Table F-7. Key Question 2 studies with a third outcome

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Becker et al., 20084 | G1: Mailed guideline (Increase clinician reach)G2: Guideline implementation (multicomponent, clinicians only)G3: Guideline implementation and motivational counseling directed at patient (multicomponent, clinicians and patients) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients) Quality of life. Measured with the Euro-Qol and Fear Avoidance Beliefs Questionnaire. | Baseline, 6 month, 12 monthSelf-report | PatientN baseline = 1378G1: 479G2: 489G3: 410N at 6 months=1261G1: 450G2: 435G3: 376N at 12 months=1211G1: 425G2: 421G3: 365 | 6 monthsG1: M=66.85G2: M=66.59G3: M=67.5412 monthsG1: M=67.65G2: M=68.46G3: M=70.38 | 6 months (author provided odds ratios for groups compared with control only)Mean diff (95% CI)G1 vs. G2: -0.25 (-2.86/2.36)G1 vs. G3: 0.69 (-1.92/3.30)G2 vs. G3: 0.943\* p=NR12 monthsMean diff (95% CI)G1 vs. G2: 0.80 (-1.74/3.34)G1 vs. G3: 2.72(0.19/5.26)G2 vs. G3: 1.919\* p=NR | Sex, age, fear avoidance, physical activity, and number of days in pain during previous 6 months |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Bekkering et al., 20055,6 | G1: Received guidelines by mail (increase reach)G2: Received guidelines + active training strategy (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients) Pain; measured using an 11-point NRS scale ranging from 0 (“no pain”) to 10 (“very severe pain”). | Baseline, 6, 12, 26, and 52 weeks after baselineSelf-report | BaselineOverall=511 patientsG1: 259 patientsG2: 256 patients6 weeksOverall=511 patientsG1: 259 patientsG2: 256 patients12 weeksOverall=511 patientsG1: 259 patientsG2: 256 patients26 weeksOverall=511 patientsG1: 259 patientsG2: 256 patients52 weeksOverall=511 patientsG1: 259 patientsG2: 256 patients | Mean scores and interquartile rangesBaselineG1: 7.0 (5.0-8.0)G2: 7.0 (5.0-8.0)6 weeksG1: 3.0 (2.0-5.0)G2: 3.0 (2.0-5.0)12 weeksG1: 2.0 (1.0-4.0)G2: 2.0 (1.0-4.0)26 weeksG1: 1.0 (0.0-4.0)G2: 2.0 (1.0-4.0)52 weeksG1: 1.0 (0.3-3.0)G2: 2.0 (0.0-4.0) | Adjusted absolute differences (G2-G1):6 weeks: 0.16 (-0.35 to 0.69)12 weeks: 0.34 (-0.19 to 0.88)26 weeks: 0.62 (0.06 to 1.18)52 weeks: 0.55 (-0.02 to 1.11) | Sex, previous episode of back pain, duration of current episode of back pain, pain and coping inventory relaxation subscale. Clustering of practices, physical therapists, patients, time points.Multilevel modeling; Wald chi-square tests |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Bishop and Wing, 200641 | G1: Control (not abstracted)G2: Physician only (increase reach)G3: Physician and patient (multicomponent) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians) Guideline-concordant treatment advice for >12-week post injury treatment period. The compulsoryWCB physician report forms were collected and scored. Dichotomous measure of 1 = presence of concordant/discordant behavior. | Once during 12-16 weeksWorkers’ Compensation Board reports | >12 weeksOverall N=428G2: 149G3: 139 | NR | NRNOTE: Authors did not analyze between groups difference from each other, nor provide any figures, tables, or data for the >12 week measures.  | NR |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Campbell et al., 20047 | G1: Control (not abstracted)G2: LHA (increase motivation)G3: TPV (multicomponent)G4: TPV and LHA (multicomponent) | Health-related decisions or behavior (applicable for general public/patients) CRC screening. Participants were asked whether they had ever had any CRC screening tests and, if so, how long ago (< 1 yr, 1-2 yrs, 2-5 yrs, or > 5 yrs). | Baseline and 1 yr followupSelf-report | N=587G2: 123G3: 159G4: 176 | FOBT test in the past year (%)BaselineG2: 23.5G3: 19.7G4: 19.5FollowupG2: 33.4G3: 36.8G4: 31.0Other CRC test in the past year (%)BaselineG2: 19.6G3: 23.7G4: 26.4FollowupG2: 25.5G3: 21.1G4: 14.9 | FOBT test BaselineG2 vs. G3: 3.8G2 vs. G4: 4.0G3 vs. G4: 0.2ns, p=0.36FollowupG2vs.G3: 3.4G2vs.G4: 2.4G3 vs.G4: 5.8ns, p=0.08Other CRCBaselineG2 vs. G3: 4.1G2 vs. G4: 6.8G3 vs. G4: 2.7ns, p=0.75FollowupG2 vs. G3: 4.4G2 vs. G4: 10.6G3 vs. G4: 6.2p=0.04 but looks like this is in comparison to controls | Demographicsregression models |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Feldstein et al., 200613 | G1: Usual care (not abstracted)G2: EMR reminder (increase reach for clinicians)G3: EMR reminder and patient reminder (via letter with educational materials (multicomponent) | Behavioral intentions to use or apply the evidenceTotal caloric expenditure from all activity from the Community Health Activities Model Program for Seniors questionnaire (a self-report physical activity questionnaire for older men and women) | Baseline and 6 months post interventionPatient self-report | G1: 32;G2: 38; G3: 38 | G1: Pre: 2,325.7; Post: 1980.9 G2: Pre: 3,082.9; Post: 2312.7; G3: Pre: 2,614.4; Post: 2525.9 | Difference: G1 vs. G2: -331.8 G1 vs. G3: -545 G2 vs. G3: -213.295% CI: NRp=0.32 treatment and UC | Presurvey responseSee Outcome #1 |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Hagmolen et al., 200815 | G1: Guideline dissemination (increase reach)G2: Guideline dissemination + educational program (increase ability)G3: Guideline dissemination + educational program + individualized treatment advice based on airway responsiveness and symptoms (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients) Usage of asthma medication. Number of PPD. For ICS this is mean PPD prescribed in 1 year. For β2 agonist it is mean number of PPD used during the diary period. | NRObjective measurement | Overall N=362G1: 98G2: 133G3: 131Also conducted post-hoc analysis where Groups 1 and 2 were combined | ICSG1: M =0.4 (SE=0.05) G2: M=0.5(SE=0.05) G3: M=0.6 (SE=0.05) β2 agonistG1: M =0.45 (SE=0.01) G2: M=0.43(SE=0.08) G3: M=0.29 (SE=0.08) | ICSG1 vs. G2: 0.1\*G1 vs.. G3: 0.2\*G2 vs. G3: 0.1\*Significant overall treatment effect among all 3 groups. p=0.03Significant difference between baseline and end of study for G3 (.1, P<0.05)Post-hoc analysis (aggregated groups 1 & 2): G1&G2 vs. G3: .2Significant difference between groupsp=0.02β2 agonistG1 vs. G2: .02\*G1 vs. G3: .16\*G2 vs. G3: .14\*No significant treatment effect between 3 groups. p=0.2Significant different between baseline and send of study for G3 (-.24, p<0.05) | NRMixed model ANOVA analyses |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Hagmolen et al., 200815 (continued) |  |  |  |  |  | Postanalysis: G1&G2 vs. G3: .15\*No significant difference between groups. p=0.2 |  |
| Jain et al., 200616 | G1: Passive intervention- guidelines by mail (increase reach)G2: Active intervention (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients) 3 measures assess Clinical Outcomes. Duration of ICU (reported in days, using the median, and the IQR is reported)Hospital length of stay (reported in median days, IQR. Followup was censored at 60 days so true upper quartile is undefined)28-day mortality rate (reported as n, %) | Baseline and 12 month followupObservation | PracticeOverall=58 ICUs randomized as 50 clustersG1: 25 clustersG2: 25 clustersPatientsBaselineOverall=623G1: 298G2: 325FollowupOverall=612G1: 305G2: 307Note: the patients were not the same at baseline and followup. The authors took a cross-sectional survey at both time points.  | ICU LOS (median, IQR)BaselineG1: 14.9 (8.3/29.9)G2: 14.4 (7.3/32.3)FollowupG1: 13.7 (7.8/28.5)G2: 13.9 (8.6/33.4)Hospital LOS (median, IQR)BaselineG1: 27.4 (15.3/60)G2: 28.2 (14.4/60)FollowupG1: 28.8 (15.0/60)G2: 29.1 (14.7/60)28 day mortality (n, %)BaselineG1: 63 (21.1%)G2: 68 (20.9%)FollowupG1: 56 (18.4%)G2: 56 (18.2%) | No significant differences in change ICU LOSΔG1 : -1.2\*ΔG2: -0.5\*ΔG1-ΔG2: 0.7\*p=NRHospital LOSΔG1 : 1.4\*ΔG2: 0.9\*ΔG1-ΔG2: 0.5\*p=NR28 day mortalityΔG1 : -2.7%\*ΔG2: -2.7\*ΔG1-ΔG2: 0\*p=NR | NRFisher’s randomization test of the log-rank statistic |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Kennedy et al., 200319 | G1: Control (not abstracted)G2: Information (increase reach)G3: Interview (increase motivation) | Behavioral intentions to use or apply the evidence Preference at baseline a binary variable was used: 0 = no preference held postconsultation and 1 = preference formed post consultation. For those who did hold a preference at baseline a nominal variable was produced with three categories: preference maintained, preference changed, no preference (the woman no longer held a preference postconsultation). | Baseline and postconsultation.Self-report | Overall=685G2: 234G3: 226 | Women with no preference at baseline#, %G2: 135, 57.7%G3: 114, 50.4% | Only reported differences between each group and the control | Consultant sex; Consultant year of qualification; Age; Baseline menorrhagia severity; Baseline knowledge; Previous treatment – D&C; Previous treatment – OCP; Previous treatment – hormonal drugs; Previous treatment – non-hormonal drugs; Duration of problem; Any previous surgery; Baseline preferences (where preference held at baseline); Recruitment periodMultinomial logistic regression |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Lien et al., 2007,22Svetkey et al., 2003,23Young et al., 200924 | G1: Advice only (increase reach)G2: Advice + behavioral counseling using established intervention (multicomponent)G3: Established intervention + DASH dietary recommendations (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients) Percent that met at least 3 health goals | 6-months and 18 monthsObjective measurement | N at 6 monthsG1: 248G2: 239G3: 242N at 18 monthsG1: 254G2: 244G3: 254 | 6 months:G1: 11.7% G2: 19.3%G3: 44.6% 18 monthsG1: 11.0%G2: 11.9%G3: 33.5% | 6 months:G2-G1: 7.6%\*p<0 .02G3-G1: 32.9%\*p<0 .0001G3-G2: 25.3%\*p<0 .000118 months:G2-G1: 0.9%\*p=NR, but non-significantG3-G1: 22.5%\*P<0 .0001G3-G2: 21.6%\*p< 0.0001 | NoneMantzel-Haenzel chi-squared |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Marcus et al., 200925 | G1: Contact control treatment delayed group (not abstracted)G2: Telephone-based individualized feedback (increase motivation)G3: Print-based individualized feedback (increase reach) | Behavioral intentions to use or apply the evidenceDecisionmaking for exercise measured by decisional balance instrument by Marcus, et al. | Baseline, 6 and 12 monthsSelf-report | NR | G1: 6 Months: -2.95; 12 Months: -3.64G2: 6 Months: 13.38; 12 Months: -0.75 G3: 6 Months: 15.45; 12 Months: 14.12 | Difference: 6 Months: F=4.49; 12 Months: F=6.0495% CI: NR6 Months: p<0.0122 12 Months: p<0.0028 | YesAnalysis of covariance, adjusted for treatment effects for gender and seasonal differences. When overall test of between-groups differences was significant at the >05 level, the source of these differences was examined further using single-degree-of-freedom contrasts that compared the active treatment arms with each other as well as with the treatment delayed group. |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Murtaugh et al.,200527 | G1: Usual care (not abstracted)G2: Basic intervention email reminder (increase reach)G3: Augmented intervention of email reminder + package of supporting materials (multicomponent) | Discussions about the evidence% giving patients instructions about Shortness of breath | chart-review of subsequent RN visit, within 45 days of initial intakeChart | 354 | Overall N=354G1: 18.1%G2: 31.1%G3: 28.9% | Difference G2-G1: 13.0%, p=0.021 Difference G3-G1: 10.8%, p=0.053Difference G3-G2: -2.2%\*, CI and p=NR | Socio-demographic variables of the RN (age, gender, race/ethnicity), Rn employment status, educational level and caseload; average baseline characteristics of patients care for by each RN including health, functional status; geographic area where nurse provided carePredictive multivariate modeling |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Paradis et al.,201128 | G1: Paper handouts (increase reach)G2: Educational DVD (increase reach) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients) Health care utilization including the # of additional clinic visits, # of parent-initiated phone calls, total # of professional consultations, proportion with >1 additional visit, and # of emergency dept visits between the enrollment visitand the 2 month well-child visit. “Professional consultations” -- the combination of clinic visits and parent-initiated phone calls. Additional office visits -- any (problem-related) visit outside of the usual well-child schedule | 2 months postenrollmentChart | Overall N=137G1: 67G2: 70 | Number of additional clinic visits:G1: 2.0 (SD=1.1)G2: 1.6 (SD=1.2)Number of parent-initiated phone calls:G1: 1.8 (SD=1.9)G2: 1.1 (SD=1.8)Total professional consultations:G1: 4.0 (SD=3.0)G2: 2.9 (SD=2.8)Proportion with >1 additional visit:G1: 42 (63%)G2: 27 (39%)Number of emergency department visits:G1: 0.2 (SD = 0.6)G2: 0.2 (SD = 0.5) | Number of additional clinic visits:G2-G1: - 0.4, 95% CI: -0.80 to -0.01p=0.05Number of parent-initiated phone calls:G2-G1: -0.7, 95% CI: -1.22 to -0.01p=0.05Total professional consultations:G2-G1: -1.1, 95% CI: -2.00 to -0.03p=0.04Proportion with >1 additional visit:G2-G1: -15, 95% CI NRp=0.01Number of emergency department visits:G2-G1: 0, 95% CI: -0.20 to 0.18p=0.91 | Hispanic ethnicity, babies born at outside hospital, #exclusively breast fedMultivariate regression analysis |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Partin et al., 200429 | G1: Usual care (not abstracted)G2: Pamphlet (increase reach)G3: Video (increase reach) | Discussions about the evidencePatient participation in CaP screening decisionmaking was assessed by a single question about whether CaP screening was discussed at their last clinic visit. | 1 week posttarget appointment self-report | N=893G2: 295G3: 308 | Unadjusted proportions G2: 0.41G3: 0.35Adjusted proportionsG2: .35G3: .41 | Unadjusted G2 vs. G3: 0.06\*, p=NRAdjustedG2 vs. G3: 0.06\*, p=NR | Adjusted analysis accounted for marital status, education, race, health status, comorbid conditions, experience with prostate problems, symptom severity, medication uselogistic regression |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Rebbeck et al., 200631 | G1: Dissemination of guidelines by mail (increase reach)G2: Implementation group (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients) Disability due to acute whiplash - measured more specifically using a 5-item adapted version of the Core Outcome Measure for neck pain. Each item was scored on a 5-point response scale. Summation of the 5 items yields a score ranging from 5 to 25; higher scores indicate greater perceived disability. | Baseline, month 1.5, month 3, month 6, month 12Self-report | Baseline:G1: 28G2: 71Month 1.5G1: 24G2: 64Month 3G1: 23G2: 59Month 6G1: 19G2: 56Month 12G1: 26G2: 67 | Baseline:G1: M=15.5, SD=3.2G2: 16.3, SD=3.7Month 1.5G1: 10.9, SD=3.8G2: 13.5, SD=4.9Month 3G1: 10.2, SD=3.7G2: 11.5, SD=4.4Month 6G1: 9.4, SD=4.3G2: 10.9, SD=5.2Month 12G1: 10.0, SD=4.2G2: 10.3, SD=4.4 | BaselineDifference (G1 vs. G2): 0.3\*95% CI: -2.1 to 2.7p=0.08Month 1.5Difference (G1 vs. G2): 2.8\*95% CI: -0.5 to 6.2p=0.09Month 3Difference (G1 vs. G2): 1.3\*95% CI: -1.3 to 3.8p=0.31Month 6Difference (G1 vs. G2): 1.7\*95% CI: -2.3 to 5.7p=0.38Month 12Difference (G1 vs. G2): 0.3\* 95% CI: -2.4 to 3.0p=0.85 | NRt-test, adjusted using methods for cluster-randomized trials |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Rimer et al., 200132 | G1: No treatment control/usual care (not abstracted) G2: Tailored print (increase reach)G3: Tailored print + telephone counseling (multicomponent) | Knowledge about the evidence2 true/false questions on breast CA and mammography (% correct):1) Mammograms are more effective for women 50-65.2) Women over 50 are at higher risk for breast cancer | 1 week following receipt of interventionSelf-report | 1127 | Mammograms are more effective for women 50-65, % correct:G1: 11%G2: 15%G3: 20%Women over 50 are at higher risk for breast cancer, % correctG1: 25%G2: 27%G3: 37% | Absolute difference in knowledge, mammogram effectiveness: G2-G1: +4%\*, p=NSG3-G1: +9%\*, p<0.05G3-G2: +5%\*, p=NSAny difference in groups: p=0.007Absolute difference in knowledge, risk for cancer: G2-G1: +2%\*, p NSG3-G1: +12%\*, p<0.05G3-G2: +10%\*, p<0.05Any difference in groups: p=0.001 | NonePearson chi-square and F-test |
| Simon et al., 200534 | G1: Mailed educational materials (increase reach)G2: Individual academic detailing (increase ability)G3: Group academic detailing (increase ability)  | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients) Rates of hospitalization (from electronic medical record) | Baseline and 1 year followupObjective | Baseline: 3692Year 1: 2142 | BaselineG1: 0.26, SD=0.94G2: 0.26, SD=0.79G3: 0.25, SD=0.77Year 1G1: 0.21, SD=0.79G2: 0.18, SD=0.63G3: 0.22, SD=0.69 | Year 1G1 vs. G2: 0.03\*G1 vs. G3: 0.01\*G2 vs. G3: 0.04\* | Differences among individual patientsDescriptive statistics (for determining M) |

Table F-7. Key question 2 studies with a third outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author,Year** | **Groups**  | **Outcome #3, Exact Measure Used**  | **Timing of Measurement,****Data Source**  | **N analyzed for This Outcome**  | **Results by Group** | **Differences in Groups**  | **Covariates Controlled for in Analysis, Statistical Methods Used** |
| Soler et al., 201035 | G1: Control (not abstracted)G2: Training session on the SEPAR guidelines (increase ability)G3: G2 + portable-device for spirometry (multicomponent) | Clinical outcomes (applicable for general public/patients) Differences in Treatment Regime (distribution of drugs prescribed according to the severity (mild vs. severe) of COPD before and after the training session. Treatment regimens: fixed combination, bronchodilators, corticoids and antibiotics. | Starting 90 days after training sessionChart | G1: 1481, G2: 2119, G3: 5556 | Long acting beta agonist:G1: 36.5%G2: 17.2%G3: 17%Anticholinergics:G1: 68.1%G2: 76.1%G3: 77.8%TheophyllineG1: 5.5%G2:7.6%G3:4.9% | Long acting beta agonist:G2- G1: 19.3%, p=NRG3-G1: 19.5%, p=NRAnticholinergics:G2-G1: +8%, p= NRG3-G1: +9.7%TheophyllineG2-G1: +2.1%, p=NRG3-G1: -0.6, p=NR | baseline valueLogistic regression |
| Wolters et al., 200539 | G1: Control mailed guidelines (increase reach)G2: Intervention involving package for learning, supporting materials, decision tree, and information leaflets for patients (multicomponent) | Behavior (applicable for clinicians)Adherence to guidelines. Number of patients referred to a urologist.The lower the referral rate, the better. More following of a watchful waiting policy  | Up to 1 year postinterventionProspective recording of patient data and management immediately after consultation with eligible patient | N=187 G1: 92G2: 95 | ReferralG1: 13, 14.5%G2: 2,2.1%Wait and see approachG1: 54, 58.7G2: 61, 64.2% | Referral G1 vs. G2: 12.4%\*OR:0.08 (0.02/0.40)Wait and seeG1 vs. G2: 5.5%\*OR:1.47 (0.66/3.28) | Age, group allocation, IPSS and BSLogistic regression |

\* calculated by reviewer
**Abbreviations:** ANOVA = ANalysis Of Variance; BS=Bother score; CaP = Cancer of the Prostate; CI = confidence interval; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CRC = colorectal cancer; DASH = Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension; dept = department; DVD = optical disc storage format; EMR = electronic medical record; FOBT = fecal occult blood test; G = group; ICS=inhaled corticosteroid; ICU = intensive care unit; IPSS=International Prostate Symptom Score; IQR = interquartile ratio; LHA = lay health advisor; LOS=length of stay; M=Mean; N=number; NR = not reported; NRS=Numeric rating scale; NS=not significant; OCP=oral contraceptive pill; PPD = puffs per day; QOL = quality of life; RN=registered nurse; SD = standard deviation; SEPAR = Spanish Society of Pulmonology; TPV = tailored and targeted print and video; UC = usual care; WCB = Workers Compensation Board;