Improving the prescription of oral anticoagulants in atrial fibrillation

Pritchett, Ruth; Bem, Danai; Turner, Grace; Thomas, G Neil; Clarke, Joanne; Fellows, Rebecca; Lane, Deirdre; Jolly, Kate

DOI:
10.1055/s-0038-1676835

Supplementary Figure 1: Sample search strategy

Database: Ovid MEDLINE

1 Atrial Fibrillation/ or "atrial fibrillation".mp.

2 Atrial Flutter/ or "atrial flutter".mp.

3 ("auricular fibrillation" or "heart fibrillation" or "heart atrium fibrillation").ti,ab.

4 1 or 2 or 3

5 exp Anticoagulants/tu, th [Therapeutic Use, Therapy]

6 ((anticoagula$ or antithrombotic$1) adj2 (therapy or treatment or under-treatment or uptake or underus$ or prescri$ or prophylaxis or management or assessment or clinic$1)).ti,ab.

7 exp Factor Xa Inhibitors/tu [Therapeutic Use]

8 exp Antithrombins/tu [Therapeutic Use]

9 ("direct thrombin inhibitor$1" or DTI$1 or "factor Xa inhibitor$1" or "fxa inhibitor$1" or NOAC$1 or "novel oral anticoagulant$1" or "new oral anticoagulant$1" or "non-vitamin K antagonist$1").ti,ab.

10 Dabigatran/ or ("dabigatran etexilate" or dabigatran or Pradaxa).ti,ab.

11 Rivaroxaban/ or (rivaroxaban or Xarelto).ti,ab.

12 (apixaban or Eliquis).ti,ab.

13 (edoxaban or Lixiana or Savaysa).ti,ab.

14 exp Coumarins/tu, th [Therapeutic Use, Therapy]

15 (4-hydroxyc?umarin$1 or "Vitamin K antagonist" or VKA$1).mp.

16 Warfarin/ or (warfarin or C?umadin or Jantoven or Marevan).ti,ab.

17 Dicumarol/ or (dic?umarol$ or dic?umarin or Bis-Hydroxyc?umarin or bishydroxyc?umarin or Acadyl or Acavyl or Barac?umin or Cuma or Cumid or Dic?uma$ or Dicumol or Dikumol or Dufalone or Kumoran or Melitoxi or Temparin or Trombosan).ti,ab.

18 Phenprocoumon/ or (phenproc?umon$ or fenproc?umon or phenproc?umarol or Marc?umar or Falithrom).ti,ab.

19 Acenocoumarol/ or (acenoc?umarol or nic?umalon$ or Sintrom or Ascumar or Acitrom or Mini-sintrom or Neo-sintrom or Sinkumar or Sinthrome or Sync?umar or Synthrom or Trombostop).ti,ab.

20 (tioclomarol$ or Apegmone).ti,ab.

21 Ethyl Biscoumacetate/ or ("ethyl bisc?umacetate" or carbethoxydic?umarol or ethyldic?umarol or dic?umacyl or Pelentan or Tromexan or Thrombolysan or Thrombarin or Neodic?umari$).ti,ab.

22 ("indandione derivative$1" or "non-c?umarin VKA$1").ti,ab.

23 Phenindione/ or (phenindion$ or fenindion$ or Dindevan or Fenilin or Phenyline or Soluthrombine).ti,ab.

24 (clorindion$ or chlorphenindone or Indaliton or Cumachlor).ti,ab.

25 (diphenadion$ or difenadion$ or diphenacin or Dipaxin or Diphac$).ti,ab.

26 (fluindion$ or Previscan).ti,ab.

27 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26

28 Health Education/ or Health Promotion/ or "Outcome and Process Assessment (Health Care)"/ or Primary Health Care/ or Health Knowledge, Attitudes, Practice/ or "Outcome Assessment (Health Care)"/ or Program Evaluation/

29 Education, Professional/ or Education, Professional, Retraining/

30 Practice Patterns, Physicians'/ or Practice Guideline/ or Practice Patterns, Nurses'/ or Practice Guidelines as Topic/ or Practice Management/ or General Practice/ or Family Practice/

31 Medical Audit/ or Nursing Audit/

32 Reminder Systems/

33 exp Drug Therapy, Computer-Assisted/ed, mt, nu, td, ut [Education, Methods, Nursing, Trends, Utilization]

34 "Marketing of Health Services"/

35 Guideline Adherence/

36 Information Dissemination/ or "dissemination tool$1".ti,ab.

37 Decision Support Techniques/ or Decision Support Systems, Clinical/

38 exp Decision Making/de [Drug Effects]

39 ("decision aid$" or "decision support" or "decision making").ti,ab.

40 (intervention$ or "local consensus process" or "education$ material" or "education$ outreach" or "education$ meeting$1" or "behavio?r$ change$1" or "perception change$1" or "practice change$1" or reminder$1 or alert$1 or "guideline$1 implementation" or "guideline$1 adherence" or "practice guideline$1" or "practice pattern$1" or audit or feedback or "evaluation feedback" or "information dissemination" or "software enhancement" or "software tool$1" or "medical practice management software" or "stroke prevention" or "action and monitoring").ti,ab.

41 ((education$ or behavio?r$ or prescri$ or persuasive or informational or marketing or professional$ or physician$1 or clinician$1 or doctor$1 or practitioner$1 or GP$1 or pharmacist$1 or

multifaceted or multidisciplinary or "patient-mediated" or "patient-driven") adj2 (intervention$1 or strateg$ or program$ or initiative$1 or incentive$1 or improv$)).ti,ab.

42 28 or 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 or 35 or 36 or 37 or 38 or 39 or 40 or 41

43 4 and 27 and 42

44 limit 43 to humans

Supplementary Figure 2: Risk of bias in RCTs using the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool.



Supplementary Figure 3: Risk of bias in controlled studies using an adjusted Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Jackson, 2004 [4]	🟡	NA	NA	🟡	🔴	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟢	🟡	NA	🔴	🔴
Touchette, 2008 [5]	🔴	🟢	🟢	🔴	🟡	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	NA	NA	🟢	🟡
Hendriks, 2010 [6]	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🔴	🟡	🟡	🟡	NA	🟡	NA	🔴	🟢
Boriani, 2012 [7]	🟢	NA	NA	🟢	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟢	🟢	NA	🟡	🟢	🟢
Cook, 2015 [8]	🔴	🟢	🟢	🟡	🟡	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	NA	NA	🟢	🟢

🟢 = Low risk of bias; 🟡 = Unclear; 🔴 = Risk of bias; NA = not applicable

Criteria used:

1. How were different groups selected (e.g. from the same source, at the same time).
2. For historical controlled studies also consider if the two sets of patients are comparable.
3. For historical controlled studies also consider: 1. changes in the diagnostic criteria; 2. differences in concomitant standards of care over time (e.g. new guidelines).
4. Were different groups similar at baseline on important characteristics that could affect outcomes (e.g., demographics, risk factors, co-morbid conditions)?
5. Did the authors report that the sample size was sufficiently large to be able to detect a difference in the main outcome between groups with at least 80% power?
6. Blinding of outcome assessment.
7. Was blinding of outcome assessment the same for all groups?
8. Incomplete primary outcome data.
9. Incomplete secondary outcome data.
10. Handling missing data (e.g. intention to treat).
11. Was follow-up time and method of follow-up the same in both groups?
12. Selective reporting (e.g. only certain outcomes, no adverse events).
13. Other sources of bias.

Supplementary Figure 4: Risk of bias in cross-sectional studies using the NIH National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute Quality Assessment Tool for observational cohort and cross-sectional studies.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Falces, 2011 [9]	✓	✓	CD	✓	x	NA	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	NR	✓	✓

✓ = YES; x = NO; CD = cannot determine; NA = not applicable; NR = not reported

Criteria used:

1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?
2. Were eligibility/selection criteria for the study population pre-specified and clearly described?
3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?
4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study pre-specified and applied uniformly to all participants?
5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?
6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?
7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?
8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?
9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?
10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?
11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?
12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?
13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?
14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?

Supplementary Figure 5: Risk of bias in before-after studies using an adapted form of the NIH National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute Quality Assessment Tool for before-after studies with no control group.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Sobreques, 2002 [10]	✓	x	✓	CD	NR	x	CD	✓	NR	✓	CD	✓	x	✓
Lowdon, 2004 [11]	✓	CD	✓	CD	CD	✓	✓	x	CD	CD	NA	CD	x	✓
Bajorek, 2005 [12]	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	CD	✓	✓	✓	x	✓
Bo, 2007 [13]	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	CD	✓	✓	✓	x	✓
Coll-Vinent, 2007 [14]	✓	✓	✓	CD	CD	✓	✓	✓	CD	✓	✓	✓	x	✓
Jackson, 2011 [15]	✓	✓	x	x	CD	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	CD	✓	x	✓
Robson, 2014 [16]	✓	✓	x	✓	CD	✓	✓	✓	CD	✓	NA	✓	✓	✓
Oliveira, 2014 [17]	✓	✓	x	CD	CD	✓	CD	✓	NR	CD	x	x	x	✓
Das, 2015 [18]	✓	✓	✓	x	CD	✓	✓	✓	NA	✓	✓	✓	x	✓
Hsieh, 2016 [19]	✓	x	x	CD	CD	✓	✓	✓	CD	✓	CD	✓	✓	✓
Wang, 2017 [20]	✓	✓	x	CD	CD	✓	✓	✓	CD	✓	✓	✓	x	NA

✓ = YES; x = NO; CD = cannot determine; NA = not applicable; NR = not reported

Criteria used:

1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?
2. Were eligibility/selection criteria for the study population pre-specified and clearly described?
3. Were the participants in the study representative of those who would be eligible for the service/intervention in the general or clinical population of interest?
4. Were all eligible participants that met the pre-specified entry criteria enrolled?
5. Was the sample size sufficiently large to provide confidence in the findings?

6. Was the service/intervention clearly described and delivered consistently across the study population?
7. Was the duration of the intervention sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see any changes in practice and/or behaviour?
8. Were the outcome measures pre-specified, clearly defined, valid, reliable, and assessed consistently across all study participants?
9. Were the people assessing the outcomes blinded to the participants' interventions?
10. Was the length of follow-up sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to capture any changes in practice and/or behaviour?
11. Was the loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? Were those lost to follow-up accounted for in the analysis?
12. Did the statistical methods examine changes in outcome measures from before to after the intervention? Were statistical tests done that provided p values for the pre-to-post changes?
13. Were outcome measures of interest taken multiple times before the intervention and multiple times after the intervention (i.e., did they use an interrupted time-series design)?
14. If the intervention was conducted at a group level (e.g., a whole hospital, a community, etc.) did the statistical analysis take into account the use of individual-level data to determine effects at the group level?

Supplementary Table 1: Excluded studies

Study	Reason for exclusion
Makowski 1994 [21]	Full text unavailable
Steffensen, 1997 [22]	Ineligible outcome
Gaughan, 2000 [23]	Not original data
Valeti, 2000 [24]	Full text unavailable
Batty, 2001 [25]	Ineligible outcome
O'Rourke 2001 [26]	Ineligible study design
Elliot, 2002 [27]	Ineligible outcome
Jackson, 2003 [28]	Not original data
Batty, 2004 [29]	Ineligible outcome
Alberts, 2004 [30]	Ineligible study design
Kiechl, 2004 [31]	Ineligible study design
Claes, 2005 [32]	Ineligible outcome
Wright, 2007 [33]	Ineligible outcome
Schwarz, 2009 [34]	Ineligible outcome
Albert, 2010 [35]	Ineligible outcome
Bishop, 2011 [36]	Ineligible outcome
Szabo, 2011 [37]	Ineligible population
Boriani, 2011 [38]	Not original data
Healicon, 2011 [39]	Full text unavailable
Hendriks, 2012 [40]	Ineligible population
Boriani, 2012 [41]	Not original data
Larsen, 2012 [42]	Full text unavailable
Skanes, 2013 [43]	Ineligible intervention
Samani, 2013 [44]	Ineligible outcome
Gadzhanova, 2013 [45]	Ineligible outcome

Arts, 2013 [46]	Ineligible study design
Jeng, 2013 [47]	Not original data
Beadles, 2014 [48]	Ineligible intervention
Po, 2014 [49]	Ineligible outcome
Grant, 2014 [50]	Ineligible outcome
Alkhalil, 2014 [51]	Full text unavailable
Skolarus, 2014 [52]	Ineligible outcome
Sibai, 2014 [53]	Ineligible study design
Das, 2014 [54]	Not original data
Fuenzalida, 2015 [55]	Ineligible outcome
Daacke, 2015 [56]	Full text unavailable
Akhavein, 2015 [57]	Full text unavailable
Garber, 2015 [58]	Ineligible study design
Zheng, 2016 [59]	Ineligible intervention
Eckman, 2016 [60]	Ineligible outcome
Eckman, 2016 [61]	Ineligible outcome
Abidi, 2016 [62]	Ineligible outcome
Lee, 2016 [63]	Ineligible study design
Rao, 2016 [64]	Ineligible study design
Willis, 2016 [65]	Ineligible study design
Czernik, 2016 [66]	Full text unavailable
Cloutier, 2016 [67]	Full text unavailable
Amiri, 2017 [68]	Ineligible outcome
Barmano, 2017 [69]	Ineligible outcome
Rose, 2017 [70]	Ineligible outcome
Karlsson, 2017 [71]	Ineligible study design
Virdee, 2017 [72]	Ineligible study design

Supplementary Table 2: Outcome measures and results

Author	Outcome measure	Baseline or pre-intervention % (n)	Follow-up or post-intervention % (n)	Group comparison	P-value
RCTs					
Bajorek et al. [1] Australia, 2016	a. Use of anticoagulants b. Proportion of patients recommended a different type of therapy c. Proportion of GPs agreeing with recommendations	*January-June 2013* *Control* a. (total n=187): 94.7% (177) *Intervention* a. (total n=206): 89.3% (184)	*12 month follow-up* *Control* a. Not reported *Intervention* a. (total n=206): 92.2% (190) b. 36.4% c.75.2%	a. OACs in the intervention arm at baseline and follow-up	a. 0.02
Arts et al. [2] The Netherlands, 2017	a. Proportion of patients treated according to the Dutch guidelines. b. Proportion of patients on OACs at baseline and follow-up	*01/10/2013* *Control* a. (total n=235): 42% (99) b. 40% (94) *Intervention* a. (total n=496): 50% (248) b. 48% (238)	*01/09/2014* *Control* a. (Total n=259): 50% (130) b. 51% (132) *Intervention* a. (Total n=522): 55% (287) b. 60% (313)	a. between group difference at baseline: 8% between group difference at follow-up: 5% b. between group difference at baseline: 8% between group difference at follow-up: 9%	a. Chi sq. between group difference at baseline: 0.04 Chi sq. between group difference at follow-up: 0.23 a. Cluster analysis between groups: 0.21 b. Chi sq. between group difference at baseline: 0.05 Chi sq. between group difference at follow-up: 0.02

Author	Outcome measure	Baseline or pre-intervention % (n)	Follow-up or post-intervention % (n)	Group comparison	P-value
Holt at al. [3] UK, 2017	Proportion of patients eligible for OAC who were currently prescribed an OAC ($CHADS_2 \geq 2$)	*20/02/2014* *Control* 61.9% (9.89) *Intervention* 63.5% (8.85)	*a. 6 month follow-up* *Control* 63.9% (SD 9.46) *Intervention* 66.3% (SD 9.25) b. 12 month follow-up *Control:* 67.8% *Intervention:* 65.9%	a. baseline to 6 months adjusted for baseline prescribing mean difference [95% confidence interval]: 1.21% [−0.72 to 3.13] b. baseline to 12 month adjusted for baseline prescribing mean difference [95% confidence interval]: 1.79% [−0.82 to 4.41]	a. 0.213 b. 0.173
Controlled studies					

Jackson et al. [4]
 	
Australia, 2004
	a. Percentage of eligible patients receiving warfarin upon hospital admission
	b. Percentage of eligible patients receiving warfarin upon hospital discharge
	c. All prescriptions dispensed in area (DDDs per 1000 of population)
		Pre-intervention (01/02/2001 - 31/01/2002)
		Receiving warfarin: Intervention
		a. On admission
		total 33% (n=81/245);
		high risk 33% (n=64/ 192);
		high risk without contraindications 39% (n=50/127);
		intermediate risk 30% (n=11/37)
		b. On discharge
		total 39%
		high risk 40%
		high risk without contraindications: 49%
		c. Prescriptions dispensed
		Control region: 1127
		Intervention region: 1124
			Post-intervention (01/02/2002 - 31/01/2003)
			Receiving warfarin: Intervention
			a. On admission
			total 43% (n=67/157);
			high risk 46% (n=58/125);
			high risk without contraindications 53% (n=46/87);
			intermediate risk 36% (n=9/25)
			b. On discharge
			total 51%
			high risk 56%
			high risk interventions 64%
			c. Prescriptions dispensed
			Control region: 1149
			Intervention region: 1191
				Performed comparisons between all different group combinations	a. *On admission (pre- to post-intervention)*
					total 0.05;
					high risk 0.02;
					high risk without contraindications 0.05;
					intermediate risk 0.60
					b. *On discharge (pre- to post-intervention)*
					total <0.05;
					high risk <0.01;
					high risk without contraindications <0.05;
					c. *Dispensed prescriptions*
					Intervention region: pre- vs. post <0.001
					Control region: pre- vs. post <0.001
					Intervention vs control region pre-intervention: 0.34
					Intervention vs control region post - intervention: <0.001

Author	Outcome measure	Baseline or pre-intervention % (n)	Follow-up or post-intervention % (n)	Group comparison	P-value
Touchette et al. [5] USA, 2008	a. Percentage of patients receiving warfarin in-hospital at discharge b. Percentage of patients with a discharge plan for warfarin use c. Percentage of patients in planned or actual warfarin use at discharge (high risk according to Chest 2004 guidelines [73])	Not reported	*Control* *(01/05/2001- 25/07/2001)* a. 41.8% (n=41/98) b. 56.1% (n=55/98) c. 57.1% (n=56/98) *Intervention* *(20/09/2001 – 28/02/2002)* a. 45.5% (n=70/154) b. 77.9% (n=120/154) c. 78.6% (n=121/154)	*Between group difference* a. 3.7% b. 21.8% c. 21.5%; OR 2.46 [95% CI, 1.63-3.74]	a. 0.60 b. <0.01 c. <0.01
Hendriks et al. [6] Netherlands, 2010	The percentage of patients receiving VKA treatment (according to the ACC/AHA/ESC AF guidelines [74]:- control group: 2001; intervention group: 2006)	Not reported	*Control* *2003-2004* $CHADS_2$=0 39% (n=7/18) $CHADS_2$=1 93% (n=28/30) $CHADS_2$>1 80% (n=42/52) In high -risk patients appropriate treatment was given to 79% (41/52) *Intervention* *06/2006-04/2007* $CHADS_2$=0 18% (n=6/34) $CHADS_2$=1 64% (n=25/39) $CHADS_2$>1 90% (n=34/38) In high -risk patients appropriate treatment was given to 97% (n=37/38)	*Between group difference* $CHADS_2$=0 21% $CHADS_2$=1 29% $CHADS_2$>1 10% In high -risk patients 18%	*Difference in therapy per $CHADS_2$ score* <0.001 *Difference in high-risk patients* <0.05

Author	Outcome measure	Baseline or pre-intervention % (n)	Follow-up or post-intervention % (n)	Group comparison	P-value
Boriani et al. [7] Italy, 2012	Percentage of patients on OAC therapy at the end of the observational period (≤ 48 months) ($CHADS_2 \geq 1$)	*Control* 46.9% (n=693/1477) *Intervention* 46.1% (n=904/1961)	*Control* 56.8% (n=258/454) (Intervention during the stroke risk evaluation phase 69.4% (n=474/683) Intervention: final follow-up 72.6% (n=496/683)	*Between group difference* 15.8%	<0.001
Cook et al. [8] USA, 2015	a. Prescription of warfarin in high-risk eligible patients within 30 days of AF diagnosis ($CHADS_2 \geq 2$) b. Prescription of warfarin in all eligible patients within 30 days of AF diagnosis ($CHADS_2 \geq 2$) c. Frequency of an appropriate medication prescription (warfarin for any warfarin-eligible patient, or aspirin for warfarin-eligible low-risk patients [CHADS2<2]).	Control: *(12/2008 – 02/2009)* a. High risk (CHADS2_2) 36% (n=34/94) b. Not provided c. 43% (n=85/196)	Intervention: *(12/2009 – 02/2010)* a. High risk (CHADS2_2) 27% (n=34/125) b. Not provided c. 45% (n=109/244)	*a. Between group difference in high-risk patients* OR 0.66 [95% CI, 0.37-1.17] *b. Between group difference in all warfarin-eligible patients* Adjusted OR 0.91 [95% CI, 0.60 -1.38] c. *Between group difference in appropriate prescription* OR 1.05 [95% CI, 0.72–1.54]; adjusted OR 1.12 [95% CI, 0.76–1.66]	*a. Difference in high-risk patients* 0.16 *b. Difference in all warfarin-eligible patients* 0.65 c. *Between group difference in appropriate prescription* 0.78 adjusted: 0.57
Cross-sectional studies					
Falces et al. [9] Spain, 2011	Percentage prescription of anticoagulation therapy (ACC/AHA/ESC AF guidelines [74])	Usual care: (Specialist units 01/2008 – 12/2008) 69.3% (n=201/290) (Univariate analysis)	Integrated care: Primary care 01/2008 – 12/2009; specialist units 01/2009 - 12/2009) 94.6% (n=211/223) (Univariate analysis)	Logistic regression model: adjusted OR 7.1 [95% CI, 3.8-13.5]	<0.001 for univariate analysis and logistic regression

Author	Outcome measure	Baseline or pre-intervention % (n)	Follow-up or post-intervention % (n)	Group comparison	P-value
Before-after studies					
Sobreques et al. [10] Spain, 2002	Percentage of eligible patients taking acenocumarol	Pre-intervention 70.5% (total n=53)	Post-intervention 88.6% (total n=53)	*Between group difference* 18.1%	<0.01

Lowdon et al. [11]
 	
UK, 2004
	Percentage of eligible patients prescribed anticoagulants	Pre-intervention (01/01 – 04/02)
		total 31.4% (n=38/121);
		eligible patients only (no contraindications) 43.7% (n=38/87);
		total high risk 39.6% (n=36/91);
		eligible high risk 52.2% (n=36/69)
			Post-intervention (05/02 – 12/02)
			total 54.5% (n=30/55);
			eligible patients only (no contraindications) 90.9% (n=30/33);
			total high risk 62.8% (n=27/43);
			eligible high risk 93.1% (n=27/29)
				Between group difference
				total 23.1%;
				eligible patients only (no contraindications) 47.2%
					only reported for total <0.01 and total eligible <0.001

Bajorek et al. [12] Australia, 2005	Percentage of patients receiving warfarin (± aspirin)	*Pre-intervention* *On admission* 20.7% (n=45/218)	*Post-intervention* *a. At discharge* 17.4% (n=38/218) b. At 3 month follow-up 16.1 (30/187) c. At 6 month follow-up 16.5 (30/184)	*Between group difference* post-intervention a. 3.3%	a. 0.39

Author	Outcome measure	Baseline or pre-intervention % (n)	Follow-up or post-intervention % (n)	Group comparison	P-value
Bo et al. [13] Italy, 2007	Increase in appropriate OAC prescription at discharge	*Pre-intervention* *Year 2000* *On admission* OAC strongly recommended: 36.8% *Year 2000* *At discharge* OAC strongly recommended: 56.6% with OAC (n=60/106)	*Post-intervention* *Year 2004* *On admission* OAC strongly recommended: 58.1% *Year 2004* *At discharge* OAC strongly recommended: 81.9% (n=86/105)	*Between groups absolute difference at discharge in OAC strongly recommended group* 25.3% (95%CI: 15% 35%). Adjusted OR for OAC prescription at discharge 2.11 [95% CI, 1.47 3.04]	no p values provided
Coll-Vinent et al. [14] Spain, 2007	a. Percentage of patients receiving anticoagulation treatment b. No anticoagulation when this is indicated	*The pre-intervention period (June 2004)* *a. Before visit in the pre-intervention period:* 53% (n=154/293) *a. After visit in the pre-intervention period:* 52% (n=151/293) *b. Before visit in the pre-intervention period:* 25% (n=74/293) *b. After visit in the pre-intervention period:* 24% (69/293)	*The post-intervention period (June 2005)* *a. Before visit in the post-intervention period:* 58% (n=155/267) *a. After visit in the post-intervention period:* 62% (n=163/267) *b. Before visit in the post-intervention period:* 13% (n=36/267) *b. After visit in the post-intervention period:* 10% (n=25/267)	*a. Between group difference:* After visit between pre- and post-intervention periods: 10% b. *Between group difference:* After visit between pre- and post-intervention periods: -14%	a. Not reported b. Not reported

Author	Outcome measure	Baseline or pre-intervention % (n)	Follow-up or post-intervention % (n)	Group comparison	P-value
Jackson et al. [15] Australia, 2011	Proportion of eligible patients receiving warfarin	Pre-intervention (02/2004 - 09/2004) *On admission:* high risk 31% (n=76/248); moderate risk 30% (n=22/73); low risk 16% (n=3/19); total 30% (n=101/340) *At discharge:* high risk 30% (n=76/259); moderate risk 33% (n=26/80); low risk 16% (n=4/35); total 29% (n=106/364)	Post-intervention (10/2004 - 02/2006) *On admission*: high risk 44% (n=47/107); moderate risk 50% (n=6/12); low risk 0% (n=0/3); total 43% (n=53/122) *At discharge*: high risk 57% (n=65/115); moderate risk 80% (n=13/16); low risk 0% (n=0/3); total 58% (n=78/134)	Performed comparisons between all different group combinations	*Between study arms on admission:* high risk <0.01; moderate risk 0.15; low risk no p-value; total 0.004 *Between study arms at discharge:* high risk <0.0001; moderate risk 0.0004; low risk no p-value; total 0.0008 *Admission vs discharge:* Pre-intervention: no significant difference Post-intervention: total 0.05; high risk 0.04; moderate/low risk no p-value
Oliveira et al. [17] Portugal, 2014	a. Percentage of patients prescribed appropriate prophylactic therapy based on risk-scores (> 94% with CHA_2DS_2-VASc ≥2) a. antithrombotics b. OACs	Pre-intervention (01/05/2012 – 04/05/2012) a: 49.5% (n=52/105) b: 46.4% (n=45/97)	Post-intervention (03/09/2012 – 07/09/2012) a: 60% (n=57/95) b: 56.3% (n=49/87)	*Between group difference* a. "This means an increase of 21.2% in the number of patients receiving appropriate therapy compared to the first assessment" b. no comparison	Not reported
Robson et al. [16] UK, 2014	Percentage of patients with AF and CHA_2DS_2-VASc ≥1 on anticoagulants	*Pre-intervention:* (04/2008) 50.8% (n=1943/3825) *Pre-intervention: 04/2011* 52.6% (n=2085/3964) (Intervention commenced 04/2011)	*Post-intervention:* (04/2013) 59.8% (n=2492/4168)	*Between group difference:* *Pre-intervention to pre-intervention* 2008 vs. 2011: 2.2% *Immediately pre-intervention to post-intervention* 2011 vs. 2013: 7.2% *Difference in slope of the trends:* 1.63 [95% CI, 1.32 - 1.94] p=<0.001	*Pre-intervention to pre-intervention:* 2008 vs. 2011: 0.184 *Pre-intervention to post-intervention:* 2011 vs. 2013: <0.001

Author	Outcome measure	Baseline or pre-intervention % (n)	Follow-up or post-intervention % (n)	Group comparison	P-value
Das et al. [18] UK, 2015	Overall proportion of eligible patients receiving anticoagulation ($CHADS_2$ or CHA_2DS_2-VASc ≥1)	Pre-intervention 77% (n=4187/5471)	Post-intervention 95% (n=5207/5471)	*Between group difference* 18%	<0.0001
Hsieh et al. [19] Taiwan, 2016	Percentage of discharge prescription of oral anticoagulants for eligible AF	Pre-intervention (05/2006 – 07/2008) 32.1% (total n=9612)	During- intervention (08/2010 – 07/2011) 64.1% (total n=7492)	*Between group difference* 32%	<0.001
Wang et al. [20] Australia, 2017	a. Proportion of participants receiving OACs (Warfarin and NOACs) b. Level of HCP agreement with tools recommendations	Pre-intervention a. Total n=251 OAC 50.5% (126): Warfarin 30.3% (76) NOAC 20.0% (50)	Post-intervention a. Total n=251 OAC 70.0% (176): Warfarin 40.0% (76) NOAC 30.0% (54) (Interpreted from a graph) b. Agreed whether eligible for OACs:199 (79.3%) b. Agreed with recommended therapy 132 (52.6%)	Change in patient use of OACs (in eligible patients according to risk assessment tool)	a. Change in Warfarin use p<0.001 a. Change in NOAC use p<0.001 b. Agreement between HCPs and tool re use of anticoagulants vs other therapy p<0.001

Abbreviations: AF, atrial fibrillation; $CHADS_2$ and CHA_2DS_2-VASc, scoring schemes for stroke risk assessment; CI, confidence interval; OAC, oral anticoagulants; OR, odds ratio

; SD, standard deviation; VKA, Vitamin K antagonists; HCP, healthcare professional.

References

1. Bajorek BV, Magin PJ, Hilmer SN, Krass I. Optimizing stroke prevention in patients with atrial fibrillation: A cluster-randomized controlled trial of a computerized antithrombotic risk assessment tool in australian general practice, 2012-2013. Prev Chronic Dis. 2016;13:E90
2. Arts DL, Abu-Hanna A, Medlock SK, van Weert HC. Effectiveness and usage of a decision support system to improve stroke prevention in general practice: A cluster randomized controlled trial. PLoS One. 2017;12(2):e0170974
3. Holt TA, Dalton A, Marshall T, et al. Automated software system to promote anticoagulation and reduce stroke risk: Cluster-randomized controlled trial. Stroke. 2017;48(3):787-790
4. Jackson SL, Peterson GM, Vial JH. A community-based educational intervention to improve antithrombotic drug use in atrial fibrillation. Ann Pharmacother. 2004;38(11):1794-1799
5. Touchette DR, McGuinness ME, Stoner S, Shute D, Edwards JM, Ketchum K. Improving outpatient warfarin use for hospitalized patients with atrial fibrillation. Pharm Pract. 2008;6(1):43-50
6. Hendriks JLM, Nieuwlaat R, Vrijhoef HJM, de Wit R, Crijns HJGM, Tieleman RG. Improving guideline adherence in the treatment of atrial fibrillation by implementing an integrated chronic care program. Neth Heart J. 2010;18(10):471-477
7. Boriani G, Santini M, Lunati M, et al. Improving thromboprophylaxis using atrial fibrillation diagnostic capabilities in implantable cardioverter-defibrillators the multicentre italian ANGELS of AF project. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes. 2012;5(2):182-188
8. Cook DA, Enders F, Caraballo PJ, Nishimura RA, Lloyd FJ. An automated clinical alert system for newly-diagnosed atrial fibrillation. PloS one. 2015;10(4):e0122153
9. Falces C, Andrea R, Heras M, et al. [Integration between cardiology and primary care: impact on clinical practice]. Rev Esp Cardiol. 2011;64(7):564-571
10. Sobreques J, Espinasa J, Cebria J. Effectiveness of an intervention programme to improve oral anti-coagulation treatment for patients with chronic auricular fibrillation in a health district. Aten Primaria. 2002;30(9):588-589
11. Lowdon DW, Harper JR, Gillespie ND. Improving thromboprophylaxis in elderly patients with non-valvular atrial fibrillation. Scott Med J. 2004;49(4):148-150
12. Bajorek BV, Krass I, Ogle SJ, Duguid MJ, Shenfield GM. Optimizing the use of antithrombotic therapy for atrial fibrillation in older people: a pharmacist-led multidisciplinary intervention. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2005;53(11):1912-1920
13. Bo S, Valpreda S, Scaglione L, et al. Implementing hospital guidelines improves warfarin use in non-valvular atrial fibrillation: a before-after study. BMC Public Health. 2007;7:203
14. Coll-Vinent B, Pacheco G, Junyent M, et al. [Impact of implementing common guidelines at different care levels in a healthcare area on the improvement of atrial fibrillation treatment]. Rev Esp Cardiol. 2007;60(4):392-403
15. Jackson SL, Peterson GM. Stroke risk assessment for atrial fibrillation: Hospital-based stroke risk assessment and intervention program. J Clin Pharm Ther. 2011;36(1):71-79

16. Robson J, Dostal I, Mathur R, et al. Improving anticoagulation in atrial fibrillation: Observational study in three primary care trusts. Br J Gen Pract. 2014;64(622):e275-281
17. Oliveira R, Grilo S, Moreira C, et al. A quality study to improve prophylactic antithrombotic therapy prescribed to patients with atrial fibrillation. Rev Port Cardiol. 2014;33(2):89-94
18. Das M, Panter L, Wynn GJ, et al. Primary Care Atrial Fibrillation Service: Outcomes from consultant-led anticoagulation assessment clinics in the primary care setting in the UK. BMJ open. 2015;5(12):e009267
19. Hsieh F-I, Jeng J-S, Chern C-M, et al. Quality improvement in acute ischemic stroke care in taiwan: The breakthrough collaborative in stroke. PLoS One. 2016;11(8):e0160426
20. Wang Y, Bajorek B. Pilot of a Computerised Antithrombotic Risk Assessment Tool Version 2 (CARATV2.0) for stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation. Cardiol J. 2017;24(2):176-187
21. Makowski TM, Jacobson AK, Hildebrand SW, Ferry DR, Heywood JT. Impact of computerized tracking on increasing the proportion of atrial-fibrillation patients receiving warfarin anticoagulation for stroke prevention. Circulation. 1994;90(4):473
22. Steffensen FH, Sorensen HT, Olesen F. Impact of local evidence-based clinical guidelines-a Danish intervention study. Fam Pract. 1997;14(3):209-215
23. Gaughan GL. The use of practitioner education and a warfarin monitoring service to improve anticoagulation practices. Arch Intern Med. 2000;160(15):2401-2402
24. Valeti V, Horton L, Schwartz J, Lopez-Candales A. A simple intervention to improve physician practices regarding antithrombotic therapy in patients with atrial fibrillation. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2000;35(2):102A
25. Batty G, Oborne CA, Hooper R, Jackson S. Investigation of intervention strategies to increase the appropriate use of antithrombotics in elderly hospital inpatients with atrial fibrillation. Journal of Clinical Governance. 2001;9(3):115-122
26. O'Rourke A, Fox N, Field R. A survey of education and training for clinical governance leads and Caldicott Guardians in primary care in Trent Region. Journal of Clinical Governance. 2001;9(3):137-142 136p
27. Elliott RA, Woodward MC, Oborne CA. Antithrombotic prescribing in atrial fibrillation: application of a prescribing indicator and multidisciplinary feedback to improve prescribing. Age Ageing. 2002;31(5):391-396
28. Jackson SL, Vial JH, Peterson GM. Community-based educational intervention improves Antithrombotic drug use in atrial fibrillation. Circulation. 2003;108(17):786
29. Batty GM, Grant RL, Aggarwal R, et al. National clinical sentinel audit of evidence-based prescribing for older people. J Eval Clin Pract. 2004;10(2):273-279
30. Alberts MJ, Easton JD. Stroke best practices: A team approach to evidence-based care. J Natl Med Assoc. 2004;96(4 SUPPL.):5S-20S
31. Kiechl S. Prevention of stroke in atrial fibrillation: Implementation of study results in practice. Wien Klin Wochenschr. 2004;116(24):817-819
32. Claes N, Buntinx F, Vijgen J, et al. The Belgian improvement study on oral anticoagulation therapy: A randomized clinical trial. Eur Heart J. 2005;26(20):2159-2165
33. Wright J, Bibby J, Eastham J, et al. Multifaceted implementation of stroke prevention guidelines in primary care: cluster-randomised evaluation of clinical and cost effectiveness. Qual Saf Health Care. 2007;16(1):51-59 59p

34. Schwarz K, Morike K, Meisner C, Fux R, Gleiter CH. Improving guideline adherence of antithrombotic therapy in patients with chronic atrial fibrillation: A prospective interventional cohort study. Basic Clin Pharmacol. 2009;104(6):491-492
35. Albert NM, Fonarow GC, Yancy CW, et al. Outpatient cardiology practices with advanced practice nurses and physician assistants provide similar delivery of recommended therapies (findings from IMPROVE HF). Am J Cardiol. 2010;105(12):1773-1779
36. Bishop TF, Federman AD, Ross JS. Physician incentives to improve quality and delivery of highqualityambulatorymedical care. J Gen Intern Med. 2011;26:S68
37. Szabo I, Mihaly GY, Erdelyi ZS. Antithrombotic therapy in chronic atrial fibrillation: Can enlightenment and education for stroke prevention in a busy emergency department be effective? Eur Heart J. 2011;32:462
38. Boriani G, Lunati M, Gasparini M, et al. A medical care program to improve oral anticoagulation use by leveraging atrial fibrillation diagnostic capabilities in implantable cardioverter defibrillators: the ANGELS of AF Project. Eur Heart J. 2011;32:562
39. Healicon R, Barrett J, Fay M, et al. The use of oral anti-coagulants in the management of atrial fibrillation. National data from guidance on risk assessment and stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation. Europace. 2011;13:iv3
40. Hendriks JML, De Wit R, Crijns HJGM, et al. Nurse-led care vs. usual care for patients with atrial fibrillation: Results of a randomized trial of integrated chronic care vs. routine clinical care in ambulatory patients with atrial fibrillation. Eur Heart J. 2012;33(21):2692-2699
41. Boriani G, Santini M, Lunati M, et al. Improving thromboprophylaxis using atrial fibrillation diagnostic capabilities in implantable cardioverter defibrillators. The multicentre Italian ANGELS of AF project. Eur Heart J. 2012;33:1060-1061
42. Larsen SL, Sonderstrup D, Sonderstrup J, Toft JC. [Clinical guidelines for antithrombotic therapy of patients with atrial fibrillation can be implemented in general practice by means of data capture]. Ugeskr Laeger. 2012;174(38):2227-2229
43. Skanes A, Bell A. Knowledge transfer at point-of-care: Investigating new strategies for disseminating guideline recommendations. Can J Cardiol. 2013;29(10 SUPPL. 1):S259
44. Samani A, Das S, Khan S. Improved awareness and management of thromboprophylaxis in atrial fibrillation in an elderly care population over a seven year period. Age Ageing. 2013;42:ii6
45. Gadzhanova SV, Roughead EE, Bartlett MJ. Improving cardiovascular disease management in Australia: NPS MedicineWise. Med J Aust. 2013;199(3):192-195
46. Arts DL, Abu-Hanna A, Buller HR, Peters RJG, Eslami S, van Weert HCPM. Improving stroke prevention in patients with atrial fibrillation. Trials. 2013;14:193
47. Jeng JS, Lien LM, Lee TH, et al. Quality improvement in acute ischemic stroke care in taiwan: The breakthrough collaborative in stroke. Stroke. 2013;44(2 MeetingAbstract):no pagination
48. Beadles CA, Hassmiller Lich K, Viera AJ, Greene SB, Brookhart MA, Weinberger M. A non-experimental study of oral anticoagulation therapy initiation before and after national patient safety goals. BMJ open. 2014;4(2):e003960
49. Po HL, Yu HF, Lin HC, et al. Improvement in prescription frequency of oral anticoagulant for secondary stroke prevention in the breakthrough series-stroke. Cerebrovasc Dis. 2014;38:97

50. Grant AM, Guthrie B, Dreischulte T. Developing a complex intervention to improve prescribing safety in primary care: Mixed methods feasibility and optimisation pilot study. BMJ Open. 2014;4(1):no pagination
51. Alkhalil M, Cromie N. Education in atrial fibrillation. Ir J Med Sci. 2014;183(8 SUPPL. 1):S419
52. Skolarus LE, Morgenstern LB, Scott PA, et al. An emergency department intervention to increase warfarin use for atrial fibrillation. J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis. 2014;23(2):199-203
53. Sibai M-S, Bellarbre F, Ghazali N, et al. [Decisional algorithm to prescribe vitamin K antagonist in geriatric patients with atrial fibrillation]. Geriatr Psychol Neuropsychiatr Vieil. 2014;12(1):20-24
54. Das M, Panter L, Connor N, Mills J, Gupta D. The primary care atrial fibrillation (PCAF) service: Consultant-led anticoagulation assessment clinics in the primary care setting increase the uptake of anticoagulation therapy in AF patients at high-risk of stroke. Europace. 2014;16:iii16
55. Fuenzalida C, Coll-Vinent B, Navarro M, et al. [Temporal evolution of treatment of patients with atrial fibrillation in a urban health care area]. Med Clin (Barc). 2015;144(11):483-486
56. Daacke I, Hau N, Williams J, Natarajan I. Atrial fibrillation and anti-coagulation service run by a clinical nurse specialist. Value Health. 2015;18(7):A400
57. Akhavein RM, Sklenar J, Minnier J, Heitner S. Efficacy of clinical notifications to health care providers in management of heart failure patients. Circulation. 2015;132:no pagination
58. Garber JL, Willenborg KL, Rose AE. Analysis of anticoagulant prescribing in non-valvular atrial fibrillation and development of a clinical tool for guiding anticoagulant selection. J Thromb Thrombolysis. 2015;40(2):248-254
59. Zheng Q, Aneke-Nash C, Halperin JL, Vorchheimer DA. Novel oral anticoagulant availability increases appropriate use of anticoagulants for nonvalvular atrial fibrillation in clinical practice. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2016;67(13 SUPPL. 1):787
60. Eckman MH, Lip GY, Wise RE, et al. Impact of an atrial fibrillation decision support tool (AFDST) on thromboprophylaxis for atrial fibrillation. J Gen Intern Med. 2016;31(2 SUPPL. 1):S258-S259
61. Eckman MH, Lip GYH, Wise RE, et al. Impact of an Atrial Fibrillation Decision Support Tool on thromboprophylaxis for atrial fibrillation. Am Heart J. 2016;176:17-27
62. Abidi S, Cox J, Abusharekh A, Hashemian N, Abidi SS. A digital health system to assist family physicians to safely prescribe NOAC medications. Eur J Epidemiol. 2016;31:S9
63. Lee TM, Ivers NM, Bhatia S, et al. Improving stroke prevention therapy for patients with atrial fibrillation in primary care: protocol for a pragmatic, cluster randomized trial. Implement Sci. 2016;11:13
64. Rao MP, Ciobanu AO, Lopes RD, et al. A clustered randomized trial to IMProve treatment with AntiCoagulanTs in patients with Atrial Fibrillation (IMPACT-AF): design and rationale. Am Heart J. 2016;176:107-113
65. Willis TA, Hartley S, Glidewell L, et al. Action to Support Practices Implement Research Evidence (ASPIRE): protocol for a cluster-randomised evaluation of adaptable implementation packages targeting 'high impact' clinical practice recommendations in general practice. Implement Sci. 2016;11:25

66. Czernik Z, Cheung D, Cumbler EU. Accelerating the pace of change: Standardizing anticoagulation practice for the elderly in the era of direct oral anticoagulants. J Gen Intern Med. 2016;31(2 SUPPL. 1):S862-S863
67. Cloutier J, Khoo C, Hiebert B, Wassef A, Seifer C. Physician decision making in anticoagulating atrial fibrillation: A prospective survey evaluating a physician alert system for atrial fibrillation detected on cardiac implantable electronic devices. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2016;67(13 SUPPL. 1):837
68. Amiri M, Kargar M, Borhanihaghighi A, Soltani F, Zare N. The effect of nurse-led care on stability time in therapeutic range of INR in ischemic stroke patients receiving warfarin. Appl Nurs Res. 2017;33:96-101
69. Barmano N, Walfridsson U, Walfridsson H, Karlsson JE. Structured care of patients with atrial fibrillation improves guideline adherence. J Atr Fibrillation. 2017;9(4)
70. Rose AJ, Park A, Gillespie C, et al. Results of a regional effort to improve warfarin management. Ann Pharmacother. 2017;51(5):373-379
71. Karlsson LO, Nilsson S, Charitakis E, et al. Clinical decision support for stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation (CDS-AF): Rationale and design of a cluster randomized trial in the primary care setting. Am Heart J. 2017;187:45-52
72. Virdee MS, Stewart D. Optimizing the use of oral anticoagulant therapy for atrial fibrilation in primary care: a pharmacist-led intervention. Int J Clin Pharm. 2017;39(1):173-180
73. Singer DE, Albers GW, Dalen JE, Go AS, Halperin JL, Manning WJ. Antithrombotic therapy in atrial fibrillation: The seventh ACCP conference on antithrombotic and thrombolytic therapy. Chest. 2004;126(3 Suppl):429s-456s
74. Fuster V, Ryden LE, Cannom DS, et al. ACC/AHA/ESC 2006 guidelines for the management of patients with atrial fibrillation: full text: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on practice guidelines and the European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Revise the 2001 guidelines for the management of patients with atrial fibrillation) developed in collaboration with the European Heart Rhythm Association and the Heart Rhythm Society. Europace. 2006;8(9):651-745