

Seasonal Influenza Vaccinations Using Interventions with On-Site, Reduced Cost, Actively Promoted Vaccinations - non-Healthcare Workers

Summary Evidence Table - Effectiveness Review

Study	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Outcome measure	Baseline value	Outcome value	Value used in summary	Follow-up time
<p>Author (Year): Ausseil (1999)</p> <p>Study Period: 1996-1997</p> <p>Design Suitability: Least</p> <p>Study Design: Before-After</p> <p>Quality of Execution (limitations): Fair (4)</p>	<p>Location: Manila, Philippines</p> <p>Components: Free + On-site</p> <p>Comparison Year: No program (vaccine not offered in country)</p>	<p>Staff at an international development bank</p> <p>N=1,825</p> <p>4% male</p>	<p>Vaccination coverage</p> <p>Average number of sick leave days claimed</p>	<p>0.0%</p> <p>6.1 days</p>	<p>16.0%</p> <p>6.8 days</p>	<p>16.0 pct pts (CI95: 14, 18)</p> <p>0.7 days (Relative Δ: 12.0%) NS</p>	1y
<p>Author (Year): Dille (1999)</p> <p>Study Period: 1994-1995</p> <p>Design Suitability: Least</p> <p>Study Design: Before-After</p> <p>Quality of Execution (limitations): Good (1)</p>	<p>Location: Hanford, WA</p> <p>Components: Free + On-site + Health Education + Mobile + Small Media</p> <p>Comparison Year: Free + On-site</p>	<p>All contract workers in the Hanford environmental remediation facility</p> <p>n=18,101</p>	Vaccination coverage	9.9%	35.0%	24.1 pct pts (CI95: 24, 26)	1y
<p>Author (Year): Higgins et al. (1991)</p> <p>Study Period: 1986-1988</p> <p>Design Suitability: Least</p> <p>Study Design: Before-After</p> <p>Quality of Execution (limitations): Fair (2)</p>	<p>Location: Willow Grove, PA</p> <p>Components: Free + On-site + Mobile + Reminders</p> <p>Comparison Year: NR</p>	<p>Full-time staff and personnel of the Pennsylvania Air National Guard</p> <p>N=1,100</p>	Vaccination coverage	45.0%	95.0%	50.0 pct pts (CI95: 47, 53)	1y

Worksite: Influenza Vaccinations On-Site, Reduced Cost, Actively Promoted – Non-Healthcare Workers – Evidence Table

Study	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Outcome measure	Baseline value	Outcome value	Value used in summary	Follow-up time
<p>Author (Year): Janes et al. (unpublished manuscript)</p> <p>Study Period: 2001-2002</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Study Design: Group Non-randomized Trial</p> <p>Quality of Execution (limitations): Fair (2)</p>	<p>Location: Southeast Michigan</p> <p>Components: Group 1—Free + On-site Group 2—ROPC + On-site</p> <p>Comparison Group: No program (<10% offered on-site vaccination)</p>	<p>Workers at one of 3 selected companies (50-64y or 18-49y with comorbidity), continuously enrolled for 1 year in healthcare plan, excluding Medicare enrollees</p> <p>N=8,262 n=2,754 for each group</p>	Vaccination coverage	Comparison Group 35.6%	<p>Treatment Group 1-(Free) 61.9%</p> <p>2-(Co-pay) 51.7%</p>	<p>26.3 pct pts (CI95: 23, 30)</p> <p>16.1 pct pts (CI95: 13, 20)</p>	1y
<p>Author (Year): Strunk 2005</p> <p>Study Period: 2003-2004</p> <p>Design Suitability: Least</p> <p>Study Design: Before-After</p> <p>Quality of Execution (limitations): Fair (2)</p>	<p>Location: NR</p> <p>Components: Free + On-site + Mobile + Small Media + Provision of Information + Events</p> <p>Comparison Year: NR</p>	<p>All workers of a vaccine manufacturer</p> <p>N: NR</p>	Vaccination coverage	11.3%	66.0%	54.7 pct pts (CI95: 52, 58)	1y

Abbreviations

CI95, 95% Confidence Interval

Free, Free vaccinations for workers

Mobile, Mobile cart or other mobile vaccination unit

NR, Not reported/Not able to be calculated

On-site, Vaccinations provided at the worksite

Pct pts, Percentage points

ROPC, Reduced Out-of-Pocket Cost

Tx+1, One year post treatment

x, Treatment