “Grandes Journées de la SSMG” where the Scientific Society of General Practitioners invites specialists to present the last developments around a specific theme (e.g. dermatology).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High credibility since local opinion leaders are nominated by their own colleagues</td>
<td>Impact on parts of team, not whole team (not everyone may agree on the opinion leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High adherence of professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplication of informed people, cascade effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opportunities**

- Education of key opinion leaders to insure correctness of knowledge

**Threats**

- Loss of correctness of knowledge through the process (opinion leader has to disseminate the information correctly)
- Loss of credibility
Patient mediated interventions

Patient mediated interventions consist of “new clinical information (not previously available) collected directly from patients and given to the provider, e.g. depression scores from an instrument” (EPOC). The interviewees did not report on this type of strategy.

Audit and feedback

Audit and feedback are described as “any summary of clinical performance of healthcare over a specified period. The summary may also have included recommendations for clinical action. The information may have been obtained from medical records, computerised databases or observations from patients” (EPOC). One illustration in Belgium is the feedbacks on prescription drawn up by RIZIV/INAMI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Individual approach: feedback towards an enduser or service</td>
<td>• Negative perception because experienced as control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quantifiable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Answer to “why and how questions”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increased confidence physician if good feedback</td>
<td>• Target group resists, does not cooperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culture of quality of care</td>
<td>• Decreased confidence physician if bad feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compulsory aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adverse effect: sense of control may increase physician’s aversion to CPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No reward (accreditation, financial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reminders

Reminders contain “patient- or encounter-specific information, provided verbally, on paper or on a computer screen, which is designed or intended to prompt a health professional to recall information. This would usually be encountered through their general education, in the medical records or through interactions with peers, and so remind them to perform or avoid some action to aid individual patient care. Computer-aided decision support and drugs dosage are included.” (EPOC) Examples are the EBMeds (Electronic Decision Support) System (provides diagnose specific guideline links, automatic reminders, alerts for clinical issues concerning screening, diagnosis, treatment and practice) and the CEBAM Evidence Linker, that provides diagnose specific guideline links.
### Strengths
- Associated-material for patients in Electronic Medical Record (EMR) or another file: simple explanations, drawings, specific technical explanations
- Information about the new guideline available in the provider’s most commonly used tool of information (letter, EMR, periodical)
- Short and clear notes
- The implementation of the Decision Support System for the first line of care is linked to the E-Health criteria for the homologation of EMD packages.

### Weaknesses
- Negative perception because experienced as control

### Opportunities
- Repetition leads to higher adherence of professionals

### Threats
- Adverse effect: same as for audit and feedback

### Marketing

Marketing is described as the "use of personal interviewing, group discussion (‘focus groups’), or a survey of targeted providers to identify difficulties to change and subsequent design of an intervention that addresses identified difficulties” (EPOC).

Interviewees did not report on this type of strategy.

### Mass media

Mass media contain a “varied use of communication that reached great numbers of people including television, radio, newspapers, posters, leaflets and booklets, alone or in conjunction with other interventions; targeted at the population level” (EPOC). One illustration is the campaigns promoted by the BAPCOC (Belgian Antibiotic Policy Coordination Committee) for the use of antibiotics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can reach end users on a wide scale</td>
<td>Messages of general interest, not specific (drug abuse, antibiotics, organ donation,...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition possible (e.g. radio/tv spots)</td>
<td>High cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information available for the professionals and the patients in the same tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Target group: not clear who gets reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher adherence of the patient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Integration in) multi faceted intervention (feedback for instance simultaneously to media campaign and/or dissemination of BAPCOC antibiotics guide)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2.6. Information about the institutions of the interviewees

This table gives detailed information on the interviewed organizations. The group of interviewees represents a small selection of the large landscape of CPG stakeholders in Belgium. The information in this table was gathered from one or two persons representing the organization.

### General information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of members</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Source of financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCE</td>
<td>About 50</td>
<td>• Development: Public Health service&lt;br&gt;• Validation: CEBAM&lt;br&gt;• Dissemination: Public Health (via Colleges); INAMI (via CNPQ)</td>
<td>• General practitioners&lt;br&gt;• Specialists&lt;br&gt;• Dentists&lt;br&gt;• Nurses&lt;br&gt;• Midwives&lt;br&gt;• Physiotherapists</td>
<td>Belgian state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPIQ-S</td>
<td>About 100</td>
<td>• KCE&lt;br&gt;• Public Health Service</td>
<td>• General practitioners&lt;br&gt;• Nurses</td>
<td>Public Health Service DG2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSMG</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>• Development: Domus medica&lt;br&gt;• Validation: CEBAM&lt;br&gt;• Dissemination: EBMPracticeNET</td>
<td>• General practitioners</td>
<td>Public Health Service DG2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APB</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>• Dissemination: SSPF/IPSA (Continuous education for pharmacists)</td>
<td>• Pharmacists</td>
<td>APB; Public Health Service (Fonds federal de lutte contre les Assuétudes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• General practitioners&lt;br&gt;• Nurses in nursing homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Medical Imaging</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>• Consilium radiologicum belgicum&lt;br&gt;• Société Royale belge de Radiologie</td>
<td>• Specialists in medical imaging</td>
<td>College of Medical Imaging; Public Health Service DG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACTS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dieticians</td>
<td>UPDLF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDLF</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dermatologists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRBDV/KBVDV</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dermatologists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllIB</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>• Dissemination: CIPIQ-S and SISD</td>
<td>• Liberally practicing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domus Medica</td>
<td>2000 • SSMG • NHG • Nurses • General Practitioners + students • FOD/SPF RIZIV/INAMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVP Psychiatrists</td>
<td>600 • Psychiatrists • Oncologists • Oncology nurses • Specialists involved in oncology • Patients</td>
<td>Public Health Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Oncology</td>
<td>? • KCE • Domus Medica • NHG • Oncologists • Oncology nurses • Specialists involved in oncology • Patients</td>
<td>Public Health Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Geriatrics</td>
<td>8 • Geriatricians • Multidisciplinary team of geriatric wards</td>
<td>Public Health Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLOV</td>
<td>1000 • <a href="http://www.eetexpert.be">http://www.eetexpert.be</a> • KCE • Midwives</td>
<td>KCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGK</td>
<td>5000 • CIPIQ-S • Academisch Centrum Huisartsengeneeskunde KULeuven • Nurses • Patients • Informal caregivers</td>
<td>WGK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXXON</td>
<td>6000 • WCPT Europe • Domus Medica • KNGF • Physiotherapists • AXXON</td>
<td>AXXON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVIZV</td>
<td>Number? • Intensive care nurses • VVIZV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPCOC</td>
<td>Several working committees • Domus Medica • Centrum voor Huisartsengeneeskunde Antwerpen <a href="http://www.huisartsengeneeskunde.be">http://www.huisartsengeneeskunde.be</a> • NHG • GIN • Health care workers • Population</td>
<td>Belgian state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIZIV/INAMI</td>
<td>&gt; 99% population covered by the National • Development: KCE • General practitioners = Financing Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCE Report 212</td>
<td>Clinical practice guidelines Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute for Health and Disability Insurance</th>
<th>Validation: CEBAM</th>
<th>Dissemination: EBMPPracticeNET</th>
<th>Implementation: Domus Medica and SSMG</th>
<th>FOD/SPF (workflow CPG)</th>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Dentists</th>
<th>Nurses</th>
<th>Midwives</th>
<th>Pharmacists</th>
<th>Paramedics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutualités Chrétienne / Christelijke Mutualiteit</td>
<td>SSMG</td>
<td>CEBAM</td>
<td>RIZIV/INAMI</td>
<td>KCE</td>
<td>General practitioners</td>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>Midwives</td>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 million affiliated members</td>
<td>RIZIV/INAMI</td>
<td>KCE</td>
<td>Kankerregister</td>
<td>OKRA, ALteo, Kazou, Skoebidoe,…</td>
<td>General practitioners</td>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>Midwives</td>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCFI/CBIP</td>
<td>Domus Medica</td>
<td>RIZIV/INAMI</td>
<td>EBMPPracticeNET</td>
<td></td>
<td>General practitioners</td>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
<td>FOD/SPF Santé Publique (FAGG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEBAM</td>
<td>Domus Medica</td>
<td>EBMPPracticeNET</td>
<td>SSMG</td>
<td>CIPIQ-S</td>
<td>General practitioners</td>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
<td>FOD/SPF Santé Publique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff: 18</td>
<td>Domus Medica</td>
<td>EBMPPracticeNET</td>
<td>SSMG</td>
<td>CIPIQ-S</td>
<td>General practitioners</td>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
<td>FOD/SPF Santé Publique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind &amp; Gezin</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>EBMPracticeNET</td>
<td>CIPIQ-S</td>
<td>KCE</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Bureau of consultation (general practitioners, pediatricians, youth)</td>
<td>Flemish Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBMPacticeNET</td>
<td>15 organizations</td>
<td>Domus Medica</td>
<td>SSMG</td>
<td>CEBAM</td>
<td>CEBAM Digital Library for Health</td>
<td>WVVK</td>
<td>BCFI</td>
<td>Minerva</td>
<td>Farmaka</td>
<td>KCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General practitioners</td>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>Midwives</td>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
<td>Physiotherapists</td>
<td>Ergotherapists</td>
<td>Speech Therapists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number CPG/year</th>
<th>Mono/multi-disciplinary CPG</th>
<th>Evidence based</th>
<th>Expert consensus</th>
<th>Level evidence of Adaptation</th>
<th>Author training</th>
<th>Validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCE</td>
<td>About 6</td>
<td>+/+++</td>
<td>KCE adopted methodology</td>
<td>If not enough evidence</td>
<td>GRADE ADAPTE</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>CEBAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPIQ-S</td>
<td>Max. 1</td>
<td>+/+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>GRADE ADAPTE</td>
<td>At least MSc Training to scientific search Must know the context of home care</td>
<td>Delphi + consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSMG</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>+/+</td>
<td>CEBAM methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADAPTE</td>
<td>CEBAM training</td>
<td>CEBAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APB</td>
<td>1 or 2 and updates</td>
<td>+/+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary Product Characteristics (SPC) concerning pharmaceutical data</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>familiarization with EBM approach and knowledge of practice in pharmacy</td>
<td>External experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICEP</td>
<td>+/+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Joanna Briggs Institute)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmaka</td>
<td>Formulaire MRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Medical Imaging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+/+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Group of the Belgian Royal Society of Radiology</td>
<td>Group of the Belgian Royal Society of Radiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDLF</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
<td>ADAPTE</td>
<td>CEBAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatologists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+/+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVP Psychiatrists</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Oncology</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Geriatrics</td>
<td>+/+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLOV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGK</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXXON/WVVK</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPCOC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+/+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIZIV/INAMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutualité Chrétienne/Christelijke Mutualiteit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCFI/CBIP</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEBAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind &amp; Gezin</td>
<td>+/+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBMPpracticeNET</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADAPTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Number CPG/year</td>
<td>Type of interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCE</td>
<td>About 6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPIQ-S</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSMG</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APB</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmaka</td>
<td>Formulaire MRS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Medical Imaging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDLF</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatologists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domus Medica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVP Psychiatrists</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Oncology</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Geriatrics</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLOV</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGK</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXXON/WVVK</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVIZV</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPCOC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIZIV/INAMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Clinical practice guidelines Belgium

### Number CPG/year and Type of interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number CPG/year</th>
<th>Type of interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christelijke Mutualiteit</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCFI/CBIP</td>
<td>Folia, Transparantiefiches,</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geneesmiddelencompendium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEBAM</td>
<td>Validated: 5-10/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind &amp; Gezin</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBMPPracticeNET</td>
<td>In total: 940 international</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPG + 40 Belgian CPG</td>
<td>(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform wetenschap en</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praktijk (portal4Care)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financing institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing institution</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APB</td>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDLF</td>
<td>Dieticians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPF Santé publique DG1</td>
<td>Specialists (Colleges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPF Santé publique DG2</td>
<td>General practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nurses in home care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOD/SPF</td>
<td>CEBAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAPCOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIZIV/INAMI</td>
<td>CEBAM Digital library, including Duodecim Finnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBMPPracticeNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christelijke Mutualiteit</td>
<td>SSMG (small part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialists (occasionally)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3. STAKEHOLDERS DISCUSSION GROUPS

Appendix 3.1. Six proposals for the future of guideline dissemination: initial text

The 6 statements proposed to the stakeholders as a basis of discussion (see chapter 3) are displayed below. They were based on the results of the systematic reviews (chapter 1) and the analysis of the field (chapter 2).

The original text that was submitted to the stakeholders was structured as follows:

- The proposal for the future;
- Paragraph(s) that further explain the reason of this statement (i.e., summary of literature and/or analysis of the Belgian landscape);
- The question(s) (if any) submitted to the stakeholders of the 18th June panel (if no question the stakeholders provided free comments).

Appendix 3.1.1. Statement: on a national platform of clinical practice guidelines

**Statement 1: One national platform ensures efficient dissemination of guidelines that are adapted to the Belgian clinical landscape**

The initiatives to coordinate the dissemination, the implementation and updating of the evidence should be taken at a national level.

Collaborations between health professional organizations should be encouraged. A strong co-operation between groups of experts and a vision of sharing clinical knowledge, analogous to the philosophy of open source software, should aim to reach an optimal level of collaboration (national as well as international). The ultimate goal is that any investment in guidelines’ development should benefit from the largest possible dissemination strategy.

EBMPracticeNet is in that respect an interesting illustration that gathers all guidelines developers/disseminators to optimize the dissemination. The question is to know if this initiative would be successful if it is extended to other health professionals besides general practitioners.

Questions to the stakeholders:

- What should the platform look like? (website only, organization, etc?)
- Who should fund this platform? (public vs private)
- Could this be a “clearinghouse”? (displaying all available CPGs with characteristics)

**Appendix 3.1.2. Statement on the value of a quality label**

**Statement 2: All guidelines would benefit from a quality label**

The scientific content of a guideline is one element that contributes to the acceptance by health professionals who need to trust it. Therefore in theory, an obligatory independent validation panel should guarantee the scientific quality of each guideline.

In practice the interviews highlighted the positive and negative aspects of this procedure. Some developers, in particular scientists and governmental institutions, consider external validation as a quality label. However time, energy and financial resources are barriers: authors have to cope with multiple remarks on their work, which is experienced as a demotivating aspect.

This validation process could be performed by well-established organizations (e.g., CEBAM) to ensure consistency of the guideline development or adaptation process and quality of output. The rigor of the guideline development should rely on a validated instrument such as AGREE together with an evaluation of the content of the guideline.

Questions to the stakeholders:

- Is validation of CPG a condition for dissemination?
- What do we do with Belgian guidelines that are not validated?
- What do we do with international guidelines that were validated abroad?
Appendix 3.1.3. Statement on the need for a multidisciplinary approach

**Statement 3: Since multidisciplinarity is a priority for future health care, involvement of all health professionals’ organizations will improve adherence to clinical guidance**

Multidisciplinary collaboration for (chronic) patients requires the sharing of a common clinical knowledge and agreement on the possible clinical decisions according to the stage of a disease. The multidisciplinary development of clinical guidelines across disciplines and across lines of care should ensure that all caregivers share this common clinical evidence. For that purpose guideline development groups should be multidisciplinary with a representation of all key stakeholders to discuss the content but also the formulation, presentation and lay-out.

Transparent methods have to translate expert opinions in recommendations and to consider all opinions in the formulation of these last ones. Careful selection of the consensus method is needed to reflect as far as possible the participants’ opinions minimize the social psychological influences and disagreements within multidisciplinary group discussions.

**Question to the stakeholders:**
- What are the practical conditions to set up a successful multidisciplinary collaboration?

Appendix 3.1.4. Statement on the adaptation of international guidelines versus national production

**Statement 4: Adapting existing guidelines from other countries is preferred to « de novo » guidelines development in Belgium**

The range of medical topics makes it impossible to develop a national guideline for each of them. On the other hand larger countries with similar health care system produced high-quality guidelines for their health care providers (for example NICE).

Therefore guideline adaptation could be an alternative to de novo guideline development. Level of evidence should be clearly identified and the strength of recommendation should be determined with a national panel of experts. It might be useful to ask participants to evaluate first independently each recommendation in order to have an idea of the divergences between opinions between groups of health professionals.

The Belgian landscape has already experience with the adoption of international guidelines. It is noteworthy that the medical specialists mostly adopt international guidelines (for example stroke care). The translation of Duodecim guidelines is another illustration where guidelines were imported on a national platform with limited initiative from the professionals themselves.

**Question to the stakeholders:**
- What are the conditions for a successful adoption of international guidelines by health professionals in Belgium (healthcare system, nature of guideline, process of import, adaptation)?

Appendix 3.1.5. Statement on the effectiveness of multifaceted interventions

**Statement 5: Multifaceted interventions among professionals with a strong focus on electronic dissemination should be the future**

The overview of the literature and the SWOT-analysis on guideline dissemination strategies show a variation of observed effects within and across the dissemination strategies. This heterogeneity hampers to draw a firm conclusion on the most effective intervention to disseminate guidelines.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissemination strategies</th>
<th>Literature review</th>
<th>SWOT-analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit &amp; feedback</td>
<td>• small improvements in desired practice and to a lesser extent in patient’s outcomes</td>
<td>• an opportunity to reflect upon one's own practice but negatively perceived by the providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed and electronic educational materials</td>
<td>• a small beneficial effect on professional practice outcome but the clinical significance of these improvements is not known</td>
<td>• printed material: a conventional strategy that reaches a large group, still at high cost. The use of paper is still appreciated by (older) groups of professionals especially when messages are clear and user-friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• electronic material (including reminders): similar advantages but at a lower cost. Still a group of the target population (older practitioners ) maybe excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer reminders</td>
<td>• only small improvements in process adherence, even for prescription behaviour changes</td>
<td>• see electronic educational materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational meetings</td>
<td>• not likely to be effective for changing complex behaviours. Improvements in desired practice and in patient outcomes are small and similar to other interventions</td>
<td>• conferences also reach a large group but requires time reaching the professionals who need it most seems also to be a challenge; in that way e-learning seems more efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational outreach visits</td>
<td>• a small but consistent effect for improving physicians’ prescribing whereas the effect on other professional behaviors is more variable. A KCE report on that topic could not draw any conclusion on the cost-effectiveness</td>
<td>• might be efficacious but the face-to-face approach limits its implementation for reasons of efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local opinion leaders</td>
<td>• an overall positive effect of opinion leaders but the results varied across trials and within trials where multiple outcomes were assessed</td>
<td>• might play a role in guideline dissemination if their scientific message is limited to the available evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>• no review found on this topic</td>
<td>• reach multiple target groups and may reinforce patient adherence to the treatment but the final effect remains unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifaceted interventions</td>
<td>• an increased effect but no identification of core components possible</td>
<td>• a common choice to overcome barriers but lack of global strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The interviewees emphasized the importance of the user-friendliness of the messages. Also the possibility to have different formats (summary at a glance, decision tree, detailed text) is important to answer to the needs and possible questions. This point requires the continuous adaptation of scientific message for the target population of health professionals. For that purpose the guidelines and main messages should be first designed with the help of a professional from other domains than medicine. The product should then be tested among the end users to adapt it according to their preferences. Further links with the original data from the literature should further highlight professionals who need more specific information.

The persons interviewed in this research also suggested rewards for the use of guidelines in order to improve their use. An accreditation system already exists for the attendance to conferences but up to now the other dissemination strategies do not benefit from the same advantages. Concrete implementation of this reward system would need further analysis.

Electronic dissemination strategies have the potential to be more efficient if available at the place of consultation, easily tailored to an individual patient, based on data provided by electronic health records. The popup of electronic reminders can increase consultation time but it could be an efficient way to avoid overloading of physicians with non-essential scientific information. Electronic systems are the easiest way to keep the evidence up-to-date.

This trend requires a good knowledge infrastructure where information is centralized, easily accessible when needed. I.e. the right information, in the right format, at the right time without any additional effort. Point-of-care decision support systems based on electronic guidelines have been suggested to successfully meet these needs. A number of studies have already shown positive findings for some computer-based decision support systems such as drug-dosing systems and reminders for preventive care services. However, there is less evidence for more complex guideline-based implementation systems.

Problems inherent to the use of electronic systems are e.g. their accessibility at the point of care (e.g. for home visits) and the cultural change (and training) to ensure standardized data entry and appropriate use. Availability of technical support in case of problems with the system is a point of interest. Ease, speed, and some control in the use of the system seem to be critical success factors. The collaboration with end users is essential to include their preferences for system attributes and functionality in the system engineering.

Appendix 3.1.6. Statement on the need for integration of guidelines in professional education

Statement 6: Training of students and professionals in healthcare is a cornerstone to increase adherence to guidelines

This statement got a consensus and was not discussed during the stakeholders’ meeting.

The knowledge of (the existence) and usefulness of the guidelines is a prerequisite for their use by any health professional. Guidelines should be used as a backbone in all undergraduate, graduate curricula and continuing medical education for all health professionals.

Appendix 3.2. Stakeholders discussion: main results

A common platform

FR:
- Website : on y va MAIS ! User-friendly, interactivité
- Impliquer associations professionnelles et associations patients - Avec les développeurs
- Plate-forme ne suffit pas : il faut d'autres actions : bâton > carotte
- Clearinghouse : pb budget – langue – langage commun (entre professionnels) - complexité – compétences pédagogiques
- Mettre guideline avec son origine sur le website
- Radiologie : plate-forme pour les professionnels en // d’une plate-forme pour le public.
Importance of quality label

FR:
- 2 types de validation : (1) Validation CEBAM = quality label (stt pour financeurs) ; (2) validation autre qu CEBAM existe (par sociétés professionnelle): rapidité masi il faut que ces société se réfèrent à des outils
- Procédure AGREE classique : trop lourde
- Guidelines non validés : peuvent être mis à disposition en notant le (non) statut de validation

NL:
- Quality label needed
- « quality : what’s a name ?
- Users are « safe »
- Veel discussie daar rond
- Betrouwbaarheid niveau moet bepaald zijn
- Richtlijnen met de degree of betrouwbaarheid aangeduid

Adaptation of international guidelines

FR:
- Avantage
  - équipes bien supérieures aux nôtres
  - Update
  - Temps ?
- Problèmes
  - Temps ?
  - Difficile d'identifier guidelines, adapter etc
  - Langue travailler en anglais et // entre les 2 versions FR et NL
  - Connaissances de la procédure ADAPT
- Solutions :
  - Feedback utilisateurs
  - développement au niveau européen

NL:
- Contra : verdunning van evidence - Niet gemakkelijk (Domus) – manpower needed
- Pro : kwaliteitskenmerk – skills nodig – budget
- Europese kaart

Multidisciplinarity

FR:
- Formation
- Difficulté de disponibilité pour avoir représentativité
- Hiérarchisation des professions
- Culture : pensée monodisciplinaire prédomine

NL:
- Understandable guidelines (short, readable, brief)
- Available for all – easy access
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