

Vaccination Programs: Clinic-Based Client Education when Used Alone

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

Study	Location and Intervention	Study Population, Setting, Sample	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary [95%CI]	Follow-up time
<p>Author (Year): Herman (1994)</p> <p>Study Period: Oct 1989 – March 1990</p> <p>Design Suitability (Design): Greatest (Group Randomized Controlled Trial)</p> <p>Quality of Execution (# of limitations): Fair (2)</p> <p>Outcome Measure: Influenza PPV</p>	<p>Location: USA, Ohio</p> <p>Intervention: Face-to-Face Client Education</p> <p>Comparison: Provider Education</p>	<p>Setting: Public Teaching Hospital</p> <p>Study Population:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adults 65+ Mainly White <p>Influenza Vaccine: N= 756 eligible n=756 participated</p> <p>PPV: N=1202 n= 901 participated</p> <p>N= 3 Parallel group practices selected</p>	<p>Percentage of older adults that were vaccinated</p> <p>All 3 practices</p> <p>Influenza</p> <p>PPV</p>	<p>41.7%</p> <p>3.4 %</p>	<p>44.6%</p> <p>5.1%</p>	<p>+ 2.9 pct pts 95% CI [-6, 12]</p> <p>+1.7 pct pts 95% CI [-2, 5]</p>	<p>Interv period was 6 months</p>
<p>Author (Year): Elangovan (1996)</p> <p>Study Period: Jun – Sep 1995</p> <p>Design Suitability (Design): Least (Before-after)</p> <p>Quality of Execution (# of limitations): Fair (4)</p> <p>Outcome Measure: PPV</p>	<p>Location: USA, Kansas</p> <p>Intervention: Face-to-Face Client Education</p> <p>Comparison: None</p>	<p>Setting: University Ambulatory care clinic</p> <p>Study population:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adult 65+ Both Whites and African American <p>N= 244 eligible</p> <p>n= 132 participated</p>	<p>Percentage of Older adults that were vaccinated</p> <p>PPV</p>	<p>54%</p>	<p>79%</p>	<p>+25 pct pts 95% CI [20,31]</p>	<p>Interv period was 3 months</p>

Study	Location and Intervention	Study Population, Setting, Sample	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary [95%CI]	Follow-up time
<p>Author (Year): Jacobson (1999)</p> <p>Study Period: May – Jun 1998</p> <p>Design Suitability (Design): Greatest (Individual Randomized Controlled Trial)</p> <p>Quality of Execution (# of limitations): Good (1)</p> <p>Outcome Measure: PPV</p>	<p>Location: USA, Atlanta, Georgia</p> <p>Intervention: Use of Educational brochure on Immunization for Patient education</p> <p>Comparison: Use of Educational brochure on Nutrition for Patient education</p>	<p>Setting: Public Teaching Hospital</p> <p>Study Population:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult 65+ • Mainly African American • Low Socioeconomic status • Less than High School Education <p>N= 433 eligible N= 433 participated</p>	<p>Percentage of older adults that were vaccinated</p> <p>PPV</p>	<p>3.8%</p>	<p>19.9%</p>	<p>+16.1 pct pts 95% CI [10,22]</p>	<p>Interv period was 4 weeks</p>
<p>Author (Year): Thomas (2003)</p> <p>Study Period: August – Sep 1998</p> <p>Design Suitability (Design): Greatest (Individual Randomized CntrolledTrial)</p> <p>Quality of Execution (# of limitations): Good (1)</p> <p>Outcome Measure: PPV</p>	<p>Location: USA, Atlanta, Georgia</p> <p>Intervention: Use of Educational Brochure (B) and Videotape (V) for Patient Education</p> <p>Comparison: Use of Educational brochure on Nutrition for Patient education</p>	<p>Setting: Public Teaching Hospital</p> <p>Study Population:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Older Adults (mean age 63 years) • Mainly African American • Less than High School Education <p>N= 2962 eligible N= 558 participated</p>	<p>Percentage of older adults that were vaccinated</p> <p>VB Group</p> <p>V Group</p>	<p>6.6%</p> <p>6.6%</p>	<p>23.3%</p> <p>10.2%</p>	<p>+16.7pct pts CI [9, 24]</p> <p>+3.6 pct pts 95% CI [-3,10]</p>	<p>Interv period was 4 weeks</p>

Study	Location and Intervention	Study Population, Setting, Sample	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary [95%CI]	Follow-up time									
<p>Author (Year): Eubelen (2011)</p> <p>Study Period: July – Dec 2008</p> <p>Design Suitability (Design): Greatest (Other design w/concurrent comparison)</p> <p>Quality of Execution (# of limitations): Fair (3)</p> <p>Outcome Measure: Tetanus booster</p>	<p>Location: Belgium</p> <p>Intervention: use of audiovisual messaging in waiting rooms</p> <p>Comparison: Usual care</p>	<p>Setting: General medical practice</p> <p>Provider: 6 general practitioners</p> <p>Study Population: Adults and children</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="714 532 1094 618"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Group</u></th> <th><u>Ref pd</u></th> <th><u>Study pd</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Interv</td> <td>11851</td> <td>11466</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contrl</td> <td>8724</td> <td>8643</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Ref pd</u>	<u>Study pd</u>	Interv	11851	11466	Contrl	8724	8643	<p>Percentage of doses prescribed</p> <p>Interv</p> <p>Contrl</p>	<p>0.44%</p> <p>0.38%</p>	<p>0.79%</p> <p>0.39%</p>	<p>+0.34 pct. pts. CI [.28,.40]</p>	<p>Interv period was 6 months</p>
<u>Group</u>	<u>Ref pd</u>	<u>Study pd</u>														
Interv	11851	11466														
Contrl	8724	8643														