Results of Topic Selection Process & Next Steps

The nominator is a group of health systems invited to participate in an AHRQ-LHS meeting. The nominator is interested in using a systematic review process to use this evidence report to inform operational decisions related to implementing change management interventions including which interventions to implement and how to adapt them to account for local context and available resources. This evidence report can also be used to inform and support management strategies and practical decisions that, may be driven by the extent of resources available.

A new systematic review will not be feasible due to heterogeneity of the studies that used evidence based interventions (EBI) and implementation strategies. The studies included a variety of health conditions, at many different settings, and on heterogeneous populations. The program will not develop a review at this time. No further activity on this nomination will be undertaken by the Effective Health Care (EHC) Program.
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**Background**

This topic brief will use below terminology to avoid inconsistency and confusion.

Evidence Based Intervention (EBI) are treatments, practices or programs that have documented empirical evidence of effectiveness eg: evidence-based clinical practice recommendations. Implementation strategies (IS) are methods or techniques used to enhance the adoption, implementation, and sustainability of a EBIs to new populations or new settings or both.

Before implementing the EBI-IS to new populations or new delivery systems raises two questions:

1- Is there sufficient empirical evidence or justification from prior evidence that this EBI would impact health outcomes as expected?
2- Are EBI necessary and acceptable by health systems to make it feasible, practical and sustainable in the new context?
Health systems commonly use scale up (to reach larger numbers of target audience within the same/similar setting in effectiveness studies) or scale-out (to reach new populations and/or new settings that differ from those in effectiveness studies) intervention strategies to broaden the delivery of an EBIs.

Scale up or scale out strategies that are commonly reported to broaden the implementation of EBIs are:³

1. Healthcare infrastructure related: eg: providing medical equipment etc.
2. Policy and regulation related eg: revising policy to allow wide spread community based care management of a disease
3. Financial related eg: changing payment mechanism
4. Human resources related eg: training HC providers
5. Patient related: eg: involving patient/public in promotion

Assessing the effectiveness of implementation outcomes is important for the new populations and setting/context. Proctor et al.⁴ developed framework for assessing implementation outcomes “acceptability, adoption, appropriateness, cost, feasibility, fidelity, penetration and sustainability”.

**Nominator and Stakeholder Engagement**

The topic is nominated by a Senior Vice President and Chief Quality Officer at Northwell Health and a panel of Learning Health Systems (LHS) invited to participate AHRQ-LHS meeting.

**Key Questions and PICOTS**

The key questions for this nomination are:

1. What is the effectiveness of strategies to implement evidence-based clinical practice recommendations (or EBI) on provider/staff behavior and patient outcomes in clinical setting?
   a. What are the characteristics of these implementation strategies?
   b. Of strategies that demonstrate fidelity, what are the common elements? Which elements can be adapted to reflect the local context without losing fidelity?
   c. What implementation strategies are most effective for whom?
   d. What are resources and costs of the implementation strategies?
   e. What is the cost-effectiveness of the implementation strategies?
   f. What strategies also support sustainment after implementation?
   a. Which clinical staff are responsible for maintaining the change?
   b. What staff training is needed to sustain change?

**Contextual Questions:** What interventions, or strategies can be used to influence or change individual behaviors? E.g., Are there interventions/strategies that draw from the non-clinical medicine literature such as behavioral economics, Jobs theory etc. that may effectively change behavior?

To define the inclusion criteria for the key questions, we specify the population, interventions, comparators, outcomes, timing, and setting (PICOTS) of interest (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 1. Key Questions and PICOTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: EBI=evidence-based interventions; IS=implementation strategy

**Methods**

We assessed nomination “Implementation of Evidence Based Interventions” for priority for a systematic review or other AHRQ EHC report with a hierarchical process using established selection criteria. Assessment of each criteria determined the need to evaluate the next one. See Appendix A for detailed description of the criteria.

1. Determine the appropriateness of the nominated topic for inclusion in the EHC program.
2. Establish the overall importance of a potential topic as representing a health or healthcare issue in the United States.
3. Determine the desirability of new evidence review by examining whether a new systematic review or other AHRQ product would be duplicative.
4. Assess the potential impact a new systematic review or other AHRQ product.
5. Assess whether the current state of the evidence allows for a systematic review or other AHRQ product (feasibility).
6. Determine the potential value of a new systematic review or other AHRQ product.

**Appropriateness and Importance**
We assessed the nomination for appropriateness and importance.

**Desirability of New Review/Duplication**
We searched for high-quality, completed or in-process evidence reviews published in the last three years from March 2016 to March 2019. See Appendix B for sources searched.

**Impact of a New Evidence Review**
The impact of a new evidence review was qualitatively assessed by analyzing the current standard of care, the existence of potential knowledge gaps, and practice variation. We considered whether it was possible for this review to influence the current state of practice through various dissemination pathways (practice recommendation, clinical guidelines, etc.).

**Feasibility of a New Evidence Review**
We conducted a literature search in PubMed from March 2014 to March 2019. See Appendix C for the PubMed search strategy and links to the ClinicalTrials.gov search. Because a large number of articles were identified, we reviewed a random sample of 200 titles and abstracts for inclusion and classified identified studies by key question and study design, to assess the size and scope of a potential evidence review. We then calculated the projected total number of included studies based on the proportion of studies included from the random sample.

**Results**
See Appendix A for detailed results for all selection criteria.

**Appropriateness and Importance**
This is an appropriate and important topic.

**Desirability of a New Review/Duplication**
A new evidence review (OR mapping) would not be duplicative of an existing product. We identified one AHRQ systematic review on "Quality improvement, implementation, and dissemination strategies to improve mental health care for children and adolescents"; 33 SRs, from PubMed relevant to the topic targeting variety of HC providers and on variety of topics. The most common topic areas on EBI and ISs were non-specific (n=8); Musculo-skeletal (n=4) cardiac (n=3); ID (n=3); M-medicine/telehealth (n=3). In addition we identified 9 Cochrane systematic reviews related to the drug adherence, antibiotic use and tools to promote the uptake of guidelines. See Table 2, Duplication column.

**Feasibility of a New Evidence Review**
A new evidence review is not feasible.
A new systematic review will not be informative for LHSs due to heterogeneity of the studies that used EBI/IS. The studies included a variety of health conditions, at many different settings, and on heterogeneous populations. The majority of the studies assessed the outcomes of disease specific guidelines and guideline uptake by using variety of implementation strategies. See Table 2, Feasibility column.

**Table 2. Key Questions and Results for Duplication and Feasibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KQ 1: Change Management Interventions for Clinicians</td>
<td>Total number of identified systematic reviews: #</td>
<td>Size/scope of review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AHRQ EPC: 1[^37]</td>
<td>Relevant Studies Identified: # 978 and sampled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cochrane: 9 11, 22, 38-44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^37]: Reference number
### Key Question

**Duplication (3/1/2019-3/1/2016)**
- PubMed: 33 3-10, 12-21, 23-36, 45

- Random sample Projected Total: # 254 (25%)
  - RCTs: 15 (8%) 42, 46-59
  - Observational: 31 (15%) 60-89
  - Pre/post: 6 (3%) 90-95
- Clinicaltrials.gov #14
  - Recruiting: 5
  - Active: 2
  - Complete: 7

**Abbreviations:** AHRQ=Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; KQ=Key Question

### Summary of Findings

- **Appropriateness and importance:** The topic is both appropriate and important.
- **Duplication:** A new review would not be duplicative of an existing product. Even though we identified 39 systematic reviews with emphasis on the most recent, most on-point, most comprehensive, and highest quality (i.e., Cochrane or AHRQ) reviews. The reviews included a variety of health conditions, at many different settings, and on heterogeneous populations.
- **Impact:** A new systematic review has unclear impact potential.
- **Feasibility:** A new review is not feasible due to heterogeneity of the studies that used evidence-based interventions (EBI) and implementation strategies.

### References


**Appendix A. Selection Criteria Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriateness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Does the nomination represent a health care drug, intervention, device, technology, or health care system/setting available (or soon to be available) in the U.S.?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Is the nomination a request for a systematic review?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Is the focus on effectiveness or comparative effectiveness?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Is the nomination focus supported by a logic model or biologic plausibility? Is it consistent or coherent with what is known about the topic?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Importance</td>
<td>The nomination is not specific to a disease. It is related to implementation of variety of Evidence based interventions on variety of medical conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Represents a significant disease burden; large proportion of the population</td>
<td>The target population is clinicians, clinical staff and health systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Is of high public interest; affects health care decision making, outcomes, or costs for a large proportion of the US population or for a vulnerable population</td>
<td>Yes there is significant variation on HS delivery and implementation strategies on the published literature and it is also not clear if there is differences on implementation strategies based on a specific disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Represents important uncertainty for decision makers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d. Incorporates issues around both clinical benefits and potential clinical harms</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e. Represents high costs due to common use, high unit costs, or high associated costs to consumers, to patients, to health care systems, or to payers</td>
<td>Yes, some implementation strategies can be costly which is why health systems want to know which are the most evidence based implementation strategies for a specific condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Desirability of a New Evidence Review/Duplication</td>
<td>There are multiple SRs on the topic but mostly specific to a disease, population and health system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Would not be redundant (i.e., the proposed topic is not already covered by available or soon-to-be available high-quality systematic review by AHRQ or others)</td>
<td>This topic is related to EB Intervention delivery and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impact of a New Evidence Review</td>
<td>Yes there is variations since the topic is implementation related and most implementation strategies are topic, setting and specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Is the standard of care unclear (guidelines not available or guidelines inconsistent, indicating an information gap that may be addressed by a new evidence review)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Is there practice variation (guideline inconsistent with current practice, indicating a potential implementation gap and not best addressed by a new evidence review)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Primary Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Effectively utilizes existing research and knowledge by considering:
- Adequacy (type and volume) of research for conducting a systematic review
- Newly available evidence (particularly for updates or new technologies)

We identified a large number of studies and estimated the size of the review is 250. ClinicalTrials.gov showed 14 ongoing or recently completed trials.

6. Value

6a. The proposed topic exists within a clinical, consumer, or policy-making context that is amenable to evidence-based change

Yes

6b. Identified partner who will use the systematic review to influence practice (such as a guideline or recommendation)

Partner is the AHRQ-LHS panel. Many of the organizations represented on the LHS Panel are members of the High Value Healthcare Collaborative (HVHC) and could potentially distribute this report to other HVHC members.

The health systems represented on the LHS panel will use this evidence report to inform operational decisions related to implementing change management interventions including which interventions to implement and how to adapt them to account for local context and available resources. This evidence report can also be used to inform and support management strategies and very practical decisions that, again, may be driven by the extent of resources available (for example, having a central clinical coordinator across medical offices vs. a clinical coordinator at each office to help with diabetes management).

Abbreviations: AHRQ=Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; EB=evidence-based; HS=health system; KQ=Key Question; LHS=learning health system; SR=systematic reviews
**Appendix B. Search for Evidence Reviews (Duplication)**

Listed below are the sources searched, hierarchically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Search</th>
<th>AHRQ: Evidence reports and technology assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov">https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov</a>; <a href="https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/ta/index.html">https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/ta/index.html</a>; <a href="https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/evidence-based-reports/search.html">https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/evidence-based-reports/search.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VA Products: PBM, and HSR&amp;D (ESP) publications, and VA/DoD EBCPG Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cochrane Systematic Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HTA (CRD database): Health Technology Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/crdweb/">http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/crdweb/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHRQ Products in development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/">https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Products in development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochrane Protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSPERO Database (international prospective register of systematic reviews and protocols)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/">http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertiary Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PubMed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C. Search Strategy & Results (Feasibility)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDLINE (PubMed) searched on:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Concept | Increased use of evidence | ((("Diffusion of Innovation"[Mesh])OR "Guideline Adherence"[Mesh]) OR (( "Evidence-Based Practice/methods"[Mesh] OR "Evidence-Based Practice/organization and administration"[Mesh] OR "Evidence-Based Practice/standards"[Mesh] )) OR "change management"[Title/Abstract]) AND (evaluation studies[pt] OR evaluation studies as topic[mesh] OR program evaluation[mesh] OR validation studies as topic[mesh] OR (effectiveness[tiab] OR (pre-[tiab] AND post-[tiab])) OR (program*[tiab] AND evaluat*[tiab]) OR intervention*[tiab])) OR ((utilization[Title/Abstract] OR address[Title/Abstract] OR program*[Title/Abstract] OR intervention*[Title/Abstract]))

AND

| Interventions | (("Delivery of Health Care"[Mesh]) OR "Attitude of Health Personnel"[Mesh]) OR "Health Personnel"[Mesh]

Limits: 5 years English | Filters: published in the last 5 years; English

SR N=84 | Systematic[sb]


| RCT N=756 | ((((((groups[tiab])) OR (trial[tiab])) OR (randomly[tiab])) OR (drug therapy[sh])) OR (placebo[tiab]) OR (randomized[tiab]) OR (controlled clinical trial[pt])) OR (randomized controlled trial[pt]))


| Observational N=64 | "Observational Study" [Publication Type] OR "Observational Studies as Topic"[Mesh]


| Qualitative N=157 | ((( barriers[Title/Abstract] AND facilitators[Title/Abstract] )) OR obstructive beneficial[Title/Abstract] OR restriction enablement[Title/Abstract]) OR (("Focus Groups"[Mesh]) OR "Qualitative Research"[Mesh]) OR "Delphi Technique"[Mesh])

clinicalTrials.gov
14 Studies found for: Recruiting, Not yet recruiting, Active, not recruiting, Completed, Enrolling by invitation Studies | Evidence-Based | Evidence-Based | Evidence-Based | Evidence-Based | First posted from 02/28/2014 to 02/28/2019