

Supplementary File A: The AMSTAR Criteria

1. Was an 'a priori' design provided? The research question and inclusion criteria should be established before the conduct of the review.
2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction? There should be at least two independent data extractors and a consensus procedure for disagreements should be in place.
3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed? At least two electronic sources should be searched. The report must include years and databases used (e.g. Central, EMBASE, and MEDLINE). Key words and/or MESH terms must be stated and where feasible the search strategy should be provided. All searches should be supplemented by consulting current contents, reviews, textbooks, specialized registers, or experts in the particular field of study, and by reviewing the references in the studies found.
4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion? The authors should state that they searched for reports regardless of their publication type. The authors should state whether or not they excluded any reports (from the systematic review), based on their publication status, language etc.
5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided? A list of included and excluded studies should be provided.
6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided? In an aggregated form such as a table, data from the original studies should be provided on the participants, interventions and outcomes. The ranges of characteristics in all the studies analysed e.g. age, race, sex, relevant socioeconomic data, disease status, duration, severity, or other diseases should be reported.
7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented? 'A priori' methods of assessment should be provided (e.g., for effectiveness studies if the author(s) chose to include only randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled studies, or allocation concealment as inclusion criteria); for other types of studies alternative items will be relevant.
8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions? The results of the methodological rigor and scientific quality should be considered in the analysis and the conclusions of the review, and explicitly stated in formulating recommendations.
9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate? For the pooled results, a test should be done to ensure the studies were combinable, to assess their homogeneity (i.e. Chi-squared test for homogeneity, I ²). If heterogeneity exists a random effects model should be used and/or the clinical appropriateness of combining should be taken into consideration (i.e. is it sensible to combine?).
10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed? An assessment of publication bias should include a combination of graphical aids (e.g., funnel plot, other available tests) and/or statistical tests (e.g., Egger regression test).
11. Was the conflict of interest stated? Potential sources of support should be clearly acknowledged in both the systematic review and the included studies.

The AMSTAR criteria, adapted from [1]

Study	1. Was an 'a priori' design provided?	2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?	3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed?	4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?	9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?	10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	11. Was the conflict of interest stated?	Total
Anderson 1996[2]	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	No	3
Arditi 2012[3]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	11
Austin 1994[4]	Yes	Unclear	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	3
Baker 2015[5]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	11
Balas 1996[6]	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	6
Balas 2000[7]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	8
Bauer 2002[8]	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Not Applicable	Yes	No	No	3
Beilby 1997[9]	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	5
Blackwood 2014[10]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	11
Boren 2009[11]	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	4
Brennan 2013[12]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	7
Bright 2012[13]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8
Brody 2013[14]	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	4
Bryan 2008[15]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8
Buntinx 1993[16]	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	No	No	3
Chaillet 2006[17]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	7
Chhina 2013[18]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	7
Clarke 2010[19]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	8
Damiani 2010[20]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	9
Davey 2013[21]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	11
Davis 1995[22]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8
Delpierre 2004[23]	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	4
Dexheimer 2008[24]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	8

Study	1. Was an 'a priori' design provided?	2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?	3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed?	4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?	9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?	10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	11. Was the conflict of interest stated?	Total
Dexheimer 2014[25]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	8
EHC 1994[26]	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	5
Figueras 2001[27]	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	6
Fleming 2013[28]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	7
Flodgren 2010[29]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	10
Flodgren 2011[30]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	10
Flodgren 2013[31]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	11
Forsetlund 2009 [32]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	11
Forsetlund 2011[33]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8
Frampton 2014[34]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	11
French 2010[35]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	10
Garg 2005[36]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	7
Giguere 2012[37]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	10
Gilbody 2003[38]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	5
Goodwin 2011[39]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	7
Grimshaw 2004[40]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
Gross 2001[41]	Yes	Unclear	No	No	No	No	No	No	Unclear	No	No	1
Hakkennes 2008[42]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8
Heselmans 2009[43]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8
Ivers 2012[44]	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
Kahn 2013[45]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	11
Kastner 2008[46]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	7
Loganathan	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8

Study	1. Was an 'a priori' design provided?	2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?	3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed?	4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?	9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?	10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	11. Was the conflict of interest stated?	Total
2011[47]												
Mandelblatt 1995[48]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	4
McGowan 2009[49]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	10
Medves 2010[50]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	5
O'Brien 2007[51]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	10
Oxman 1995[52]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	8
Perry 2011[53]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8
Randell 2007[54]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	8
Robertson 2010[55]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8
Safdar 2008[56]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	7
Schedlbauer 2009[57]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	8
Shea 1996[58]	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Shiffman 1999[59]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7
Shojania 2009[60]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	10
Siddiqui 2011[61]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	9
Steinman 2006[62]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	7
Tan 2005[63]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	11
Thomas 1999[64]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	10
Tinmouth 2005[65]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	5
Wensing 1998[66]	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	7
Worrall 1997[67]	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	6
Wutoh 2004[68]	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	5

1. Shea BJ, Grimshaw JM, Wells GA, et al. Development of AMSTAR: a measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2007;7:10 doi: 1471-2288-7-10 [pii] 10.1186/1471-2288-7-10[published Online First: Epub Date]].
2. Anderson GM, Lexchin J. Strategies for improving prescribing practice. *CMAJ Canadian Medical Association Journal* 1996;154(7):1013-7
3. Arditi C, Rège-Walther M, Wyatt Jeremy C, et al. Computer-generated reminders delivered on paper to healthcare professionals; effects on professional practice and health care outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2012; (12). <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD001175.pub3/abstract>.
4. Austin SM, Balas EA, Mitchell JA, et al. Effect of physician reminders on preventive care: meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Proc Annu Symp Comput Appl Med Care* 1994:121-4
5. Baker R, Camosso-Stefinovic J, Gillies C, et al. Tailored interventions to address determinants of practice. *The Cochrane Database Of Systematic Reviews* 2015;4:CD005470 doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD005470.pub3[published Online First: Epub Date]].
6. Balas EA, Austin SM, Mitchell JA, et al. The clinical value of computerized information services. A review of 98 randomized clinical trials. *Archives of Family Medicine* 1996;5(5):271-8
7. Balas EA, Weingarten S, Garb CT, et al. Improving preventive care by prompting physicians. *Archives Of Internal Medicine* 2000;160(3):301-08
8. Bauer MS. A review of quantitative studies of adherence to mental health clinical practice guidelines. *Harv Rev Psychiatry* 2002;10(3):138-53
9. Beilby JJ, Silagy CA. Trials of providing costing information to general practitioners: a systematic review. *The Medical Journal Of Australia* 1997;167(2):89-92
10. Blackwood B, Burns Karen EA, Cardwell Chris R, et al. Protocolized versus non-protocolized weaning for reducing the duration of mechanical ventilation in critically ill adult patients. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2014; (11). <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD006904.pub3/abstract>.
11. Boren SA, Puchbauer AM, Williams F. Computerized prompting and feedback of diabetes care: a review of the literature. *Journal Of Diabetes Science And Technology* 2009;3(4):944-50
12. Brennan N, Mattick K. A systematic review of educational interventions to change behaviour of prescribers in hospital settings, with a particular emphasis on new prescribers. *British Journal Of Clinical Pharmacology* 2013;75(2):359-72 doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2125.2012.04397.x[published Online First: Epub Date]].

13. Bright TJ, Wong A, Dhurjati R, et al. Effect of clinical decision-support systems: A systematic review. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2012;157 (1):29-43
14. Brody AA, Galvin JE. A review of interprofessional dissemination and education interventions for recognizing and managing dementia. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education* 2013;34(3):225-56 doi: 10.1080/02701960.2013.801342[published Online First: Epub Date]].
15. Bryan C, Boren SA. The use and effectiveness of electronic clinical decision support tools in the ambulatory/primary care setting: a systematic review of the literature. *Informatics in Primary Care* 2008;16(2):79-91
16. Buntinx F, Winkens R, Grol R, et al. Influencing diagnostic and preventive performance in ambulatory care by feedback and reminders. A review. *Family Practice* 1993;10(2):219-28
17. Chaillet N, Dubé E, Dugas M, et al. Evidence-based strategies for implementing guidelines in obstetrics: a systematic review. *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 2006;108(5):1234-45
18. Chhina HK, Bhole VM, Goldsmith C, et al. Effectiveness of academic detailing to optimize medication prescribing behaviour of family physicians. *Journal Of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences: A Publication Of The Canadian Society For Pharmaceutical Sciences, Société Canadienne Des Sciences Pharmaceutiques* 2013;16(4):511-29
19. Clarke A, Blundell N, Forde I, et al. Can guidelines improve referral to elective surgical specialties for adults? A systematic review. *Quality & Safety In Health Care* 2010;19(3):187-94 doi: 10.1136/qshc.2008.029918[published Online First: Epub Date]].
20. Damiani G, Pinnarelli L, Colosimo SC, et al. The effectiveness of computerized clinical guidelines in the process of care: a systematic review. *BMC Health Services Research* 2010;10:2
21. Davey P, Brown E, Charani E, et al. Interventions to improve antibiotic prescribing practices for hospital inpatients. *The Cochrane Database Of Systematic Reviews* 2013;4:CD003543 doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD003543.pub3[published Online First: Epub Date]].
22. Davis DA, Thomson MA, Oxman AD, et al. Changing physician performance. A systematic review of the effect of continuing medical education strategies. *JAMA* 1995;274(9):700-05
23. Delpierre C, Cuzin L, Fillaux J, et al. A systematic review of computer-based patient record systems and quality of care: more randomized clinical trials or a broader approach? *International Journal For Quality In Health Care: Journal Of The International Society For Quality In Health Care / Isqua* 2004;16(5):407-16
24. Dexheimer JW, Talbot TR, Sanders DL, et al. Prompting clinicians about preventive care measures: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Journal Of The American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA* 2008;15(3):311-20 doi: 10.1197/jamia.M2555[published Online First: Epub Date]].
25. Dexheimer JW, Borycki EM, Chiu K-W, et al. A systematic review of the implementation and impact of asthma protocols. *BMC Medical Informatics And Decision Making* 2014;14:82-82 doi: 10.1186/1472-6947-14-82[published Online First: Epub Date]].
26. Dissemination NCFRa. Can guidelines be used to improve clinical practice? *Effective Health Care* 1994;1(8):1-12

27. Figueiras A, Sastre I, Gestal-Otero JJ. Effectiveness of educational interventions on the improvement of drug prescription in primary care: a critical literature review. *Journal Of Evaluation In Clinical Practice* 2001;7(2):223-41
28. Fleming A, Browne J, Byrne S. The effect of interventions to reduce potentially inappropriate antibiotic prescribing in long-term care facilities: a systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *Drugs & Aging* 2013;30(6):401-08 doi: 10.1007/s40266-013-0066-z[published Online First: Epub Date]].
29. Flodgren G, Deane K, Dickinson HO, et al. Interventions to change the behaviour of health professionals and the organisation of care to promote weight reduction in overweight and obese people. *The Cochrane Database Of Systematic Reviews* 2010(3):CD000984 doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD000984.pub2[published Online First: Epub Date]].
30. Flodgren G, Parmelli E, Doumit G, et al. Local opinion leaders: effects on professional practice and health care outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2011(8)
31. Flodgren G, Conterno LO, Mayhew A, et al. Interventions to improve professional adherence to guidelines for prevention of device-related infections. *The Cochrane Database Of Systematic Reviews* 2013;3:CD006559 doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006559.pub2[published Online First: Epub Date]].
32. Forsetlund L, Bjørndal A, Rashidian A, et al. Continuing education meetings and workshops: effects on professional practice and health care outcomes. *The Cochrane Database Of Systematic Reviews* 2009(2):CD003030 doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD003030.pub2[published Online First: Epub Date]].
33. Forsetlund L, Eike MC, Gjerberg E, et al. Effect of interventions to reduce potentially inappropriate use of drugs in nursing homes: a systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *BMC Geriatrics* 2011;11:16-16 doi: 10.1186/1471-2318-11-16[published Online First: Epub Date]].
34. Frampton GK, Harris P, Cooper K, et al. Educational interventions for preventing vascular catheter bloodstream infections in critical care: evidence map, systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technology Assessment (Winchester, England)* 2014;18(15):1-365 doi: 10.3310/hta18150[published Online First: Epub Date]].
35. French SD, Green S, Buchbinder R, et al. Interventions for improving the appropriate use of imaging in people with musculoskeletal conditions. *The Cochrane Database Of Systematic Reviews* 2010(1):CD006094 doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006094.pub2[published Online First: Epub Date]].
36. Garg AX, Adhikari NK, McDonald H, et al. Effects of computerized clinical decision support systems on practitioner performance and patient outcomes: a systematic review. *JAMA* 2005;293(10):1223-38 doi: 10.1001/jama.293.10.1223[published Online First: Epub Date]].
37. Giguère A, Légaré F, Grimshaw J, et al. Printed educational materials: effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2012(10)
38. Gilbody S, Whitty P, Grimshaw J, et al. Educational and organizational interventions to improve the management of depression in primary care: a systematic review. *JAMA* 2003;289(23):3145-51
39. Goodwin V, Jones-Hughes T, Thompson-Coon J, et al. Implementing the evidence for preventing falls among community-dwelling older people: a systematic review. *Journal of Safety Research* 2011;42(6):443-51

40. Grimshaw JM, Thomas RE, MacLennan G, et al. Effectiveness and efficiency of guideline dissemination and implementation strategies. *Health Technol Assess* 2004;8(6):iii-iv, 1-72 doi: 94-08-29 [pii][published Online First: Epub Date]].
41. Gross PA, Pujat D. Implementing practice guidelines for appropriate antimicrobial usage: a systematic review. *Medical Care* 2001;39(8 Suppl 2):II55-II69
42. Hakkennes S, Dodd K. Guideline implementation in allied health professions: a systematic review of the literature. *Quality & Safety In Health Care* 2008;17(4):296-300 doi: 10.1136/qshc.2007.023804[published Online First: Epub Date]].
43. Heselmans A, Donceel P, Aertgeerts B, et al. Effectiveness of electronic guideline-based implementation systems in ambulatory care settings - a systematic review. *Implementation Science* 2009;4:82-82 doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-4-82[published Online First: Epub Date]].
44. Ivers N, Jamtvedt G, Flottorp S, et al. Audit and feedback: effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2012; (6).
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD000259.pub3/abstract>.
45. Kahn SR, Morrison DR, Cohen JM, et al. Interventions for implementation of thromboprophylaxis in hospitalized medical and surgical patients at risk for venous thromboembolism. *The Cochrane Database Of Systematic Reviews* 2013;7:CD008201 doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD008201.pub2[published Online First: Epub Date]].
46. Kastner M, Straus SE. Clinical decision support tools for osteoporosis disease management: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Journal Of General Internal Medicine* 2008;23(12):2095-105 doi: 10.1007/s11606-008-0812-9[published Online First: Epub Date]].
47. Loganathan M, Singh S, Franklin BD, et al. Interventions to optimise prescribing in care homes: systematic review. *Age And Ageing* 2011;40(2):150-62 doi: 10.1093/ageing/afq161[published Online First: Epub Date]].
48. Mandelblatt J, Kanetsky PA. Effectiveness of interventions to enhance physician screening for breast cancer. *The Journal Of Family Practice* 1995;40(2):162-71
49. McGowan J, Grad R, Pluye P, et al. Electronic retrieval of health information by healthcare providers to improve practice and patient care. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2009; (3).
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD004749.pub2/abstract>.
50. Medves J, Godfrey C, Turner C, et al. Systematic review of practice guideline dissemination and implementation strategies for healthcare teams and team-based practice. *International Journal Of Evidence-Based Healthcare* 2010;8(2):79-89 doi: 10.1111/j.1744-1609.2010.00166.x[published Online First: Epub Date]].
51. O'Brien MA, Rogers S, Jamtvedt G, et al. Educational outreach visits: effects on professional practice and health care outcomes. *The Cochrane Database Of Systematic Reviews* 2007(4):CD000409
52. Oxman AD, Thomson MA, Davis DA, et al. No magic bullets: a systematic review of 102 trials of interventions to improve professional practice. *CMAJ: Canadian Medical Association Journal = Journal De L'association Medicale Canadienne* 1995;153(10):1423-31

53. Perry M, Drašković I, Lucassen P, et al. Effects of educational interventions on primary dementia care: A systematic review. *International Journal Of Geriatric Psychiatry* 2011;26(1):1-11 doi: 10.1002/gps.2479[published Online First: Epub Date]].
54. Randell R, Mitchell N, Dowding D, et al. Effects of computerized decision support systems on nursing performance and patient outcomes: a systematic review. *Journal Of Health Services Research & Policy* 2007;12(4):242-49
55. Robertson J, Walkom E, Pearson S-A, et al. The impact of pharmacy computerised clinical decision support on prescribing, clinical and patient outcomes: a systematic review of the literature. *The International Journal Of Pharmacy Practice* 2010;18(2):69-87
56. Safdar N, Abad C. Educational interventions for prevention of healthcare-associated infection: A systematic review. *Critical Care Medicine* 2008;36 (3):933-40 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0B013E318165FAF3>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
57. Schedlbauer A, Prasad V, Mulvaney C, et al. What evidence supports the use of computerized alerts and prompts to improve clinicians' prescribing behavior? *Journal Of The American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA* 2009;16(4):531-38 doi: 10.1197/jamia.M2910[published Online First: Epub Date]].
58. Shea S, DuMouchel W, Bahamonde L. A meta-analysis of 16 randomized controlled trials to evaluate computer-based clinical reminder systems for preventive care in the ambulatory setting. *Journal Of The American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA* 1996;3(6):399-409
59. Shiffman RN, Liaw Y, Brandt CA, et al. Computer-based guideline implementation systems: a systematic review of functionality and effectiveness. *Journal Of The American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA* 1999;6(2):104-14
60. Shojania KG, Jennings A, Mayhew A, et al. The effects of on-screen, point of care computer reminders on processes and outcomes of care. *The Cochrane Database Of Systematic Reviews* 2009(3):CD001096 doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD001096.pub2[published Online First: Epub Date]].
61. Siddiqui MRS, Sajid MS, Khatri K, et al. The role of physician reminders in faecal occult blood testing for colorectal cancer screening. *The European Journal Of General Practice* 2011;17(4):221-28 doi: 10.3109/13814788.2011.601412[published Online First: Epub Date]].
62. Steinman MA, Ranji SR, Shojania KG, et al. Improving antibiotic selection: a systematic review and quantitative analysis of quality improvement strategies. *Medical Care* 2006;44(7):617-28
63. Tan K, Dear PRF, Newell SJ. Clinical decision support systems for neonatal care. *The Cochrane Database Of Systematic Reviews* 2005(2):CD004211
64. Thomas LH, Cullum NA, McColl E, et al. Guidelines in professions allied to medicine. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 1999(1)
65. Tinmouth A, Macdougall L, Fergusson D, et al. Reducing the amount of blood transfused: a systematic review of behavioral interventions to change physicians' transfusion practices. *Archives Of Internal Medicine* 2005;165(8):845-52
66. Wensing M, van der Weijden T, Grol R. Implementing guidelines and innovations in general practice: which interventions are effective? *British Journal of General Practice* 1998;48(427):991-7

67. Worrall G, Chaulk P, Freake D. The effects of clinical practice guidelines on patient outcomes in primary care: a systematic review. CMAJ: Canadian Medical Association Journal = Journal De L'association Medicale Canadienne 1997;156(12):1705-12
68. Wutoh R, Boren SA, Balas EA. eLearning: a review of Internet-based continuing medical education. The Journal Of Continuing Education In The Health Professions 2004;24(1):20-30