

---

## Opinion leaders compared to no intervention for implementing evidence based practice

---

**Patient or population:** Health professionals

**Settings:** Primary and secondary practice (hospital)

**Intervention:** Opinion leaders

**Comparison:** No intervention

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Median adjusted risk difference (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies and outcomes)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	<b>No intervention Opinion leaders</b>					
<b>Compliance with desired practice across outcomes</b>	<b>Study population</b>		0,09 ranged from -0.15 to 0.38 <sup>3</sup>	Unclear (5 studies including 37 outcomes)	⊕000 VERY LOW <sup>4</sup>	
(Measured as treatment of patients with rheumatoid arthritis, COPD, osteoarthritis and rates of epidural anesthesia)	Not estimable	Not estimable <sup>1,2</sup>				

\*The basis for the **assumed risk** (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The **corresponding risk** (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the **relative effect** of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

**CI:** Confidence interval;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

**High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

**Moderate quality:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

**Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Very low quality:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

<sup>1</sup> In total there was 748+ participants (it was unclear how many participated in one of the studies)

<sup>2</sup> The review reported no confidence intervals

<sup>3</sup> Adjusted risk differences (difference in compliance between groups)

<sup>4</sup> Four studies had high risk of bias and there was serious inconsistency in the effect estimates

---

**Opinion leaders compared to other intervention (audit and feedback and lecture) for implementing evidence based practice**

**Patient or population:** Health professionals  
**Settings:** Primary and secondary practice (hospital)  
**Intervention:** Opinion leaders  
**Comparison:** Other intervention (audit and feedback and lecture)

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Median adjusted risk difference (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies and outcomes)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Other intervention (audit and feedback and lecture)	Opinion leaders				
<b>Compliance with desired practice across outcomes praksis</b>	<b>Study population</b>		0,14 ranged from 0.12 to 0.17 <sup>3</sup>	2176 (2 studies including 3 outcomes)	⊕⊕OO <sup>4</sup> LOW	
	Not estimable	Not estimable <sup>1,2</sup>				
(Measured as correct urinary catheter practices, rates of trial of labor and vaginal birth)						

\*The basis for the **assumed risk** (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The **corresponding risk** (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the **relative effect** of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

**CI:** Confidence interval;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

**High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

**Moderate quality:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

**Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Very low quality:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

<sup>1</sup> In total there was 2176 participants

<sup>2</sup> The review reported no confidence intervals

<sup>3</sup> Adjusted risk differences (difference in compliance between groups)

<sup>4</sup> One study had high risk of bias and one study had medium risk of bias