

## Article

# Moving stroke rehabilitation evidence into practice; a systematic review of randomised controlled trials

Bird, Marie-Louise, Miller, Tiev, Connell, Louise and Eng, Janice

Available at <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/28160/>

*Bird, Marie-Louise, Miller, Tiev, Connell, Louise ORCID: 0000-0002-0629-2919 and Eng, Janice (2019) Moving stroke rehabilitation evidence into practice; a systematic review of randomised controlled trials. Clinical Rehabilitation . ISSN 0269-2155*

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.  
10.1177%2F0269215519847253

For more information about UCLan's research in this area go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/researchgroups/> and search for <name of research Group>.

For information about Research generally at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>


 Clinical Rehabilitation

**Moving stroke rehabilitation evidence into practice; a systematic review of randomised controlled trials**

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Journal:                      | <i>Clinical Rehabilitation</i>  |
| Manuscript ID                 | CRE-2018-7705.R2  |
| Manuscript Type:              | Original Article  |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 08-Apr-2019   |
| Complete List of Authors:     | Bird, Marie-Louise; University of British Columbia, Physical Therapy<br>Miller, Tiev; Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Rehabilitation Sciences<br>Connell, Louise; University of Nottingham, Division of Physiotherapy Education;<br>Eng, Janice; University of British Columbia, Physical Therapy |
| Keywords:                     | clinician behavior, 'change in clinical practice', clinical practice guidelines, knowledge translation, Stroke  |
|                               |   |

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Objective

To investigate the effectiveness of interventions aimed at moving research evidence into stroke rehabilitation practice through changing the practice of clinicians.

## Data sources

EMBASE, CINAHL, Cochrane and MEDLINE databases were searched from 1980 to April 2019. International trial registries and reference lists of included studies completed our search.

## Review methods

Randomized controlled trials that involved interventions aiming to change the practice of clinicians working in stroke rehabilitation were included. Bias was evaluated using Revman to generate a risk of bias table. Evidence quality was evaluated using GRADE criteria.

## Results

Sixteen trials were included (250 sites, 14,689 patients), evaluating a range of interventions including facilitation, audit and feedback, education, and reminders. Eleven studies included multicomponent interventions (using a combination of interventions). Four used educational interventions alone and one used electronic reminders. Risk of bias was generally low.

Overall, the GRADE criteria indicated that this body of literature was low quality. This review found higher efficacy of trials which targeted fewer outcomes. Subgroup analysis indicated moderate level GRADE evidence (103 sites, 10,877 patients) that trials which included both site facilitation and tailoring for local factors were effective in changing clinical practice. The effect size of these varied (OR 1.63-4.9). Education interventions alone were not effective.

Conclusions: A large range of interventions are used to facilitate clinical practice change.

Education is commonly used, but in isolation is not effective. Multicomponent interventions including facilitation and tailoring to local settings can change clinical practice and are more effective when targeting fewer changes.

## Introduction

In stroke rehabilitation units, treatment delivered according to clinical guidelines leads to better recovery.<sup>1</sup> The impact of adhering to multiple clinical guidelines is additive, with positive impacts on both mortality and disability for people with stroke.<sup>2</sup> Hence, increasing the use of clinical guidelines will lead to improved patient outcomes.

Despite the availability of clinical guidelines, moving research evidence to clinical practice is limited and slow.<sup>3,4</sup> Specifically within the area of stroke rehabilitation, adherence to clinical guidelines is poor.<sup>5</sup> For example, guideline use is limited in occupational therapy.<sup>6</sup> Physical therapists are reported to use guidelines less than fifty percent of the time.<sup>7</sup> Changing clinician behaviour to use more guidelines is a complex issue.<sup>8</sup> Personal (e.g., familiarity with the recommended treatments) and environmental factors (e.g., available time and space, support from management) contribute to this complexity.<sup>9</sup>

The lack of clinician uptake of guidelines has driven an evolving body of research that measures the effectiveness of strategies aimed at altering clinical practice behaviour and subsequently patient outcomes. These emerging intervention types, targeting clinicians, are often referred to as knowledge translation interventions. Knowledge translation has been defined as a dynamic and iterative process that includes the synthesis, dissemination, exchange and ethically-sound application of knowledge to improve health and health services.<sup>10</sup>

Traditionally education has been the most commonly used intervention in rehabilitation to support practice change.<sup>11</sup> However, more trials involving complex and multicomponent interventions are being undertaken and published. Multicomponent interventions use a bundle of different activities, with many using facilitators to initiate and maintain desired behaviour changes. Care pathways are another type of activity that aim to change practice. These are defined as complex interventions for the mutual decision-making and organisation of care processes for a well-defined group of patients during a well-defined period.<sup>12</sup>

1  
2  
3 To date, there has not been a review which systematically examines the type and complexity  
4 of knowledge translation interventions designed to improve the clinical application of  
5 evidence-based practice in stroke rehabilitation. The emergence of computer reminders and  
6 recently developed web-based supports also necessitates this current review. We aim to  
7 systematically evaluate the effectiveness of knowledge translation interventions targeting  
8 clinician practice changes in stroke rehabilitation to inform future implementation research  
9 and practice.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

## 18 Methods

19  
20  
21 A literature search from 1980 to the current date (12<sup>th</sup> March 2019) using four electronic  
22 databases (EMBASE, CINAHL, Cochrane CENTRAL and MEDLINE) was conducted based  
23 on the domains of stroke and rehabilitation, knowledge translation intervention and  
24 modalities, outcomes and practice guidelines. The search strategy is presented in Appendix  
25 1. The references and citations of the included studies were reviewed for additional relevant  
26 publications. Trial registries for ongoing studies in this area were searched, and five relevant  
27 studies located. Where recruitment was completed, the study authors were contacted to  
28 determine if publication was imminent. One author group with a published abstract provided  
29 more detail and is included in this review.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Two reviewers independently screened results using Covidence software.<sup>13</sup> Conflicts in  
42 study allocation were resolved through discussion between reviewers. Full text articles were  
43 screened for inclusion using a standardized tool (Appendix 2). Studies were included if  
44  
45  
46  
47

- 48 • Participants were clinicians in stroke rehabilitation settings (rehabilitation was defined  
49 as any period after the patient was medically stable and still in care).
- 50 • Interventions were delivered with the intent to change clinical practice<sup>14</sup>
- 51 • Comparators were either no intervention or another intervention (e.g., a passive  
52 distribution of guidelines).
- 53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- Outcomes measured clinician practice behaviour change or patient outcomes but not organisational change.
- They were peer reviewed articles of randomised control trials (RCTs).

Data were excluded if the study focused on acute medical management (e.g. thrombectomy or treatment in intensive care).

Data extracted included participant and setting characteristics, description of the knowledge translation interventions, theoretical frameworks, evaluation methods and findings. Where possible we described the interventions in line with recommendations from the Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change Checklist.<sup>15</sup> Bias was evaluated, generating a risk of bias table in Revman software.<sup>16</sup> Evidence quality was evaluated using GRADE criteria, evaluating risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision and publication bias.<sup>17</sup> This review was prospectively registered on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2018 with PROSPERO: CRD42018090998 and complies with the PRISMA criteria for reporting systematic reviews.

## Results

The literature search yielded 1357 unique citations. Title and abstract screening removed 1279 citations. Seventy-eight full text articles were reviewed and seventeen papers describing sixteen studies are included.<sup>9, 18-33</sup> The screening process is represented in the Figure 1. The SCORE-IT trial (Bayey<sup>20</sup> and Salbach<sup>9</sup>) reported different outcomes from the same trial and were combined.<sup>34</sup>

## Participants and study designs

Most studies included multiple professions or multidisciplinary teams and were clustered at the ward or hospital level (Table 1). Other interventions were directed at five single professions<sup>18,21, 22,26,28</sup> and a team of physical therapists and occupational therapists.<sup>32</sup> Thirteen trials were cluster randomised trials.

## Interventions

1  
2  
3 Half of the studies were multicomponent interventions and three others described their  
4 intervention as a 'care pathway'. Four out of five single interventions involved educational  
5 training<sup>18, 21, 22, 26</sup> and one used electronic reminders.<sup>28</sup> Site facilitators were commonly used  
6 and described in ten trials.<sup>22-25, 27, 29-31, 33, 34</sup> There was considerable variety in facilitator  
7 training, length of intervention, settings and local tailoring. While six of the sixteen studies  
8 described an underlying theoretical approach to their intervention, these approaches were all  
9 different (Table 2).  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

## 21 Outcomes

22  
23  
24 Five studies focused solely on patient outcomes.<sup>19, 22, 29, 30, 32</sup> Seven studies focused on  
25 clinician outcomes only<sup>18, 23, 24, 26, 27, 31, 33</sup> and four reported on both.<sup>21, 25, 28, 34</sup> The type and  
26 number of outcomes varied considerably (range 1-21, mean 7.7); most studies investigated  
27 multiple outcomes. Eight studies evaluated practice change by measuring the use of clinical  
28 guidelines before and after intervention. Ten studies identified primary outcomes, with seven  
29 multidisciplinary cluster RCTs identifying between one and three primary outcomes.<sup>24, 29-34</sup>  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 No significant change in clinician practice were reported from the four education  
38 interventions (1628 patients).<sup>18, 21, 22, 26</sup> Electronic reminders used in general practice (311  
39 patients) produced a large improvement in guideline use (OR 4.9) and reduction in mortality  
40 (OR 0.27). The care pathway interventions produced mixed results. One care pathway study  
41 with site facilitators and with intervention tailoring improved all care indicators (7/7) and most  
42 process indicators (12/14).<sup>25</sup> The other two care pathways did not involve tailoring of the  
43 intervention and consequently not find any significant results.<sup>19, 30</sup>  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

## 52 Level of evidence

53  
54  
55 Overall, the body of the literature reporting the use of knowledge translation interventions to  
56 change clinician behaviour and practice was of low quality based on the GRADE criteria.  
57  
58 Evidence was downgraded twice; once for inconsistency due to differences in enrolment and  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 outcomes populations (i.e., patients treated or health professionals) and once for  
4  
5 indirectness due to large variations in intervention types. Most studies were unable to blind  
6  
7 participants. Other biases were generally rated low (Figure 2); for example, imprecision was  
8  
9 less of a concern and rated low as there were multiple large studies.

## 11 12 Subgroup analysis

13  
14  
15 A subgroup analysis of seven multidisciplinary and multicomponent trials that used  
16  
17 facilitation as one component showed moderate GRADE level evidence indicating  
18  
19 effectiveness in producing positive results in at least one primary outcome (data from five  
20  
21 trials, 103 sites, 10 877 participants).<sup>24, 27, 29, 34</sup> While the two other multicomponent  
22  
23 multidisciplinary interventions with facilitators found no significant between group difference,  
24  
25 improvements in both control and intervention groups were reported.<sup>23, 33</sup>

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 Figure 1. Prisma flow chart of study screening

32  
33  
34 Figure 2. Risk of Bias of included studies

## 35 36 37 38 Discussion

39  
40 Interventions that aim to change clinician behaviours vary in effectiveness. Trials that  
41  
42 included an education intervention in isolation were not effective. Support for clinicians from  
43  
44 site facilitators was frequently included in effective studies. Interventions that included an  
45  
46 element of site-specific tailoring of the intervention (for example workshops to examine local  
47  
48 barriers and ways to overcome them) were generally effective. Trials that identified primary  
49  
50 outcomes or had a small number of outcomes appeared to have more positive results.

51  
52  
53 This is the first systematic review of knowledge translation interventions designed to change  
54  
55 stroke rehabilitation clinician behaviours. We reported adherence to practice guidelines,  
56  
57 protocols and any effect on patient outcomes where available. This review identified multiple  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 large studies with low levels of bias. Heterogeneity among interventions, comparators and  
4  
5 outcome measures produced mixed results resulting in a low level of evidence overall.  
6  
7

8 This review identifies a couple of successful intervention components to improve  
9  
10 rehabilitation guideline uptake; facilitation and tailoring of interventions for local settings.  
11  
12 Facilitation is supported by data from nearly 11, 000 participants from over 100 sites,  
13  
14 strengthening the importance of this finding in stroke rehabilitation. Our review supports  
15  
16 previous research that advocates tailoring of guideline implementation in wider rehabilitation  
17  
18 settings.<sup>35</sup> However, more research is still required to develop generalizable tailoring  
19  
20 strategies.<sup>36</sup>  
21  
22

23 Education in isolation was not found to be an effective implementation intervention for  
24  
25 practice change. None of the four studies in this review reported a change in clinician  
26  
27 practice or any patient outcomes. While education and training appear to be the standard  
28  
29 intervention in frontline clinical practice,<sup>11</sup> we recommend that education be included with  
30  
31 other components for promoting practice change. Stopping ineffective processes, like  
32  
33 education interventions in isolation, may be one of the most powerful ways to move the area  
34  
35 of clinical practice change forward.  
36  
37

38 While only one study used electronic reminders to increase adherence to medication  
39  
40 guidelines, this intervention produced the largest effect size seen in this review. That study  
41  
42 reported a five fold increase in guideline use and a 60% reduction in death rates compared  
43  
44 to control.<sup>28</sup> The use of technology such as reminders in electronic medical records warrants  
45  
46 future exploration.  
47  
48

49 A novel finding in this review is the higher efficacy of trials which targeted primary outcomes  
50  
51 or fewer outcomes. This may reflect overall study quality or a focus of attention or be an  
52  
53 element of successful implementation. Implementing a large number of practice changes  
54  
55 concomitantly has been identified as problematic,<sup>9</sup> and may justify the modest improvements  
56  
57 seen in this review. Practice change typically requires multiple new behaviours to be  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 adopted, and the resource issues associated with such implementation is another known  
4 barrier.<sup>37</sup> To address this, targeting a few well-defined clinician behaviour changes may be  
5 one way of achieving effective results.  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 Synthesis of data identified in this review is limited by the large range of study designs,  
11 intervention targets and comparators, and outcomes. These limitations may contribute to the  
12 low quality of evidence rating and the observed differences in the size and direction of the  
13 results. A subgroup analysis was not pre-specified, and this may have introduced further  
14 bias.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 A large range of interventions are used to facilitate clinical practice change. We were able to  
22 identify some strategies or intervention components that were included in effective trials  
23  
24 Multicomponent interventions including facilitation and tailoring to local settings can change  
25 clinical practice and are more effective when targeting fewer changes. Education and  
26 training are commonly used, but in isolation these are not effective in producing practice  
27 change of clinicians working in stroke rehabilitation.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 Clinical Messages

- 38 • Multicomponent multidisciplinary interventions that include site facilitation and  
39 consideration of local settings can change clinical practice.
- 40 • Education and training interventions should form part of multicomponent  
41 interventions and not be used in isolation.
- 42 • Implementing a small number of practice changes at a time produces more effective  
43 results.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 Acknowledgements.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Thanks to Katherine Miller, Librarian UBC for assistance with the search strategy and Alyssa  
4  
5 Chen for updating the review. This work was supported by the Canadian Institutes of Health  
6  
7 Research (FDN 143340) and Canada Research Chairs Program.  
8  
9

## 10 References

- 11  
12  
13 1. Hubbard IJ, Harris D, Kilkenny MF, et al. Adherence to clinical guidelines improves patient  
14  
15 outcomes in Australian audit of stroke rehabilitation practice. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2012; 93: 965-  
16  
17 971.
- 18  
19 2. Urimubenshi G, Langhorne P, Cadilhac DA, et al. Association between patient outcomes and  
20  
21 key performance indicators of stroke care quality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Euro*  
22  
23 *Stroke J* 2017; 2: 287-307.
- 24  
25 3. Bernhardsson S, Lynch E, Dizon JM, et al. Advancing evidence-based practice in physical  
26  
27 therapy settings: multinational perspectives on implementation strategies and interventions. *Phys*  
28  
29 *Ther* 2016; 97: 51-60.
- 30  
31 4. Salbach NM, Guilcher SJ, Jaglal SB, et al. Determinants of research use in clinical decision  
32  
33 making among physical therapists providing services post-stroke: a cross-sectional study. *Implement*  
34  
35 *Sci* 2010; 5: 77.
- 36  
37 5. Donnellan C, Sweetman S and Shelley E. Health professionals' adherence to stroke clinical  
38  
39 guidelines: a review of the literature. *Health Policy* 2013; 111: 245-263.
- 40  
41 6. Upton D, Stephens D, Williams B, et al. Occupational therapists' attitudes, knowledge, and  
42  
43 implementation of evidence-based practice: a systematic review of published research. *Brit J Occ*  
44  
45 *Ther* 2014; 77: 24-38.
- 46  
47 7. Bernhardsson S, Johansson K, Nilsen P, et al. Determinants of guideline use in primary care  
48  
49 physical therapy: a cross-sectional survey of attitudes, knowledge, and behavior. *Phys Ther* 2014; 94:  
50  
51 343-354.
- 52  
53 8. Mudge S, Hart A, Murugan S, et al. What influences the implementation of the New Zealand  
54  
55 stroke guidelines for physiotherapists and occupational therapists? *Disabl Rehab* 2017; 39: 511-518.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 9. Munce SEP, Graham ID, Salbach NM, et al. Perspectives of health care professionals on the  
4  
5 facilitators and barriers to the implementation of a stroke rehabilitation guidelines cluster  
6  
7 randomized controlled trial. *BMC Health Services Research* 2017; 17: 440. journal article. DOI:  
8  
9 10.1186/s12913-017-2389-7.  
10  
11
- 12 10. Canadian Institute of Health Research. [www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/29418.html](http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/29418.html) ( 2016, accessed  
13  
14 2nd November 2018).  
15
- 16 11. Jones CA, Roop SC, Pohar SL, et al. Translating knowledge in rehabilitation: systematic  
17  
18 review. *Phys Ther* 2015; 95: 663-677.  
19
- 20 12. Vanhaecht K. The impact of clinical pathways on the organisation of care processes. 2007.  
21  
22
- 23 13. Covidence software Melbourne, Australia: Veritas Health Innovation. Available at  
24  
25 [www.covidence.org](http://www.covidence.org).  
26  
27
- 28 14. Peirson L, Catallo C and Chera S. The Registry of Knowledge Translation Methods and Tools:  
29  
30 a resource to support evidence-informed public health. *Int J Pub Health* 2013; 58: 493-500.  
31
- 32 15. Perry CK, Damschroder LJ, Hemler JR, et al. Specifying and comparing implementation  
33  
34 strategies across seven large implementation interventions: a practical application of theory.  
35  
36 *Implement Sci* 2019; 14: 32.  
37
- 38 16. RevMan. The Nordic Cochrane Centre; The Cochrane Collaboration. Review Manager.  
39  
40 Version 5.3. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre; 2014  
41  
42
- 43 17. GRADEpro Guideline Development Tool [Software]. *McMaster University* 2015; 435.  
44
- 45 18. Van Peppen R, Schuurmans M, Stutterheim E, et al. Promoting the use of outcome measures  
46  
47 by an educational programme for physiotherapists in stroke rehabilitation: a pilot randomized  
48  
49 controlled trial. *Clin Rehab* 2009; 23: 1005-1017.  
50
- 51 19. Allen K, Hazelett S, Jarjoura D, et al. A Randomized Trial Testing the Superiority of a  
52  
53 Postdischarge Care Management Model for Stroke Survivors. *J Stroke Cerebrovascr* 2009; 18: 443-  
54  
55 452. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2009.02.002>.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - 9
  - 10
  - 11
  - 12
  - 13
  - 14
  - 15
  - 16
  - 17
  - 18
  - 19
  - 20
  - 21
  - 22
  - 23
  - 24
  - 25
  - 26
  - 27
  - 28
  - 29
  - 30
  - 31
  - 32
  - 33
  - 34
  - 35
  - 36
  - 37
  - 38
  - 39
  - 40
  - 41
  - 42
  - 43
  - 44
  - 45
  - 46
  - 47
  - 48
  - 49
  - 50
  - 51
  - 52
  - 53
  - 54
  - 55
  - 56
  - 57
  - 58
  - 59
  - 60
20. Bayley. Facilitated knowledge translation improved stroke rehabilitation outcomes: The SCORE-IT cluster randomized controlled trial. 2018.
21. Jones A, Carr EK, Newham DJ, et al. Positioning of Stroke Patients. *Stroke* 1998; 29: 1612-1617.
22. Jones A, Tilling K, Wilson-Barnett J, et al. Effect of recommended positioning on stroke outcome at six months: a randomized controlled trial. *Clin Rehab* 2005; 19: 138-145.
23. Lakshminarayan K, Borbas C, McLaughlin B, et al. A cluster-randomized trial to improve stroke care in hospitals. *Neurology* 2010; 74: 1634-1642.
24. Middleton S, McElduff P, Ward J, et al. Implementation of evidence-based treatment protocols to manage fever, hyperglycaemia, and swallowing dysfunction in acute stroke (QASC): a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2011; 378: 1699-1706.
25. Panella M, Marchisio S, Brambilla R, et al. A cluster randomized trial to assess the effect of clinical pathways for patients with stroke: results of the clinical pathways for effective and appropriate care study. *BMC medicine* 2012; 10: 71.
26. Pennington L, Roddam H, Burton C, et al. Promoting research use in speech and language therapy: a cluster randomized controlled trial to compare the clinical effectiveness and costs of two training strategies. *Clin Rehab* 2005; 19: 387-397.
27. Power M, Tyrrell PJ, Rudd AG, et al. Did a quality improvement collaborative make stroke care better? A cluster randomized trial. *Implement Sci* 2014; 9: 40.
28. Ranta A, Dovey S, Weatherall M, et al. Cluster randomized controlled trial of TIA electronic decision support in primary care. *Neurology* 2015; 84: 1545-1551.
29. Strasser DC, Falconer JA, Stevens AB, et al. Team training and stroke rehabilitation outcomes: a cluster randomized trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2008; 89: 10-15.
30. Sulch D, Perez I, Melbourn A, et al. Randomized controlled trial of integrated (managed) care pathway for stroke rehabilitation. *Stroke* 2000; 31: 1929-1934.

- 1  
2  
3 31. Williams L, Daggett V, Slaven JE, et al. A cluster-randomised quality improvement study to  
4 improve two inpatient stroke quality indicators. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2015: bmjqs-2015-004188.  
5  
6  
7 32. McCluskey A, Ada L, Kelly PJ, et al. A behavior change program to increase outings delivered  
8 during therapy to stroke survivors by community rehabilitation teams: The Out-and-About trial. *Int J*  
9  
10 *Stroke* 2016; 11: 425-437.  
11  
12  
13 33. Lynch EA, Cadilhac DA, Luker JA, et al. Education-only versus a multifaceted intervention for  
14 improving assessment of rehabilitation needs after stroke; a cluster randomised trial. *Implement Sci*  
15  
16 *e* 2015; 11: 120.  
17  
18  
19 34. ScoreIT. Combination of two papers by Bayley and Salbach. 2018.  
20  
21  
22 35. Baker R, Camosso-Stefinovic J, Gillies C, et al. Tailored interventions to address determinants  
23 of practice. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2015.  
24  
25  
26 36. Powell BJ, Fernandez ME, Williams NJ, et al. Enhancing the Impact of Implementation  
27 Strategies in Healthcare: A Research Agenda. *Front Pub Health* 2019; 7: 3.  
28  
29  
30 37. Purvis T, Moss K, Denisenko S, et al. Implementation of evidence-based stroke care:  
31 enablers, barriers, and the role of facilitators. *J Multidiscip Health* 2014; 7: 389.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

Table 1. Study design, population, intervention type and outcomes of included studies.

| Author and Study Design<br>Location [Target]   | Intervention Type and<br>components   | Multi-<br>disciplinary<br>(yes/no) | Outcome tool used (s)  | Results  | Outcome<br>number<br>and type  |
|--|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <u>Allen, 2004<sup>19</sup> RCT</u><br>USA [Patient Outcomes].                         | Care Pathway  | Yes                                | Neuromotor function<br>Institution time/death,<br>Quality of life<br>Risk Management<br>Stroke Knowledge and lifestyle   | <i>SMD(SE)</i><br>-0.028(0.087)<br>-0.042(0.084)<br>-0.049(0.11)<br>0.024(0.048)<br>0.26(0.070)*   | No<br>primary<br>Five<br>Domains   |
| <u>Bayley, 2018<sup>20</sup> Cluster RCT</u><br>Canada<br>[Patient Outcomes]           | Multicomponent:<br>Site Facilitation<br>Tailoring via workshops<br>Reminder cards<br>Booklets | Yes                                | Primary Lower Limb - Mobility<br>Primary Upper Limb - Box Block Test<br><b>Adherence to guidelines</b><br>Sit-to-stand<br>Lower Extremity Range of Motion<br>Lower Extremity Brace<br>Task Training (Leg)<br>Training sitting balance<br>Training standing balance<br>Lower Extremity FES<br>Walking Practice<br>Treadmill Walking<br>Upper Extremity Range of Motion<br>Upper Extremity Brace<br>Task Training (Arm)<br>Reduce Hand Edema<br>Treatment Shoulder<br>Upper Extremity FES<br>Upper Extremity Education | <i>OR (95%CI)</i><br><b>1.63(1.23-2.17)*</b><br><b>1.69 (0.72-4.01)</b><br><i>ES (95% CI)&amp;</i><br>0.34 (0.17, 0.54)*<br>-0.22 (-0.41, -0.04)^<br>-0.02 (-0.21,0.16)<br>-0.05 (-0.24,0.13)<br>-0.19 (-0.37, -0.01)^<br>-0.25 (-0.43, -0.06)^<br>-0.05 (-0.24,0.13)<br>0.38 (0.19, 0.56)*<br>0.009 (-0.18,0.19)<br>0.10 (-0.08,0.29)<br>0.09 (-0.09,0.28)<br>0.10 (-0.09, 0.28)<br>-0.008 (-0.19,0.18)<br>0.13 (-0.05, 0.32)<br>0.02 (-0.16, 0.20)<br>0.09 (-0.10, 0.27) | <b>2 Primary<br/>Patient<br/>outcomes</b><br><br>18<br>Clinician<br>outcomes |
| <u>Salbach, 2017<sup>9</sup>Cluster RCT</u><br>[Clinician Outcomes]<br>(Guideline use) |   |                                    |  |  |  |

| Author and Study Design<br>Location [Target]  | Intervention Type and<br>components  | Multi-<br>disciplinary<br>(yes/no) | Outcome tool used (s)  | Results   | Outcome<br>number<br>and type                                      |
|---|--|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
|   |  |                                    | Constraint Therapy<br>Visual Imagery for Arm   | 0.05 (-0.14,0.23)<br>0.09 (-0.10,0.27)  |  |
| <u>Jones 1998</u> <sup>21</sup> RCT<br>United Kingdom<br>[Patient Outcomes]<br>[Clinician Outcome]<br>(Clinician knowledge) | Education  | No                                 | 19 joint positions in patients<br><br>Nurse stroke knowledge<br>Nurse positioning knowledge  | No between group<br>differences (presented<br>as pre/post)<br>% difference<br>10%<br>3%               | 19 Patient<br>outcomes<br>No<br>Primary<br>2 Clinician<br>outcomes |
| <u>Jones 2005</u> <sup>22</sup> Cluster RCT<br>United Kingdom<br>[Patient Outcomes]   | Education  | No                                 | Rivermead Mobility Index<br>Patient Positioning (6month)   | <i>ES (95%CI)</i> <sup>&amp;</sup><br><b>-0.03(-0.46, 0.41)</b><br>0.2(-0.03, 0.43)                   | <b>One<br/>Primary</b>   |
| <u>Lakshminarayan 2010</u> <sup>23</sup><br>Cluster RCT<br>USA<br>[Clinician Outcomes]<br>(Guideline use)                   | Multicomponent:<br>Site facilitation<br>Audit and feedback<br>Tailoring through<br>customized feedback         | Yes                                | <b>Adherence to guidelines</b><br>Aspirin within 24 hours<br>Smoking cessation counselling<br>Early mobilization<br>PT and OT within 48hours | <i>OR (95% CI)</i><br>1.4 (0.95–2.1)<br>1.4 (0.79–2.4)<br>0.58 (0.33–1.04)<br>0.98 (0.66–1.5)         | No<br>Primary<br>4 Clinician<br>outcomes                           |
| <u>Lynch 2015</u> <sup>33</sup> Cluster RCT<br>Australia<br>[Clinician Outcomes]<br>(Guideline use)                         | Multicomponent:<br>Site facilitation<br>Education<br>Audit and feedback<br>Reminders<br>Tailoring via workshop | Yes                                | <b>Adherence to guidelines</b><br>Assessment of rehabilitation needs   | <i>OR (95% CI)</i><br><b>Intervention 4.13<br/>(2.54-6.71)</b><br><b>Control 3.41<br/>(1.99-5.84)</b> | <b>One<br/>Primary</b>   |
| <u>McLusky 2016</u> <sup>32</sup> Cluster<br>RCT Australia<br>[Clinician and Patient<br>Outcomes]                           | Multicomponent:<br>Workshop with goal<br>setting and education<br>Tailoring via feedback                       | Yes                                | Number of clients receiving 4 or more<br>outings/week during rehabilitation  | <i>Risk difference</i><br><b>4% (-9 – 17)</b><br>0.5 (-0.4 – 1.4)<br>0.5 (-1.8 – 2.8)                 | <b>One<br/>Primary</b><br>2<br>secondary                           |



| Author and Study Design<br>Location [Target]  | Intervention Type and<br>components   | Multi-<br>disciplinary<br>(yes/no) | Outcome tool used (s)  | Results   | Outcome<br>number<br>and type  |
|---|---|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
|   |   |                                    | Number of outings/week during<br>rehabilitation  |   |  |
|   |   |                                    | Number of outings/week 6 months later  |   |  |
| <u>Middleton 2011</u> <sup>24</sup> Cluster RCT<br>Australia<br>[Patient Outcomes]<br>[Clinician Outcomes]<br>(Guideline use) | Multicomponent:<br>Site facilitation<br>Education<br>Reminders<br>Tailoring via workshops | Yes                                | <b>Modified Rankin &gt;2 90 days</b><br>Barthel index<br>SF-36 physical<br>SF-36 Mental<br>Length of stay<br><br><b>Adherence to guidelines</b><br>Fever – mean temp<br>≥ one temp recorded 24hr<br>Glucose mean 24hr<br>Swallow screen 24hr   | <i>ES (95% CI)</i> <sup>&amp;</sup><br><b>0.2 (0.06-0.31)*</b><br>0.2 (0.06-0.07)<br>0.32(0.06-0.20)*<br>0.05(-0.08-0.06)<br>0.07(-0.06-0.06)<br><i>Absolute difference<br/>(95%CI)</i><br>0.09(0.04-0.15)*<br>16.4%(8.3-24.6)*<br>0.54(0.08-1.01)*<br>29.2(22.0-36.4)*                                       | <b>One<br/>Primary</b><br>4 Patient<br>outcomes<br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br>4 Clinician<br>outcomes |
| <u>Panella 2012</u> <sup>25</sup> Cluster RCT<br>Italy<br>[Patient Outcomes].<br><br>[Clinician Outcomes]<br>(Guideline use)  | Care Pathway  | Yes                                | 30-day mortality after stroke<br>7-day mortality<br>Hospital LOS<br>Hospital readmission Institutionalization<br>after discharge<br>Return to function<br>Complication rates<br><br><b>Adherence to guidelines</b><br>Provide information<br>Use of Protocol<br>Use of CT/MRI >48hr<br>Aspirin <24 hr<br>Swallow screen<br>RP Assessment | <i>OR (95% CI)</i><br>0.70 (0.35-1.37) <sup>#</sup><br>0.42 (0.15-1.11) <sup>**</sup><br>-<br>-<br>1.29(0.58-2.87)<br>2.7(1.5-4.88)*<br>1.3(0.98-1.43)*<br><i>OR (95% CI)</i><br>1.16 (1.08 - .24)*<br>18.64 (8.14-44.31)*<br>1.78 (0.58-5.61)<br>1.73 (1.02-2.75)*<br>15.3 (3.1-101)*<br>10.44 (6.06-18.10)* | No<br>Primary<br>6 Patient<br>Outcomes<br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br>21<br>Clinician<br>Outcomes      |

| Author and Study Design<br>Location [Target]   | Intervention Type and<br>components   | Multi-<br>disciplinary<br>(yes/no) | Outcome tool used (s)                  | Results  | Outcome<br>number<br>and type |
|--|---|------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
|  |   |                                    | ECG <24hours                           | 0.82 (0.35-1.94)   |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Continuous monitors 48hours            | 5.57 (3.21-9.73)*  |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Discharge assessment                   | 1.82 (0.88-3.77)   |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Discharge plan                         | 2.01 (1.26-3.21)*  |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Discharge sign plan                    | 999 (137-20374)*   |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Discharge summary                      | 3.90 (2.26-6.67)*  |                               |
|  |   |                                    | FIM at discharge-                      | 30.4 (13.5-71.2)*  |                               |
|  |   |                                    | FIM at 3 months                        | 45.6(11.2-205.6)*  |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Admit to stroke unit                   | 7.24 (4.45-11.82)*   |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Stay in stroke unit                    | 27.6 (8.1-104.1)*  |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Use of case manager                    | 189(28-3698)*  |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Stroke Team                            | 59.0 (13.6-360.4)*   |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Rehabilitation need assessment<48hours | 20. (9.0-46.1)*  |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Discharge need assessment and plan     | 32.8 (15.1-73.8)*  |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Follow up at 3 months                  | 28.0 (4.09-91.88)*   |                               |
| <u>Pennington 2005</u> <sup>26</sup> Cluster<br>RCT<br>United Kingdom<br>[Clinician Outcomes]<br>(Guideline use)             | Education   | No                                 | <b>Adherence to guidelines</b>         | Mean difference pre-<br>post<br>Group1 -1.72, Group 2<br>0.52<br>Between group<br>difference | 10<br>Clinician<br>Outcomes   |
|  |   |                                    | Implementation                         | 0.29   |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Number new activities                  | 2.19*  |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Number hours EBP activities            | 31.1   |                               |
|  |   |                                    | Change in Culture                      | 0.43   |                               |
| <u>Power 2014</u> <sup>27</sup> Cluster RCT<br>[interrupted time series<br>design]<br>United Kingdom<br>[Clinician Outcomes] | Multicomponent:<br>Site facilitation<br>Weekly sharing and<br>learning meetings<br>Web portal | Yes                                | <b>Rehabilitation Bundle</b>           | OR Ratio (95%CI)   | No                            |
|  |   |                                    | PT Assessment                          | 1.6 (0.98, 2.6)  | Primary                       |
|  |   |                                    | OT Assessment                          | 1.06 (0.68, 1.67)  | 5 Clinician                   |
|  |   |                                    | Mood Assessment                        | 2.68 (1.69, 4.26)*   | Outcomes                      |
|  |   |                                    | Multidisciplinary Team Goals           | 5.43 (3.26, 9.05)*   |                               |

| Author and Study Design<br>Location [Target]  | Intervention Type and<br>components  | Multi-<br>disciplinary<br>(yes/no) | Outcome tool used (s)   | Results  | Outcome<br>number<br>and type                  |
|---|--|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
|   | Tailoring via feedback   |                                    | >50% of stay in stroke unit   | 1.17 (0.8, 1.72)   |  |
| <u>Ranta 2015</u> <sup>28</sup> Cluster RCT<br>New Zealand<br>[Patient Outcomes]<br>[Clinician Outcomes]<br>(Guideline use) | Electronic Reminders   | No                                 | 90-day stroke risk<br>TIA/Stroke 90 days<br>Vascular event or death<br>Treatment plan                               | OR Ratio (95%CI)<br><b>0.27 (0.05–1.41)</b> #<br>0.26 (0.56–0.85)**<br>0.27 (0.10–0.73)**<br>3.44 (1.93–6.13)* | <b>One<br/>Primary</b>                         |
| <u>Strasser 2008</u> <sup>29</sup> Cluster RCT<br>USA<br>[Patient Outcomes]   | Multicomponent:<br>Site facilitation<br>Education<br>Audit and feedback<br>Tailoring with feedback                 | Yes                                | <b>Adherence to guidelines</b><br>(FIM Score gain>23%),<br>Community discharge<br>Length of stay                    | <b>4.56 (2.75–7.57)*</b><br>Between group<br>difference<br><b>13.6%*</b><br><b>5.5%</b><br><b>3.0 days</b>     | <b>One<br/>Primary<br/>Three<br/>Primary</b>   |
| <u>Sulch 2000</u> <sup>30</sup> Cluster RCT<br>United Kingdom<br>[Patient Outcomes]   | Care Pathway   | Yes                                | Length of stay<br>Death<br>PT input<br>OT input   | ES (95%CI)&<br><b>0.23 (-0.09-0.55)</b><br>0.37 (0.04-0.69)^<br>0.08 (-0.24-0.40)<br>0.07 (-0.68-0.82)         | <b>One<br/>Primary<br/>9<br/>secondary</b>     |
| <u>van peppen 2009</u> <sup>18</sup> Pilot RCT<br>Netherlands<br>[Clinician Outcomes]                                       | Education  | No                                 | Number of outcome measures used<br><br>self-reported use of outcomes  | <i>pre/post I, pre/post C</i><br>15/13, 15/14<br><i>median (range)</i><br>3(0-6)/6(1-7), 3(0-6),<br>4(0-6)     | <b>One<br/>Primary</b><br><br>One<br>secondary |
| <u>Williams 2015</u> <sup>31</sup> Cluster RCT<br>[with follow up]<br>USA<br>[Clinician Outcomes]<br>(Guideline use)        | Multicomponent:<br>Site facilitation<br>Education<br>Audit and feedback<br>Tailoring via barrier<br>identification | Yes                                | <b>Adherence to guidelines</b><br>DVT prophylaxis<br>Dysphagia screening<br>Composite indicator<br>Defect-free care | <i>OR (ratio)</i><br><b>4.9*</b><br><b>1.04</b><br>1.15<br>1.25  | <b>Two<br/>Primary</b>                         |

| Author and Study Design<br>Location [Target]                      | Intervention Type and<br>components | Multi-<br>disciplinary<br>(yes/no) | Outcome tool used (s)  | Results | Outcome<br>number<br>and type |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---------|-------------------------------|
| *Significant difference between conditions (favors intervention). |                                     |                                    | I=Intervention, C=Control MultiD=Multidisciplinary, EBP - Evidence-based         |         |                               |
| ^Significant difference between conditions (favors of control).   |                                     |                                    | practice. FES – Functional Electrical Stimulation, FIM – Functional Independence |         |                               |
| &ES calculated from pre-post data provided in paper.              |                                     |                                    | Measure, Primary outcome(s) bolded   |         |                               |
| #OR less than 1 indicates a positive result for the intervention  |                                     |                                    |  |         |                               |

For Peer Review

Table 2 Description of intervention setting, study size, theoretical framework, content of intervention and comparator, and contextualisation.

| Author and Setting   | Theoretical Framework        | Participants (n)   | Intervention Condition  | Control Condition   | Contextualization           |
|--|------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Allen, 2004 <sup>19</sup><br>Community   | Not described                | (I) 190 Patients<br><br>(C) 190 patients                                     | Actors: Nurses and Interdisciplinary team<br>Actions: Nurses performed assessment within 1-week of discharge and an Interdisciplinary post stroke consultation team developed individual care plan. Training: Standard education and intervention protocols for stroke  | Usual care<br>(multidisciplinary care plan).  | Nil                         |
| Bayley, 2018 <sup>20</sup><br>and Salbach,<br>2017 <sup>9</sup><br>Sub-Acute<br>Hospital | Knowledge to<br>Action Cycle | (I) 10 sites, 169<br>patients<br><br>(C) 10 sites, 143<br>patients           | Actors: Two local facilitators per site, one nurse and one therapist<br>Actions: Facilitators ran local workshops on 'barriers' and strategies for clinical practice change.<br>Training of actors: a 2-day face-to-face workshop<br>Dose of Facilitation: 4 hours per week over a 16-month period<br>Resources provided: Booklets and reminder cards of treatment protocols. | Resources. Booklet without treatment protocols, a book and a 2- hour DVD on measurement of stroke outcomes. Clinicians could join a list serve to ask questions and share experiences | Yes. Barrier identification |
| Jones, 1998 <sup>21</sup><br>Hospital  | Not described                | (I) 30 nurses, 23<br>patients<br><br>(C) 29 nurses, 15<br>patients           | Actors: Nurses<br>Actions: Lectures<br>Dose: Two 2-hour face-to-face training sessions<br>Resources: Workbook.  | Usual care.   | Nil                         |
| Jones, 2005 <sup>22</sup><br>Hospital  | Not described                | (I) 5 Stroke units,<br>68 patients<br><br>(C) 5 Stroke units,<br>52 patients | Actors: Nurses<br>Actions: Education session<br>Dose: One day face-to-face workshop<br>Resources: Workbook, opinion leaders   | Usual care.   | Nil                         |
| Lakshminarayana<br>2010 <sup>23</sup><br>Hospital  | Not described                | (I) 9 hospitals  | Actors: Multidisciplinary team and hospital managers<br>Actions: Site facilitation, audit and written feedback,<br>Resources: opinion leaders   | Audit and written feedback of baseline performance.   | Customized feedback.        |

| Author and Setting                           | Theoretical Framework                        | Participants (n)   | Intervention Condition   | Control Condition  | Contextualization  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | (C) 10 hospitals   |  |  | Barriers addressed.  |
| Lynch 2015 <sup>33</sup>                     | Grol and Wensing 'Implementation for change' | (I) 5 hospitals<br>(C) 5 hospitals                                     | Actors: Multidisciplinary team<br>Actions: Workshops, site facilitation, audit and feedback<br>Dose: Over 2 weeks – one-hour education and then 2x30 minute for audit and feedback. One additional hour workshop for barrier identification.<br>Resources: Site champions, reminders, choice of site visits or education | One 30-minute education session and provision of hardcopies of intervention tool and access to online resources. | Barrier identification and local strategy development session with feedback. |
| McCluskey 2016 <sup>32</sup><br>Community    | Not described                                | (I) 11 teams, 164 patients<br>(C) 10 teams, 115 patients               | Actors: Health care team<br>Actions: One workshop, audit and feedback<br>Dose: 2-hour face-to-face workshop and 1-hour booster at 12 months<br>Resources: Provision guidelines and target recommendations with training materials  | Sent clinical guideline by mail.   | Local feedback   |
| Middleton 2011 <sup>24</sup><br>Hospital     | Not described                                | (I) 10 stroke units, 1294 patients<br>(C) 9 stroke units, 951 patients | Actors: Multidisciplinary team<br>Actions: Site facilitation, workshops<br>Dose: 2 Face-to-face and site visits<br>Resources: Site champions, reminders (phone/email)  | Received abridged version of existing guidelines.  | Workshops addressed local barriers   |
| Panella 2012 <sup>25</sup><br>Hospital       | Not described                                | (I) 7 stroke units, 238 patients<br>(C) 7 stroke units, 238 patients   | Actors: Multidisciplinary team<br>Actions: Workshops, site facilitation<br>Dose: 3-day face-to-face training in quality improvement of clinical pathways<br>Resources: Evidence-based key intervention and indicator information.  | Usual care.  | Organizational adaptation of Clinical Pathways                               |
| Pennington <sup>26</sup><br>2005<br>Hospital | Diffusion of Innovation                      | (I) 8 SLP departments, 708 patients                                    | Actors: Speech and language pathologists<br>Actions: Workshops<br>Dose: Five-day face-to-face training on the critical appraisal of published research studies and practice guidelines and 2.5 days training on change management.   | 2.5 days face-to-face training on the critical appraisal of published research studies and practice guidelines.  | Choice of guideline implemented as per local action plan.                    |

| Author and Setting                                | Theoretical Framework   | Participants (n)   | Intervention Condition   | Control Condition   | Contextualization                              |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
|   |   | (C) 9 SLP departments, 762 patients  | Resources: nil   |   |  |
| Power 2014 <sup>27</sup><br>Hospital              | Quality Improvement Collaborative using 'model for Improvement'         | (I) 10 hospitals, 3533 patients<br>(C) 11 hospitals, 3059 patients                                 | Actors: Multidisciplinary team<br>Actions: Workshops, site facilitation (mentorship and opinion leader), weekly meeting and monthly review of progress<br>Dose: Four days face-to-face training<br>Resources: Web-based portal | Usual care.   | Local feasibility, reliability and evidence    |
| Ranta 2015 <sup>28</sup><br>Community             | Not described   | (I) 29 clinics, 119 patients<br>(C) 27 clinics, 192 patients)                                      | Actors: General medical practitioners<br>Actions: Workshops<br>Dose: one-day training in electronic support tools and one hour face-to-face didactic education session<br>Resources: Electronic reminders                      | One hour face-to-face didactic education session. Usual care  | Nil  |
| Strasser 2008 <sup>29</sup><br>Rehab              | Treatment, Implementation Delivery, Receipt and enactment (Lichenstein) | (I) 15 Medical centres, 227 staff, 439 patients<br>(C) 16 Medical centres, 237 staff, 350 patients | Actors: Multidisciplinary<br>Actions: Site facilitation, workshops, audit and feedback<br>Dose: 2.5-day face-to-face workshops,<br>Resources: nil  | Audit and feedback.   | Site specific performance with recommendations |
| Sulch 2000 <sup>30</sup><br>Rehab                 | Not described   | (I) 76 Patients<br>(C) 76 Patients   | Actors: Multidisciplinary team<br>Actions: Site facilitation (opinion leader), team meetings<br>Dose: over 3-months<br>Resources: nil  | Conventional multidisciplinary care                           |  |
| van Peppen, 2009 <sup>18</sup><br>Acute and rehab | Theories by Ajzen and Grol  | (I) 15 Clinicians<br>(C) 15 Clinicians   | Actors: Physical Therapists<br>Actions: Educational workshop facilitated by expert tutor<br>Dose: 5x2-hour sessions over 14 weeks<br>Resources: nil  | Actions: Educational workshop facilitated by non-expert tutor |  |

| Author and Setting                      | Theoretical Framework | Participants (n)   | Intervention Condition   | Control Condition | Contextualization                            |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|-------------------|--|
| Williams 2015 <sup>31</sup><br>Hospital | Not described         | (I) 6 hospitals,<br>1147 patients<br><br>(C) 6 hospitals,<br>1017 patients | Actors: Multidisciplinary team<br>Actions: Site facilitation (Mentorship), workshops, audit<br>and feedback<br>Dose: Face-to-face training sessions, monthly and quarterly<br>feedback<br>Resources: nil | Feedback only.    | Identification of<br>operational<br>barriers |

I=intervention, C= control


For Peer Review



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### PRISMA 2009 Flow Diagram



From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit [www.prisma-statement.org](http://www.prisma-statement.org).

Figure 1. Prisma flow chart of study screening

|                     | Random sequence generation (selection bias) | Allocation concealment (selection bias) | Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) | Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) | Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) | Selective reporting (reporting bias) | Other bias |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|------------|
| Allen 2009          | +   | +                                       | -   | +   | +  | ?                                    | +          |
| Bayleyetal 2018     | +   | +                                       | +   | +   | +  | +                                    | +          |
| Jones 1998          | +   | -                                       | -   | -   | -  | +                                    | +          |
| Jones 2005          | +   | +                                       | +   | -   | -  | +                                    | +          |
| Lakshminarayan 2010 | +   | +                                       | -   | +   | +  | +                                    | +          |
| Lynch 2015          | +   | +                                       | -   | +   | +  | +                                    | +          |
| McClusky 2013       | +   | +                                       | -   | +   | +  | +                                    | +          |
| Middleton 2011      | +   | +                                       | ?   | +   | +  | +                                    | +          |
| Panella 2012        | +   | ?                                       | -   | +   | +  | +                                    | +          |
| Pennington 2005     | +   | +                                       | -   | +   | +  | ?                                    | +          |
| Power 2014          | +   | +                                       | -   | +   | +  | -                                    | +          |
| Ranta 2015          | +   | ?                                       | -   | +   | ?  | +                                    | +          |
| Salbach 2017        | +   | +                                       | +   | +   | +  | +                                    | +          |
| Strasser 2008       | +   | ?                                       | ?   | -   | +  | +                                    | +          |
| Sulch 2000          | +   | +                                       | -   | ?   | +  | +                                    | +          |
| VanPeppen 2009      | +   | +                                       | ?   | ?   | +  | ?                                    | +          |
| Williams 2015       | +   | -                                       | ?   | +   | +  | +                                    | +          |

Figure 2. Risk of Bias of included studies

## APPENDIX 1 Search Strategy

## APPENDIX 1i: Search Strategy for EMBASE(OVID host) SEARCH SYNTAX

(([stroke] + [rehabilitation]) + [KT]) + ([education/modalities] or [outcomes])

## Concept: Stroke and Rehab

1. exp Stroke/ (181,703)
2. stroke\*.ti,ab. (347,912)
3. ((CVA or apoplexy or (cerebr\* or brain)) adj3 (infarct\* or stroke\* or accident\*)).ti,ab. (61,386)
4. 1 or 2 or 3 [stroke] (423,154)

## Concept: Rehabilitation

5. rh.fs. (143,528)
6. rehab\*.ti,ab. (211,333)
7. "physical and rehabilitation medicine".ti,ab. (495)
8. exp Rehabilitation/ or exp Physical Therapy Modalities/ (415,706)
9. ("physical therap\*" or physiotherap\* or "occupational therap\*" or "speech therap\*" or "speech patholog\*" or "language therap\*" or "language patholog\*" or "recreation\* therap\*" or "social worker\*" or nurs\* or dietic\* or physician\* or physiatrist\* or neurolog\*).ti,ab. (1,422,947)
10. Health Personnel/ or Allied Health Personnel/ or Community Health Workers/ or Dental Auxiliaries/ or Dental Assistants/ or Dental Hygienists/ or Dental Technicians/ or Denturists/ or Licensed Practical Nurses/ or Nurses' Aides/ or Physical Therapist Assistants/ or Audiologists/ or Caregivers/ or Dental Staff/ or Dental Staff, Hospital/ or Dentists/ or Faculty, Dental/ or Faculty, Medical/ or Faculty, Nursing/ or Health Educators/ or Medical Staff/ or Medical Staff, Hospital/ or Hospitalists/ or Nurses/ or Nursing Staff/ or Nutritionists/ or Occupational Therapists/ or Pharmacists/ or Physical Therapists/ or Physicians/ or General Practitioners/ or Geriatricians/ or Neurologists/ or Physiatrists/ or Physicians, Family/ or Nursing/ or Dietician/ or Social Work/ (932,961)
11. 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 [rehabilitation] (2,424,149)

## Concept: Knowledge Translation

12. (knowledge adj2 (application\* or apply or applies or applying or broke\* or creation or diffus\* or disseminat\* or exchang\* or implement\* or management or mobili\* or translat\* or transfer\* or uptak\* or utili\*)).ti,ab. (20,189)
13. (evidence\* adj2 (exchang\* or translat\* or transfer\* or diffus\* or disseminat\* or implement\* or management or mobil\* or uptak\* or utili\*)).ti,ab. (16,716)
14. ((KT or knowledge) adj2 (application\* or apply or applies or applying or broke\* or diffus\* or disseminat\* or decision\* or exchang\* or implement\* or intervent\* or mobili\* or plan\* or policy or policies or strateg\* or translat\* or transfer\* or uptak\* or utili\*)).ti,ab. (22,464)
15. (research\* adj2 (diffus\* or disseminat\* or exchang\* or transfer\* or translation\* or application\* or apply or applies or applying or implement\* or mobil\* or transfer\* or uptak\* or utili\*)).ti,ab. (35,968)
16. ("research findings into action" or "research to action" or "research into action" or "evidence to action" or "evidence to practice" or "evidence into practice").ti,ab. (14,650)
17. ("research utilis\*" or "research utiliz\*" and ("decision mak\*" or "decision-mak\*" or "policy mak\*" or "policy-mak\*" or "policy decision\*" or "health\* polic\*" or practice or action\*1)).ti,ab. (605)
17. Diffusion of Innovation/ or (diffusion adj2 innovation).ti,ab. (12,713)
19. (leader\* adj1 (opinion or educat\* or influen\*)).ti,ab. (2,736)
20. (("systematic review\*" or "knowledge synthes\*") adj5 ("decision mak\*" or "policy mak\*" or "policy decision\*" or "health polic\*")).ti,ab. (510)

- 1  
2  
3 21. (("systematic review\*" or "knowledge syntheses\*") adj2 (application\* or implement\* or  
4 utili\*ation or utilize\* or utilise\* or utili\*ing)).ti,ab. (421)  
5 22. "research utili\*ation".ti,ab. (672)  
6 23. ("evidence base\*" or "evidence inform\*") adj5 (decision\* or plan\* or policy or policies or  
7 practice or action\*).ti,ab. (26,307)  
8 24. ("decision support system\*" or reminder\* or "multidisciplinary team\*" or researcher-  
9 clinician\* or mentor\* or "opinion leader\*").ti,ab. (68,523)  
10 25. Decision Support Systems/ or Decision Support Techniques/ or Mentor/ or Leadership/  
11 or Reminder System/ (78,987)  
12 26. 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 [KT]  
13 (245,821)  
14

15  
16 Concept: Education/ Modalities

- 17 27. (educat\* adj2 (continuing or nurs\* or physician\* or professional or medical)).ti,ab.  
18 (95,755)  
19 28. Clinical Protocols/ or Clinical Practice/ or Pamphlets/ or Audiovisual Aids/ or Manuals as  
20 Topic/ or Inservice Training/ or Health Education/ or Consumer Health Information/ or Patient  
21 Education/ (835,546)  
22 29. (class\* or workshop\* or "audiovisual aid\*" or "inservice training" or leaflets).ti,ab.  
23 (1,664,745)  
24 30. 27 or 28 or 29 or 30 [education/modalities] (2,529,813)

25 Concept: Outcomes

- 26 31. Health Knowledge, Attitudes, Practice/ or Practice Guidelines as Topic/ or "Attitude of  
27 Health Personnel"/ or Patient Care/ or Patient Care Planning/ or Guideline Adherence/  
28 (664,483)  
29 32. ((clinic\* or practice) adj3 (behavio\*r\* or attitude\* or knowledge or pathway or  
30 guideline\*)).ti,ab. (123,922)  
31 33. (patient or health) adj2 ("care planning").ti,ab. (1,257)  
32 34. 31 or 32 or 33 [outcomes] (754,605)  
33  
34

35 RESULTS

- 36 35. 4 and 11 [stroke and rehabilitation] (111,649)  
37 36. 35 and 26 [stroke and rehabilitation] and [KT] (2,544)  
38 37. 30 or 34 [education/modalities] or [outcomes] (3,111,092)  
39 38. 36 and 37 {[stroke and rehabilitation] and [KT]} and {[education/modalities] or  
40 [outcomes]} (1,204)  
41 39. Limit 38 to (English language and yr="1980-current") (1,171)  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 APPENDIX 1ii: Search Strategy for MEDLINE (OVID host) SEARCH SYNTAX

47 Search Strategy:

48 ({[stroke] + [rehabilitation]} + [KT]) + ([education/modalities] or [outcomes])  
49  
50

51 Concept: Stroke and Rehab

- 52 1. exp Stroke/ (120,092)  
53 2. stroke\*.ti,ab. (221,369)  
54 3. ((CVA or apoplexy or (cerebr\* or brain)) adj3 (infarct\* or stroke\* or accident\*)).ti,ab.  
55 (41,917)  
56 4. 1 or 2 or 3 [stroke] (268,336)  
57

58 Concept: Rehabilitation

- 59 5. rh.fs. (188,649)  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21
6. rehab\*.ti,ab. (151,032)
  7. "physical and rehabilitation medicine".ti,ab. (336)
  8. exp Rehabilitation/ or exp Physical Therapy Modalities/ (288,786)
  9. ("physical therap\*" or physiotherap\* or "occupational therap\*" or "speech therap\*" or "speech patholog\*" or "language therap\*" or "language patholog\*" or "recreation\* therap\*" or "social worker\*" or nurs\* or dietic\* or physician\* or physiatrist\* or neurolog\*).ti,ab. (1,099,853)
  10. Health Personnel/ or Allied Health Personnel/ or Community Health Workers/ or Dental Auxiliaries/ or Dental Assistants/ or Dental Hygienists/ or Dental Technicians/ or Denturists/ or Licensed Practical Nurses/ or Nurses' Aides/ or Physical Therapist Assistants/ or Audiologists/ or Caregivers/ or Dental Staff/ or Dental Staff, Hospital/ or Dentists/ or Faculty, Dental/ or Faculty, Medical/ or Faculty, Nursing/ or Health Educators/ or Medical Staff/ or Medical Staff, Hospital/ or Hospitalists/ or Nurses/ or Nursing Staff/ or Nutritionists/ or Occupational Therapists/ or Pharmacists/ or Physical Therapists/ or Physicians/ or General Practitioners/ or Geriatricians/ or Neurologists/ or Physiatrists/ or Physicians, Family/ or Nursing/ or Dietician/ or Social Work/ (391,897)
  11. 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 [rehabilitation] (1,752,670)

22  
23

#### Concept: Knowledge Translation

- 24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56
12. (knowledge adj2 (application\* or apply or applies or applying or broke\* or creation or diffus\* or disseminat\* or exchang\* or implement\* or management or mobili\* or translat\* or transfer\* or uptak\* or utili\*)).ti,ab. (15,257)
  13. (evidence\* adj2 (exchang\* or translat\* or transfer\* or diffus\* or disseminat\* or implement\* or management or mobil\* or uptak\* or utili\*)).ti,ab. (13,007)
  14. ((KT or knowledge) adj2 (application\* or apply or applies or applying or broke\* or diffus\* or disseminat\* or decision\* or exchang\* or implement\* or intervent\* or mobili\* or plan\* or policy or policies or strateg\* or translat\* or transfer\* or uptak\* or utili\*)).ti,ab. (17,224)
  15. (research\* adj2 (diffus\* or disseminat\* or exchang\* or transfer\* or translation\* or application\* or apply or applies or applying or implement\* or mobil\* or transfer\* or uptak\* or utili\*)).ti,ab. (28,213)
  16. ("research findings into action" or "research to action" or "research into action" or "evidence to action" or "evidence to practice" or "evidence into practice").ti,ab. (11,865)
  17. ("research utilis\*" or "research utiliz\*" and ("decision mak\*" or "decision-mak\*" or "policy mak\*" or "policy-mak\*" or "policy decision\*" or "health\* polic\*" or practice or action\*1)).ti,ab. (571)
  18. Diffusion of Innovation/ or (diffusion adj2 innovation).ti,ab. (17,110)
  19. (leader\* adj1 (opinion or educat\* or influen\*)).ti,ab. (2,166)
  20. (("systematic review\*" or "knowledge synthes\*") adj5 ("decision mak\*" or "policy mak\*" or "policy decision\*" or "health polic\*")).ti,ab. (383)
  21. (("systematic review\*" or "knowledge synthes\*") adj2 (application\* or implement\* or utili\*ation or utilize\* or utilise\* or utili\*ing)).ti,ab. (345)
  22. "research utili\*ation".ti,ab. (683)
  23. ("evidence base\*" or "evidence inform\*") adj5 (decision\* or plan\* or policy or policies or practice or action\*).ti,ab. (21,155)
  24. ("decision support system\*" or reminder\* or "multidisciplinary team\*" or researcher-clinician\* or mentor\* or "opinion leader\*").ti,ab. (45,403)
  25. Decision Support Systems/ or Decision Support Techniques/ or Mentor/ or Leadership/ or Reminder System/ (68,826)
  26. 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 [KT] (196,401)

57

#### Concept: Education/ Modalities

- 58  
59  
60
27. (educat\* adj2 (continuing or nurs\* or physician\* or professional or medical)).ti,ab. (85,323)

- 1  
2  
3 28. Clinical Protocols/ or Clinical Practice/ or Pamphlets/ or Audiovisual Aids/ or Manuals as  
4 Topic/ or Inservice Training/ or Health Education/ or Consumer Health Information/ or Patient  
5 Education as Topic/ or Teach-Back Communication/ (195,717)  
6 29. (class\* or workshop\* or "audiovisual aid\*" or "inservice training" or leaflets).ti,ab.  
7 (1,288,304)  
8 30. 27 or 28 or 29 [education/modalities] (1,550,262)  
9

10 Concept: Outcomes

- 11 31. Health Knowledge, Attitudes, Practice/ or Practice Guidelines as Topic/ or "Attitude of  
12 Health Personnel"/ or Patient Care/ or Patient Care Planning/ or Guideline Adherence/  
13 (366,943)  
14 32. ((clinic\* or practice) adj3 (behavio\* or attitude\* or knowledge or pathway or  
15 guideline\*)).ti,ab. (88,398)  
16 33. (patient or health) adj2 ("care planning").ti,ab. (967)  
17 34. 31 or 32 or 33 [outcomes] (432,339)  
18  
19

20 Results

- 21 35. 4 and 11 [stroke and rehabilitation] (62,884)  
22 36. 35 and 26 [stroke and rehabilitation] and [KT] (1,114)  
23 37. 30 or 34 [education/modalities] or [outcomes] (1,916,360)  
24 38. 36 and 37 {[stroke and rehabilitation] and [KT]} and {[education/modalities] or  
25 [outcomes]} (422)  
26 39. limit 38 to (English language and yr="1980-current")(407)  
27  
28  
29

30 APPENDIX 1iii: Search Strategy for CINAHL (EBSCOhost)

31 Concept: Stroke and Rehabilitation

- 32  
33 S1 (MH "Stroke+") (59,623)  
34  
35 S2 stroke (98,475)  
36  
37 S3 cerebral infarct\* or brain infarct\* (5,003)  
38  
39 S4 brain accident\* or cerebral accident\* (527)  
40  
41 S5 cerebral vascular accident or CVA (937)  
42  
43 S6 S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 OR S5 [stroke] (101,044)  
44  
45 S7 occupational therap\* (39,496)  
46  
47 S8 physical therap\* or physiotherap\* (69,155)  
48  
49 S9 speech language patholog\* (13,534)  
50  
51 S10 speech language therap\* (2,641)  
52  
53 S11 neurolog\* (68,450)  
54  
55 S12 physician\* (08,011)  
56  
57 S13 physiatrist\* (636)  
58  
59 S14 nurs\* (818,719)  
60  
61 S15 rehab\* (160,639)

1  
2  
3 S16 (MH "Occupational Therapy+") OR (MH "Rehabilitation+") OR (MH "Physical  
4 Therapy+") OR (MH "Neurology+") OR (MH "Physiatry+") OR (MH "Nursing+") OR (MH  
5 "Recreational Therapy+") OR (MH "Social Work+") (269,197)  
6

7 Concept: Knowledge Translation

8  
9 S17 knowledge mediation or knowledge transfer or knowledge exchange or knowledge  
10 uptake or knowledge translat\* or knowledge mobili?\* (4,734)

11  
12 S18 research mediation or research transfer or research translat\* or research exchange or  
13 research uptake (6,332)

14 S19 (MH "Diffusion of Innovation") (12,042)

15  
16 S20 (MH "Selective Dissemination of Information") (39)

17  
18 S21 (MH "Professional Practice, Evidence-Based+") (69,427)

19  
20 S22 (MH "Information Management+") OR (MH "Knowledge Management+") (10,968)

21  
22 S23 S17 OR S18 OR S19 OR S20 OR S21 OR S22 [KT] (98,194)

23 Concept: Intervention Modalities

24  
25 S24 workshop\* (23,237)

26  
27 S25 (MH "Information Resources+") (418,381)

28  
29 S26 inservice\* (846)

30  
31 S27 (MH "Education, Non-Traditional+") (9,029)

32  
33 S28 (MH "Audiovisuals+") (102,400)

34  
35 S29 (MH "Seminars and Workshops+") (14,644)

36  
37 S30 (MH "Education, Continuing+") (30,553)

38  
39 S31 (MH "Professional Practice+") (253,482)

40  
41 S32 S24 OR S25 OR S26 OR S27 OR S28 OR S29 OR S30 OR S31 [modalities] (687,657)

42 Concept: Outcomes

43  
44 S33 clinician\* behavio?r\* or clinician\* attitude\* or clinician\* knowledge (1,969)

45  
46 S34 practice behavio?r\* or practice attitude\* or practice knowledge (17,107)

47  
48 S35 (MH "Attitude of Health Personnel+") (82,040)

49  
50 S36 (MH "Professional Knowledge+") OR (MH "Health Knowledge+") (41,459)

51  
52 S37 (MM "Practice Guidelines") (25,062)

53  
54 S38 (MM "Guideline Adherence") (5,687)

55  
56 S39 (MM "Critical Path") (2,938)

57  
58 S40 (MM "Patient Care Plans") (2,193)

59  
60 S41 S33 OR S34 OR S35 OR S36 OR S37 OR S38 OR S39 OR S40 [outcomes] (163,466)

S42 S7 OR S8 OR S9 OR S10 OR S11 OR S12 OR S13 OR S14 OR S15 OR S16 [rehab]  
(1,398,831)

Results

S43 S6 AND S42 {stroke and rehabilitation} (32,725)

S44 S23 AND S43 [{stroke and rehabilitation} and KT] (995)

S45 S32 OR S41 [outcomes or modalities] (803,804)

S46 S44 AND S45 stroke and rehabilitation} and KT and [outcomes or modalities] (911)

S46 limit to english language (870)

#### APPENDIX 1iv: Search Strategy for COCHRANE CENTRAL (OVID host) SEARCH SYNTAX

##### Search Strategy:

(([stroke] + [rehabilitation]) + [KT]) + ([education/modalities] or [outcomes])

##### Concept: Stroke and Rehab

1. exp Stroke/ (7,829)

2. stroke\*.ti,ab. (36,925)

3. ((CVA or apoplexy or (cerebr\* or brain)) adj3 (infarct\* or stroke\* or accident\*)).ti,ab. (4,449)

4. 1 or 2 or 3 [stroke] (39,933)

##### Concept: Rehabilitation

5. rh.fs. (16,542)

6. rehab\*.ti,ab. (22,092)

7. "physical and rehabilitation medicine".ti,ab. (22)

8. exp Rehabilitation/ or exp Physical Therapy Modalities/ (31,597)

9. ("physical therap\*" or physiotherap\* or "occupational therap\*" or "speech therap\*" or "speech patholog\*" or "language therap\*" or "language patholog\*" or "recreation\* therap\*" or "social worker\*" or nurs\* or dietic\* or physician\* or physiatrist\* or neurolog\*).ti,ab. (69,173)

10. Health Personnel/ or Allied Health Personnel/ or Community Health Workers/ or Dental Auxiliaries/ or Dental Assistants/ or Dental Hygienists/ or Dental Technicians/ or Denturists/ or Licensed Practical Nurses/ or Nurses' Aides/ or Physical Therapist Assistants/ or Audiologists/ or Caregivers/ or Dental Staff/ or Dental Staff, Hospital/ or Dentists/ or Faculty, Dental/ or Faculty, Medical/ or Faculty, Nursing/ or Health Educators/ or Medical Staff/ or Medical Staff, Hospital/ or Hospitalists/ or Nurses/ or Nursing Staff/ or Nutritionists/ or Occupational Therapists/ or Pharmacists/ or Physical Therapists/ or Physicians/ or General Practitioners/ or Geriatricians/ or Neurologists/ or Physiatrists/ or Physicians, Family/ or Nursing/ or Dietician/ or Social Work/ (6,405)

11. 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 [rehabilitation] (117,874)

##### Concept: Knowledge Translation

12. (knowledge adj2 (application\* or apply or applies or applying or broke\* or creation or diffus\* or disseminat\* or exchang\* or implement\* or management or mobili\* or translat\* or transfer\* or uptak\* or utili\*)).ti,ab. (1,124)

13. (evidence\* adj2 (exchang\* or translat\* or transfer\* or diffus\* or disseminat\* or implement\* or management or mobil\* or uptak\* or utili\*)).ti,ab. (1,750)

14. ((KT or knowledge) adj2 (application\* or apply or applies or applying or broke\* or diffus\* or disseminat\* or decision\* or exchang\* or implement\* or intervent\* or mobili\* or plan\* or policy or policies or strateg\* or translat\* or transfer\* or uptak\* or utili\*)).ti,ab. (2,208)



- 1  
2  
3 15. (research\* adj2 (diffus\* or disseminat\* or exchang\* or transfer\* or translation\* or  
4 application\* or apply or applies or applying or implement\* or mobil\* or transfer\* or uptak\* or  
5 utili\*)),ti,ab. (2, 055)  
6 16. ("research findings into action" or "research to action" or "research into action" or  
7 "evidence to action" or "evidence to practice" or "evidence into practice").ti,ab. (183)  
8 17. ("research utilis\*" or "research utiliz\*" and ("decision mak\*" or "decision-mak\*" or "policy  
9 mak\*" or "policy-mak\*" or "policy decision\*" or "health\* polic\*" or practice or action\*1)).ti,ab.  
10 (23)  
11 18. Diffusion of Innovation/ or (diffusion adj2 innovation).ti,ab. (148)  
12 19. (leader\* adj1 (opinion or educat\* or influen\*)).ti,ab. (189)  
13 20. (("systematic review\*" or "knowledge synthes\*") adj5 ("decision mak\*" or "policy mak\*" or  
14 "policy decision\*" or "health polic\*")).ti,ab. (15)  
15 21. (("systematic review\*" or "knowledge synthes\*") adj2 (application\* or implement\* or  
16 utili\*ation or utilize\* or utilise\* or utili\*ing)).ti,ab. (10)  
17 22. "research utili\*ation".ti,ab. (21)  
18 23. ("evidence base\*" or "evidence inform\*") adj5 (decision\* or plan\* or policy or policies or  
19 practice or action\*).ti,ab. (1,237)  
20 24. ("decision support system\*" or reminder\* or "multidisciplinary team\*" or researcher-  
21 clinician\* or mentor\* or "opinion leader\*").ti,ab. (5,031)  
22 25. Decision Support Systems/ or Decision Support Techniques/ or Mentor/ or Leadership/  
23 or Reminder System/ (1,887)  
24 26. 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 [KT]  
25 (13,069)  
26  
27

28 Concept: Education/ Modalities

- 29 27. (educat\* adj2 (continuing or nurs\* or physician\* or professional or medical)).ti,ab. (2,903)  
30 28. Clinical Protocols/ or Clinical Practice/ or Pamphlets/ or Audiovisual Aids/ or Manuals as  
31 Topic/ or Inservice Training/ or Health Education/ or Consumer Health Information/ or Patient  
32 Education as Topic/ or Teach-Back Communication/ (17,093)  
33 29. (class\* or workshop\* or "audiovisual aid\*" or "inservice training" or leaflets).ti,ab. (49,481)  
34 30. 27 or 28 or 29 or 30 [education/modalities] (67,442)  
35  
36

37 Concept: Outcomes

- 38 31. Health Knowledge, Attitudes, Practice/ or Practice Guidelines as Topic/ or "Attitude of  
39 Health Personnel"/ or Patient Care/ or Patient Care Planning/ or Guideline Adherence/  
40 (9,397)  
41 32. ((clinic\* or practice) adj3 (behavio\* or attitude\* or knowledge or pathway or  
42 guideline\*)).ti,ab. (7,106)  
43 33. (patient or health) adj2 ("care planning").ti,ab. (37)  
44 34. 31 or 32 or 33 [outcomes] (15,700)  
45  
46

47 Results

- 48 35. 4 and 11 [stroke and rehabilitation] (9,985)  
49 36. 35 and 26 [stroke and rehabilitation] and [KT] (209)  
50 37. 30 or 34 [education/modalities] or [outcomes] (78,229)  
51 38. 36 and 37 {[stroke and rehabilitation] and [KT]} and {[education/modalities] or  
52 [outcomes]} (69)  
53 39. limit 38 to (English language and yr="1980-current")(52)  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## APPENDIX 2:

## Screening Tool - Inclusion criteria checklist for reviewing full text articles

|  |   |
|--|---|
| First Author/ year:  | Reviewer:   |
| Study Objectives:  |   |
| Study Inclusion/ Exclusion Criteria:   |   |
| Type of Study Design: Is the study design an RCT?<br>Comments:   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes<br><input type="checkbox"/> No                                       |
| Type of Clinician: Does the study include ANY of the following professionals working in the field of STROKE patient care at any stage in the continuum of patient care? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Physical Therapist</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Occupational Therapist</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Nurse</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Physiatrist</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Physician</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Speech Language Pathologist</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Dietician</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Social Work</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Neurologist</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Recreation therapist</li> </ul> Comments:  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes<br><input type="checkbox"/> No<br><input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain |
| Type of Setting: Does the study take place in ANY of the following locations or settings? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Inpatient (acute, sub-acute, long term care)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Outpatient (private/ public/ community)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitation Centre</li> </ul> Comments:  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes<br><input type="checkbox"/> No<br><input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain |
| Type of Intervention: Does the study include the implementation of a KT intervention including ALL of the following objectives? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The intervention targets clinicians (as defined above)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The intervention is a Professional Intervention and/ or Organizational Intervention defined by the EPOC Taxonomy</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The intervention modality includes one or more of the following: education session, lecture, workshop, in-service, manual, pamphlets/ information package, or computer/ audiovisual format/or reminder or multidisciplinary team or clinical or patient decision tool or researcher-clinician intervention or local opinion leader or audit or consensus process or case discussion or mentoring or</li> </ul> Comments: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes<br><input type="checkbox"/> No<br><input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Type of Outcome Measure: Does the study report quantitative or qualitative assessed change in ANY of the following outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Clinician practice behavior</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Clinician adherence to practice guidelines</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Clinician knowledge of or attitudes to practice standards</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Clinician use of evidence in practice</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Clinician use of evidence in policy making</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Clinician practice competency</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Patient outcomes</li> </ul> <p>Comments:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> No</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain</li> </ul> |
| <p>Other: Does the paper comply with ALL of the following criteria?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Original article written in English</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Peer-reviewed article</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Published between 1980 to current</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Study included n &gt; 5 at study completion</li> </ul> <p>Comments:</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> No</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain</li> </ul> |
| <p>Total number of questions answered "yes":</p>   | <p>/6</p>   |
| <p><b>Selection Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Exclude study (Answered "no" to one or more of the above six questions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Include study as background information (Answered "no" to one or more of the above six questions; however, provides relevant information for study background and rationale)</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Include study for systematic review (Answered "yes" to all of the above six questions)</li> </ul>  |   |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review