## Vaccination Programs: Provider Education When Used Alone

Summary Evidence Table - Updated Evidence (search period: 1980-2012)

Study	Location and Intervention	Population and Sample	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary [95%CI]	Follow-up time
Author (Year): Cowan (1992)	Location: USA, Illinois  Provider Education:	Setting: internal medicine resident clinic, University of Illinois	PPV Group 1 vs 2	0.0%	10.3%	10.3% change (nonsig)	Oct 1 - Dec 31
Study Period: 1985	Generic health     assessment fact sheet     attached to client's chart	Study Population:				(CI: -0.8, 21.4)	1985 (3 months)
Design Suitability		• adults					
(Design):	Comparison:	• mean ages 57-60 years	DT	0.0%	1.6%	1.6% change	
Greatest (Group randomized trial)	2. Usual Care	(Participants)	Group 1 vs 2			non significant (CI:-1.5, 4.7)	
		Group N					
Quality of		1 62					
Execution: Fair		2 45					
Outcome Measure:		(Providers)					
PPV, Influenza		<u>Group</u> <u>N</u>					
		1 16					
		2 13					
Author (Year):	Location: USA, Northern	Setting: community hospitals					
Crouse (1994)	Minnesota		Group 1 vs 2	40.3%	17%	23.3 pct pts (p < 0.002)	1991-1992
	Intervention:	Study Population:				(p < 0.002)	
Study Period: 1991	Standing orders	inpatients					
	_	adults; otherwise, not	Group 1 vs 3	40.3%	9.6%	30.7 pct pts	
Design Suitability	2. Physician reminders	described				(significance	
(Design):	Comparison:	(Hospitals)				not provided)	
Greatest (Prospective cohort study)	3. Physician education	(Hospitals)	Group 2 vs 3	17%	9.6%	7.4 pct pts	
conort study)	,	Group N	' '			(nonsignificant	
Quality of		2 2					
<b>Execution:</b> Fair		2 2 3					
		2					
Outcome Measure: Influenza							

Study	Location and Intervention	Population and Sample	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary [95%CI]	Follow-up time
Author (Year): Taylor (2008)  Study Period: Nov.2003-Jan. 2006  Design Suitability (Design): Greatest (Group randomized Controlled Trials)  Quality of Execution (# of limitations): Good (1)  Outcome Measure: Childhood Series	Location: USA, King County, Washington State  Intervention: 1-Hour educational Program comprising interactive computer slide presentation  + Routine VFC program  Control: Routine VFC program only	Setting: Private Pediatric and Family Medicine Practices  Study Population:  Private pediatric and Family medicine Practices in King County Participate in VFC program Administer at least 35 doses of MMR in 2002  N=91 n=73 Intervention=37 Control=36  Patient Characteristics: Not stated	The Primary study outcome was the Practice Immunization rates (PIR) determined 1-year after the intervention or initial assessment in control practices.  Childhood series	Childhood series Interv: 69.8% Contrl:66.8%	Childhood series Interv: 71.4% Contrl: 69.6	+1.8 Pct pts (p=0.94)	Follow-up time not reported

Study	Location and Intervention	Population and Sample	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary [95%CI]	Follow-up time
Author (Year): Siriwadena (2002)	<b>Location:</b> UK, Trent Region	Setting: Primary care practices Study Population:	Influenza and pneumococcal vaccination	Control: 25.4%	Intervention: 20.7%	-4.7 pct pts (OR=0.99)	Interv period was
Study Period: 2000		<ul> <li>Practices in west Lincolnshire Primary Care Trust (39)</li> <li>Trent Focus Collaborative</li> </ul>	rates in high risk groups	23.176		95%CI: 0.96- 1.02	not clearly stated.
Design Suitability (Design): Greatest (Group Randomized Controlled Trial)	on vaccination + Provider feedback on practice vaccination rates  Comparison:	Research Network (50)  N=89  n=30 Primary Care Practices attending to High risk patients  Patient Characteristics:	PPV (for >65 years group):				
Quality of Execution (# of limitations): Good (0)	Provider feedback on practice vaccination rates only	<ul> <li>CHD Patients</li> <li>Diabetes Patients</li> <li>Splenectomy Patients</li> <li>&gt;65 Years (Only Pneumoccocal)</li> </ul>					
Outcome Measure: Influenza and Pneumoccocal Vaccination							

Study	Location and Intervention	Population and Sample	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary [95%CI]	Follow-up time
Author (Year): Franzini (2007)	Location: USA, Larger Houston Area Intervention: I- Hour	Setting: Private Pediatric and Family Medicine practices Study Population:	Assessment of Up To Date pre and post (1 year)	Pre: Criteria I:	Post: Criteria I:	Criteria I 4pct pts	1 Year Interv period
Study Period: 2006  Design Suitability	peer-based provider education for each practice	<ul> <li>Initial list of 852 of which 189 recruited. Qualifying practices have =&gt;25 children per month</li> </ul>	intervention based on review of	I 44 C 47	I 45 C 44	(CI: -2%- 10%)	
( <b>Design</b> ): Greatest (Group Randomized Controlled Trial)	<b>Comparison:</b> Usual care	<=4 years age. • Final participation: 3 intervention and 94 controls.	sample of immunization records (50 each from	Criteria II I 59 C 58	Criteria II I 60 C 55	Criteria II 4 Pct pts (CI: -1%-9%)	
Quality of Execution (# of limitations): Fair (2)		<ul> <li>Patient Characteristics:</li> <li>Age: Children 12-23 months         Children 19-35 months</li> <li>Gender: Not stated</li> <li>Race/Ethnicity: Not stated</li> <li>SES: Not stated</li> </ul>	each practice for children 12-23 months).				
Outcome Measure: Childhood series							

Study	Location and Intervention	Population and Sample	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary [95%CI]	Follow-up time
Author (Year): Boom (2010)	<b>Location:</b> USA, Greater Houston area, TX and surrounding counties	<b>Setting:</b> Pediatric and family medicine practices	Immunization Status (19-23 months of	Childhood series Interv: 59% Contrl:58%	Childhood series Interv: 60%	+4 pct pts (nonsig)	1 year
Study Period: 2003-2005	<b>Provider Education:</b> peer education sessions using Raising Immunizations	<ul><li>Study Population:</li><li>Children</li><li>12-23 months</li></ul>	age)		Contrl: 55%		
Design Suitability (Design):	Thru Education (RITE) program	participate in VFC program					
Greatest (Group randomized trial)	Comparison: Usual Care	(Provider sites)  Group N  Interv 61					
Quality of Execution (# of limitations): Good (1)		Contrl 62					
Outcome Measure: Childhood Series							