
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				
	No intervention Opinion leaders					
Compliance with desired practice across outcomes	Study population		0,09 ranged from -0.15 to 0.38 ³	Unclear (5 studies including 37 outcomes)	⊕000 VERY LOW ⁴	
(Measured as treatment of patients with rheumatoid arthritis, COPD, osteoarthritis and rates of epidural anesthesia)	Not estimable	Not estimable ^{1,2}				

*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.

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

² The review reported no confidence intervals

³ Adjusted risk differences (difference in compliance between groups)

⁴ 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				
Compliance with desired practice across outcomes praksis	Study population		0,14 ranged from 0.12 to 0.17 ³	2176 (2 studies including 3 outcomes)	⊕⊕OO ⁴ LOW	
	Not estimable	Not estimable ^{1,2}				
(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.

¹ In total there was 2176 participants

² The review reported no confidence intervals

³ Adjusted risk differences (difference in compliance between groups)

⁴ One study had high risk of bias and one study had medium risk of bias