Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
Feldman, 2005 ¹	Kansas City Cardiomyopath y Questionnaire:	Score unit	Heart failure patients whose nurses received e-mail	227 199		40.4 46.6		6.20	0.013
	Summary score Adjusted score (higher score = better outcome)		recommendati ons (basic intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual care						
	Kansas City	Score unit	Heart failure	227		37.8			0
	Cardiomyopath y Questionnaire: Physical limitation domain score Adjusted score (higher score = better outcome)		patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons (basic intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual care	199		42.5		4.70	
	Kansas City Cardiomyopath y Questionnaire: Symptom domain score (higher score = better	Score unit	Heart failure patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons (basic intervention) vs. heart	227 199		48.6 55.6		7.00	0.091
	outcome) Depression:	Score unit	failure patients receiving usual care Heart failure	227		36.3			0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure Adjusted score (higher score = presence of	Unit	Description of Intervention patients whose nurses received e-mail	n Final Control n Final Intervention 199	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final 37.4	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference 1.10	P-Value
	depression)		recommendati ons (basic intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual care						
	Euroquality of life: Health- related quality of life Adjusted score (higher score = better outcome)	Score unit	Heart failure patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons (basic intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual care	<u>227</u> 199		<u>39.3</u> 48.9		9.60	0.003
	Kansas City Cardiomyopath y Questionnaire: Summary score Adjusted score (higher score = better outcome) Kansas City	Score unit	Heart failure patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons and additional resources (augmented intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual care Heart failure	227 202 227		40.4 45.6 37.8		5.20	0.048

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
,	Cardiomyopath y Questionnaire: Physical limitation domain score Adjusted score (higher score = better outcome)		patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons and additional resources (augmented intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual	202		43		5.20	
	Kansas City Cardiomyopath y Questionaire: Symptom domain score (higher score = better outcome)	Score unit	care Heart failure patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons and additional resources (augmented intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual care	227 202		48.6 53.6		5.00	0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	Adjusted score (higher score = presence of depression)		patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons and additional resources (augmented intervention) vs. Heart failure patients receiving usual care	202		86.3		50.00	
	Euro quality of life: Health- related quality of life Adjusted score (higher score = better outcome)	Score Unit	Heart failure patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons and additional resources (augmented intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual care	227 202		39.3 36.9		-2.40	0

				n Final Control	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome	Control Change	Change Difference	
Cturdur Vaar	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Intervention	Measure at Baseline	Measure at Final	Intervention	Final Difference	P-Value
Study, Year	Cardiomyopath y Questionaire: % w/quality of life domain score >=50 (higher score = better outcome)	patients	patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons (basic intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual	199	Daseille	48	Change	3.40	
	Kansas City Cardiomyopath y Questionnaire: % w/social limitation domain score >= 50 (higher score = better outcome)	%age of patients	care Heart failure patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons (basic intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual care	<u>227</u> 199		27.8 34.8		7.00	0.9
	Kansas City Cardiomyopath y Questionnaire: % w/ self- efficacy domain score >=50	%% of patients	Heart failure patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons (basic intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual care	<u>227</u> 199		85.8 86.8		1.00	0
	Kansas City	%% of patients	Heart failure	227		44.6			0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	Cardiomyopath y Questionnaire: % w/quality of life domain score >=50 (higher score = better outcome)		patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons and additional resources (augmented intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual care	202		53.3		8.70	
	Kansas City Cardiomyopath y Questionnaire: % w/social limitation domain score >= 50 (higher score = better outcome)	%% of patients	Heart failure patients whose nurses received e-mail recommendati ons and additional resources (augmented intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual care	227 202		27.8 35.2		7.40	0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure Cardiomyopath	Unit	Description of Intervention patients whose	n Final Control n Final Intervention 202	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final 35.2	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference -50.60	P-Value
	y Questionaire: % w/ self efficacy domain score >=50		nurses received e-mail recommendati ons and additional resources (augmented intervention) vs. heart failure patients receiving usual care						
Jerant, 2001 ²	Median health care utilization	US dollars	Home telecare videoconferenc	12		21,595			<0.001
			ing vs. usual care	13		7487		-14108	
	Mean health care utilization	US dollars	Home telecare videoconferenc	12		93686			<0.05
			ing vs. usual care	13		29701		-63985	
	Median health care utilization	US dollars	Nurse phone calls with	12		21,595			0
			nurse vs. usual care	12		4117		-17478	
	Mean health care utilization	US dollars	Nurse phone calls with	12		93686			<0.05
			nurse vs. usual care	12		28,888		-64798	
Jerant, 2003 ³	Emotional	Score unit	Telecare vs.	12	11.8	8.2	-3.6	1.7	**SNR
	subscale on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: Mean		usual care	13	14.1	12.2	-1.9	4.00	

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
, ,	Physical	Score unit	Telecare vs.	12	26.4	16.1	-10.3	3.7	**SNR
	subscale on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: Mean		usual care	13	27.8	21.2	-6.6	5.10	
	Total score on	Score Unit	Telecare vs.	12	58.3	38.1	-20.2	6.5	**SNR
	Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: Mean		usual care	13	64.1	50.4	-13.7	12.30	
	Short Form-36: Mental	Score Unit	Telecare vs. usual care	12	41.8	48.9	7.1	-4	**SNR
	component score			13	41.5	44.6	3.1	-4.30	
	Short Form-36:	Score Unit	Telecare vs.	12	34.2	33.7	-0.5	5.5	**SNR
	Physical component score		usual care	13	30.1	35.1	5	1.40	
	Emotional	Score Unit	Telephone vs.	12	11.8	8.2	-3.6	0	**SNR
	subscale on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: Mean		usual care	12	8.8	5.2	-3.6	-3.00	
	Physical	Score unit	Telephone vs.	12	26.4	16.1	-10.3	1.7	**SNR

Outcomes Measure subscale on	Unit	Description of Intervention usual care	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline 24.4	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final 15.8	Control Change Intervention Change -8.6	Change Difference Final Difference -0.30	P-Value
Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: Mean								
Total score on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: Mean	Score unit	Telephone vs. usual care	12 12	58.3 54	38.1 35.5	-20.2 -18.5	1.7 -2.60	**SNR
Short Form-36: Mental component score	Score unit	Telephone vs. usual care	12 12	41.8 44.7	48.9 52.7	7.1 8	0.9 3.80	**SNR
Short Form-36: Physical component score	Score unit	Telephone vs. usual care	12 12	34.2 28.1	33.7 29	-0.5	1.4 -4.70	**SNR
Death at 30 days	% of patients % of patients	Computerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert Computerized	1251 1255 1251		12.5 13.9 22.3		1.40	0
	Measure subscale on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: Mean Total score on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: Mean Short Form-36: Mental component score Short Form-36: Physical component score	MeasureUnitsubscale on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: MeanScore unitTotal score on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: MeanScore unitShort Form-36: Mental component scoreScore unitShort Form-36: Physical component scoreScore unit	MeasureUnitInterventionsubscale on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: Meanusual careTotal score on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: MeanScore unitTelephone vs. usual careShort Form-36: Mental component scoreScore unitTelephone vs. usual careShort Form-36: Physical component scoreScore unitTelephone vs. usual careDeath at 30 days% of patientsComputerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized	Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of InterventionControl n Final Interventionsubscale on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: Meanusual care12Total score on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: MeanScore unitTelephone vs. usual care12Total score on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: MeanScore unitTelephone vs. usual care12Short Form-36: Mental component scoreScore unitTelephone vs. usual care12Short Form-36: Physical component scoreScore unitTelephone vs. usual care12Death at 30 days% of patientsComputerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized1251	Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of Interventionn Final Control n Final InterventionOutcome Measure at Baselinesubscale on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: Meanusual care1224.4Total score on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: MeanScore unitTelephone vs. usual care1258.3Total score on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: MeanScore unitTelephone vs. usual care1254Short Form-36: Physical component scoreScore unitTelephone vs. usual care1241.8Short Form-36: Physical daysScore unitTelephone vs. usual care1234.2Death at 30 days% of patientsComputerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized12511255	Outcomes Measure at minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: MeanUnitDescription of Interventionn Final n Final InterventionOutcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at Final InterventionTotal score on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: MeanScore unitTelephone vs. usual care1258.338.1Total score on MeanScore unitTelephone vs. usual care125435.5Short Form-36: Physical component scoreScore unitTelephone vs. usual care1241.848.9Short Form-36: Physical daysScore unitTelephone vs. usual care1234.233.7Death at 30 days% of patientsComputerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized125112.5Death at 30 component score% of patientsComputerized computerized125112.5	Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of Interventionn Final Control Control InterventionOutcome at BaselineOutcome at Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at BaselineControl Control Change Measure at BaselineControl ChangeUnitUnitusual care1224.415.8-8.6Total score on Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire: MeanScore unitTelephone vs. usual care125435.5-18.5Short Form-36: Short Form-36: scoreScore unitTelephone vs. usual care1241.848.97.1Mental component scoreScore unitTelephone vs. usual care1234.233.7-0.5Death at 30 days% of patientsComputerized aler to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized125112.513.9	Outcomes Measure u Measure u bescription of Intervention Description of Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Description of Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline BaselineOutcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at Intervention Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Intervention Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Intervention Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Intervention Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Intervention Outcome Measure at BaselineControl Intervention Intervention Outcome Measure at Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	days		alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert	1255		22.5		0.20	
	Major hemorrhage at 30 days	% of patients	Computerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert	1251 1255		1.5		0.00	0
	Minor hemorrhage at 30 days Mechanical	% of patients % of patients	Computerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert Computerized	1251 1255 1251		7 6.5		-0.50	0

Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
		physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert					8.50	
Pharmacologic prophylaxis	% of patients	Computerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert	<u>1251</u> 1255		13 23.6		10.60	<0.001
Deep-vein thrombosis of the arms at 90 days	% of patients	Computerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert	1251 1255		2.6 2.5		-0.10	0
Total- cholesterol	mmol/L	Coronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician	782 176	6.11 6.55	6.02 6.06	-0.09 -0.49	-0.4 0.04	0.05
	Measure prophylaxis Pharmacologic prophylaxis Deep-vein thrombosis of the arms at 90 days Total-	MeasureUnitprophylaxisImage: state of the state of the arms at 90 days% of patientsDeep-vein thrombosis of the arms at 90 days% of patientsTotal-cholesterolmmol/L	MeasureUnitInterventionprophylaxisalert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alertPharmacologic prophylaxis% of patientsComputerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alertDeep-vein thrombosis of the arms at 90 days% of patients file to physician vs. no computerized alertTotal- cholesterolmmol/LCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician	Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of InterventionControlprophylaxisalert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert1255Pharmacologic prophylaxis% of patientsComputerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert1251Pharmacologic prophylaxis% of patientsComputerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert1251Deep-vein thrombosis of the arms at 90 days% of patientsComputerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert to1251Total- cholesterolmmol/LCoronary risk physician vs. no risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician782 176	Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of Interventionn Final Control n Final InterventionOutcome Measure at BaselineprophylaxisUnitDescription of Interventionn Final InterventionIntervention Outcome Measure at Baselineprophylaxisalert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert to physician vs. no risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician to risk profile to physicianOutcome matematical the alert to risk profile to physician to risk profile to physicianOutcome no to risk profile to physicianTotal- cholesterolmmol/LCoronary risk physician vs. no risk profile to physician782 <t< td=""><td>Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of Intervention alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- veinOutcome Measure at InterventionOutcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at Intervention Outcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at FinalprophylaxisVof patients12551010Pharmacologic prophylaxis% of patientsComputerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert125113Deep-vein thrombosis of the arms at 90 days% of patientsComputerized alert125123.6Total- cholesterolmmol/LCoronar risk profile to physician alert12512.6Total- cholesterolmmol/LCoronary risk profile to physician7826.116.02Total- cholesterolmmol/LCoronary risk profile to physician7826.116.02</td><td>Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of Intervention Intervention Interventionn Final Control n Final Intervention 1255Outcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at BaselineControl Change Intervention Outcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at BaselineControl Control ChangeprophylaxisUnit11255101010prophylaxis% of patients rind about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert125113</td><td>Outcomes MeasuresUnitDescription of Intervention Description of Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention DifferenceOutcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Measure at FinalControl Change DifferenceControl Change DifferenceControl Outcome Measure at FinalControl Outcome Measure at Measure at FinalControl Outcome Measure at Measure at FinalControl Outcome Measure at Measure at Measure at FinalControl Outcome Measure at Measure at Measure at Measure at FinalControl Outcome Measure at Measure at Measure at Measure at Measure at FinalControl Outcome Measure at Measure at<b< td=""></b<></td></t<>	Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of Intervention alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- veinOutcome Measure at InterventionOutcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at Intervention Outcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at FinalprophylaxisVof patients12551010Pharmacologic prophylaxis% of patientsComputerized alert to physician about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert125113Deep-vein thrombosis of the arms at 90 days% of patientsComputerized alert125123.6Total- cholesterolmmol/LCoronar risk profile to physician alert12512.6Total- cholesterolmmol/LCoronary risk profile to physician7826.116.02Total- cholesterolmmol/LCoronary risk profile to physician7826.116.02	Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of Intervention Intervention Interventionn Final Control n Final Intervention 1255Outcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at BaselineControl Change Intervention Outcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at BaselineControl Control ChangeprophylaxisUnit11255101010prophylaxis% of patients rind about patient's risk of deep- vein thrombosis vs. no computerized alert125113	Outcomes MeasuresUnitDescription of Intervention Description of Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention Intervention DifferenceOutcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Measure at FinalControl Change DifferenceControl Change DifferenceControl Outcome Measure at FinalControl Outcome Measure at Measure at FinalControl Outcome Measure at Measure at FinalControl Outcome Measure at Measure at Measure at FinalControl Outcome Measure at Measure at Measure at Measure at FinalControl Outcome Measure at Measure at Measure at Measure at Measure at FinalControl Outcome Measure at Measure at <b< td=""></b<>

Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
cholesterol		profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician	176	1.13		0.02	-0.01	
LDL-c	mmol/L	Coronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician	782 176	3.88 4.37	3.87 3.97	-0.01 -0.4	-0.39 0.10	0.05
Total- cholesterol/HD L-cholesterol ratio	No units	Coronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician	782 176	5.7 6.2	5.5 5.6	-0.2 -0.6	-0.4 0.10	0.05
Systolic blood pressure	mm Hg	Coronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician	782 176	129.2 133	128 131	-1.2 -2	-0.8 3.00	0
Diastolic blood pressure	mm Hg	Coronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician	782 176	79.8 82.3	79.9 81.4	0.1 -0.9	-1 1.50	0
Body mass index	kg/m ²	Coronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician	782 176	27.8 28.6	27.5 28.4	-0.3 -0.2	0.1 0.90	0
8-year coronary risk	% of patients	Coronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician	782 176	9.6 12	9.3 10.2	-0.3 -1.8	-1.5 0.90	<0.01
	MeasurecholesterolLDL-cTotal- cholesterol/HD L-cholesterol ratioSystolic blood pressureDiastolic blood pressureDiastolic blood pressureBody mass index8-year	MeasureUnitcholesterol	MeasureUnitInterventioncholesterolprofile to physician vs. no risk profile to physicianprofile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician vs. <td>Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of InterventionControl n Final Interventioncholesterolprofile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician vs.<</br></td> <td>Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of Interventionn Final ControlOutcome BaselinecholesterolUnitprofile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician1761.13LDL-cmmol/LCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician7823.88Total- cholesterol/HD L-cholesterolNo unitsCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician7825.7Systolic blood pressuremm HgCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician782129.2Diastolic blood pressuremm HgCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician782129.2Diastolic blood pressuremm HgCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician78279.8Body mass indexkg/m2Coronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician78227.8Body mass indexkg/m2Coronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician78227.8Body mass index% of patientsCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician7829.6Body mass index% of patientsCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician7829.6Body mass index% of patientsCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no</td> <td>Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of Interventionn Final Enal InterventionOutcome Measure at Enal InterventionOutcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at BaselineO</td> <td>Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of InterventionFinal Control n Final n Final hitervention Change n O.0.02Control Control Change n O.0.02Control Control Change n O.0.02Control Change n O.0.02Control Change Final n O.0.02Control Change Final n O.0.02Control Change Final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final<br <="" td=""/><td>Outcomes Measures Measures UnitDescription of Intervention Outcome Measure of Intervention or isk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician vs. no risk profi</br></td></td>	Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of 	Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of Interventionn Final ControlOutcome BaselinecholesterolUnitprofile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician1761.13LDL-cmmol/LCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician7823.88Total- cholesterol/HD L-cholesterolNo unitsCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician7825.7Systolic blood pressuremm HgCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician782129.2Diastolic blood pressuremm HgCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician782129.2Diastolic blood pressuremm HgCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician78279.8Body mass indexkg/m2Coronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician78227.8Body mass indexkg/m2Coronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician78227.8Body mass index% of patientsCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician7829.6Body mass index% of patientsCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician7829.6Body mass index% of patientsCoronary risk profile to physician vs. no	Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of Interventionn Final Enal InterventionOutcome Measure at Enal InterventionOutcome Measure at BaselineOutcome Measure at BaselineO	Outcomes MeasureUnitDescription of InterventionFinal Control n Final n Final hitervention Change n O.0.02Control Control Change n O.0.02Control Control Change n O.0.02Control Change n O.0.02Control Change Final n O.0.02Control Change Final n O.0.02Control Change Final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final hitervention final <td>Outcomes Measures Measures UnitDescription of Intervention Outcome Measure of Intervention or isk profile to physician vs. no risk profile to physician vs. no risk profi</br></td>	Outcomes Measures Measures UnitDescription of

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure age	Unit	Description of Intervention profile to	n Final Control n Final Intervention 176	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline 54	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final 53.4	Control Change Intervention Change -0.6	Change Difference Final Difference 1.50	P-Value
			physician vs. no risk profile to physician						
Mitchell, 2004 ⁶	Final systolic blood pressure	mm Hg	Audit only practices vs. patients who received no feedback	1813 1339		148 151.2		3.20	0
	Final systolic blood pressure	mm Hg	Audit plus strategic practices vs. patients who received no feedback	1813 1951		148 146.5		-1.50	0
	Final proportion with controlled blood pressure in hypertensive patients	% of patients	Audit only practices vs. patients who received no feedback	1813 1339		45.7 33.5		-12.20	0
	All patients with blood pressure<160/ 90	% of patients	Audit only practices vs. patients who received no feedback	1813 1339	47.5 39	58 47	10.5 8	-2.5 -11.00	0
	All patients with blood pressure>=160 /90	% of patients	Audit only practices vs. patients who received no feedback	1813 1339	30.1 26.8	24.1 26.7	-6 -0.1	5.9 2.60	0
	All patients with no recorded blood pressure	% of patients	Audit only practices vs. patients who received no feedback	1813 1339	22.4 34.2	17.9 26.3	-4.5 -7.9	-3.4 8.40	0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure Final proportion with controlled blood pressure in hypertensive patients	Unit % of patients	Description of Intervention Audit plus strategic practices vs. patients who received no feedback	n Final Control n Final Intervention 1813 1951	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final 45.7 45.5	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference -0.20	P-Value 0.028
	All patients with blood pressure<160/ 90	% of patients	Audit plus strategic practices vs. patients who received no feedback	1813 1951	47.5 54.3	58 63	10.5 8.7	-1.8 5.00	0.08
	All patients with blood pressure>=160 /90	% of patients	Audit plus strategic practices vs. patients who received no feedback	1813 1951	30.1 26.9	24.1 22.8	-6 -4.1	1.9 -1.30	0
	All patients with no recorded blood pressure	% of patients	Audit plus strategic practices vs. patients who received no feedback	1813 1951	18.8	17.9 14.2	17.9 -4.6	-22.5 -3.70	0
	Blood pressure control	% of patients	Audit plus strategic practices vs. patients who received no feedback	1813 1339		45.7 33.5		-12.20	
	Blood pressure control	% of patients	Audit plus strategic practices vs. patients who received no feedback	1813 1951		45.7 45.5		-0.20	-

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
Poller, 2008 ⁷	Incidence of	Events per 100	Parma 5	5290		463			0.08
	clinical events adjudicated	patient-yrs	computer- assisted dosage program vs. manual dosage			420		-43.00	
	Minor bleeds	Events per 100	Parma 5	5290		245			**SNR
		patient-yrs	computer- assisted dosage program vs. manual dosage	5131		211		-34.00	
	Major bleeds	Number of	Parma 5	5290		85			**SNR
		events	computer- assisted dosage program vs. manual dosage	5131		73		-12.00	
	Thrombotic	Number of	Parma 5	5290		85			**SNR
	events	events	computer- assisted dosage program vs. manual dosage	5290		84		-1.00	
	Deaths	Number of events	Parma 5 computer- assisted dosage program vs. manual dosage	5131 5131		48 52		4.00	**SNR
	Adjudicated as	Number of	Parma 5	5290		33			**SNR

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	non-events	events	computer- assisted dosage program vs. manual dosage	5131		37		4.00	
	Total events in deep-vein thrombosis/pul monary embolism group	Number of events	Parma 5 computer- assisted dosage program vs. manual dosage	5290 5131		152 115		-37.00	0.05
	Time for which international normalized ratio (INR) was in range	Mean % of time	Computer- assisted oral anticoagulant dosage vs. medical staff dosage	6503 6605		64.7 65.9		1.20	<0.001
Poller, 2008 ⁸	Incidence of clinical events adjudicated (events per 100 patient- yrs)	Number of events	Computer- assisted oral anticoagulant dosage vs. medical staff dosage	6503 6605		555 513		-42.00	**SNR
	Minor bleeds	Events per 100 patient-yrs	Computer- assisted oral anticoagulant dosage vs. medical staff dosage	6503 6605		288 253		-35.00	**SNR
	Major bleeds	Number of	Computer-	6503		99			**SNR

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
		events	assisted oral anticoagulant dosage vs. medical staff dosage	6605		93		-6.00	
	Thrombotic events	Number of events	Computer- assisted oral anticoagulant dosage vs. medical staff dosage	6503 6605		106 97		-9.00	_ **SNR
	Deaths	Number of events	Computer- assisted oral anticoagulant dosage vs. medical staff dosage	6503 6605		62 70		8.00	_ **SNR
	Adjudicated as non-events	Number of events	Computer- assisted oral anticoagulant dosage vs. medical staff dosage	6503 6605		40 47		7.00	**SNR
	Total events in deep-vein thrombosis/pul monary embolism group	Number of events	Computer- assisted oral anticoagulant dosage vs. medical staff dosage	6503 6605		152 115		-37.00	0.001
	Time for which	Mean % of	Computer-	6503		64.7			<0.001

of Events per 100 ents patient-yrs		1					
d	Computer- assisted oral anticoagulant dosage vs. medical staff dosage	6503 6605		555 513		-42.00	**SNR
ty Score unit path aire: cy	Participants in the intervention group were given a user identification and password to SPPARO in order to access electronic hospital records vs. patients in the control group, who continued to receive standard care	43 38	83 86	85 91	2 5	3 6.00	0.08
	Score unit	to SPPARO in order to access electronic hospital records vs. patients in the control group, who continued to receive standard care in the practice	to SPPARO in order to access electronic hospital records vs. patients in the control group, who continued to receive standard care in the practice	to SPPARO in order to access electronic hospital records vs. patients in the control group, who continued to receive standard care in the practice	to SPPARO in order to access electronic hospital records vs. patients in the control group, who continued to receive standard care in the practice	to SPPARO in order to access electronic hospital records vs. patients in the control group, who continued to receive standard care in the practice	to SPPARO in order to access electronic hospital records vs. patients in the control group, who continued to receive standard care in the practice

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	stability		the intervention group were given a user identification and password to SPPARO in order to access electronic hospital records vs. patients in the control group, who continued to receive standard care in the practice	38	49	63	14	17.00	
	Quality of life	Score unit	Participants in	43	56	62	6	2	0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
			the	38	56	64	8	2.00	
			intervention						
			group were						
			given a user						
			identification						
			and password						
			to SPPARO in order to						
			access						
			electronic						
			hospital						
			records vs.						
			patients in the						
			control group,						
			who continued						
			to receive						
			standard care						
			in the practice						
	Functional	Score unit	Participants in	43	66	70	4	-3	0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	status		the intervention group were given a user identification and password to SPPARO in order to access electronic hospital records vs. patients in the control group, who continued to receive standard care in the practice	38	66	67		-3.00	
	Clinical	Score unit	Participants in	43	64	66	2	3	0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	summary		the intervention group were given a user identification and password to SPPARO in order to access electronic hospital records vs. patients in the control group, who continued to receive standard care in the practice	38	64	69	5	3.00	
	Physical	Score unit	Participants in	43	66	73	7	-4	0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
,	limitations		the	38	66	69	3	-4.00	
			intervention group were given a user identification and password to SPPARO in order to access electronic hospital records vs. Patients in the control group, who continued to receive standard care in the practice						
Roumie, 2006 ¹⁰	Systolic blood	mm Hg	Provider who	255	157.3	145	-12.3	0.3	0
2006 ¹⁰	pressure		received e-mail message and alert vs. provider who received only the e-mail message	362	158	146	-12	1.00	
	Systolic blood pressure Systolic blood	mm Hg	Provider who received e-mail message, alert and patient education vs. provider who received only the e-mail message Provider who	255 358 255	157.3 156.3	145 138 40.9	-12.3 -18.3	-6 -7.00	0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
, ·	pressure <=140		received e-mail message and alert vs. provider who received only the e-mail message			42		1.10	
	Dose increased	% of patients	Provider who received e-mail message and alert vs. provider who received only the e-mail message	255 362		13 9.1		-3.90	0.07
	Drug added	% of patients	Provider who received e-mail message and alert vs. provider who received only the e-mail message	255 362		15.7 15.4		-0.30	0
	Both increased dose and drug added Systolic blood	% of patients	Provider who received e-mail message and alert vs. provider who received only the e-mail message Provider who	255 362 255		3.7 4 40.9		0.30	0 **SNR

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure pressure	Unit	Description of Intervention received e-mail	n Final Control n Final Intervention 358	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final 59.5	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference 18.60	P-Value
	<=140		message, alert and patient education vs. provider who received only the e-mail message						
	Dose increased	% of patients	Provider who received e-mail message, alert and patient education vs. provider who received only the e-mail message	255 358		<u>13</u> 8.7		-4.30	0.07
	Drug added	% of patients	Provider who received e-mail message, alert and patient education vs. provider who received only the e-mail message	255 358		15.7 17.5		1.80	0
Scherr, 2009 ¹¹	Both increased dose and drug added	% of patients	Provider who received e-mail message, alert and patient education vs. provider who received only the e-mail message	255 358		3.7 3		-0.70	0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
Subramanian, 2004 ¹²	Short Form-36: Physical component scale (change enrollment to 12 months)	Score unit	Physicians were randomly assigned to receive either care suggestions generated with electronic medical record data and symptom data obtained from questionnaires mailed to patients within 2 weeks of scheduled outpatient visits (intervention group) vs. physicians whose suggestions generated with electronic medical record data alone (control group)	365 355		1.3 -0.6		-1.90	0.03
	Short Form-36:	Score unit	Physicians	365		2.1			0.06

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	Mental		were randomly	355	Duconno	3.7	enange	1.60	i ruido
	component		assigned to						
	scale (change		receive either						
	enrollment to		care						
	12 months)		suggestions						
			generated with						
			electronic						
			medical record						
			data and						
			symptom data						
			obtained from						
			questionnaires						
			mailed to						
			patients within 2 weeks of						
			scheduled						
			outpatient						
			visits						
			(intervention						
			group) vs.						
			physicians						
			whose						
			suggestions						
			generated with						
			electronic						
			medical record						
			data alone						
			(control group)						
Tierney,	Mental Health	Score unit	Evidence-	119		63			**SNR

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
2003 ¹³	Short Form-36: Subscale score		based cardiac care suggestions, approved by a panel of local cardiologists and general internists, were displayed to physicians and pharmacists as they cared for enrolled patients vs. control group where suggestions were withheld	142		64		1.00	
	Overall health	Score unit	Evidence-	119		4.6			**SNR

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	status (chronic heart disease questionnaire score)		based cardiac care suggestions, approved by a panel of local cardiologists and general internists, were displayed to physicians and pharmacists as they cared for enrolled patients vs. control group where suggestions were withheld	142		4.6		0.00	
	Dyspnea	Score unit	Evidence-	119		5.2			**SNR

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	chronic heart disease questionnaire score		based cardiac care suggestions, approved by a panel of local cardiologists and general internists, were displayed to physicians and pharmacists as they cared for enrolled patients vs. control group where suggestions	142		5.3		0.10	
	Fatigue	Score unit	were withheld Evidence-	119		4			**SNR

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	chronic heart disease questionnaire score		based cardiac care suggestions, approved by a panel of local cardiologists and general internists, were displayed to physicians and pharmacists as they cared for enrolled patients vs. control group where suggestions were withheld	142		3.8		-0.20	
	Emotion	Score unit	Evidence-	119		4.6			**SNR

	Outcomes		Description of	n Final Control n Final	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at	Control Change Intervention	Change Difference Final	
Study, Year	Measure	Unit	Intervention	Intervention	Baseline	Final	Change	Difference	P-Value
	(chronic heart disease questionnaire score)		based cardiac care suggestions, approved by a panel of local cardiologists and general internists, were displayed to physicians and pharmacists as they cared for enrolled patients vs. control group where suggestions were withheld	142		4.6		0.00	
	Mental Health	Score unit	Printed a note	119		63			**SNR
	Short Form-36: Subscale score	Score unit	(rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where suggestions were withheld Printed note	106		64		1.00	**SNR

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	status (chronic heart disease questionnaire score)		(rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where suggestions were withheld	106		4.5		-0.10	
	Dyspnea chronic heart disease questionnaire score	Score unit	Printed note (rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where suggestions were withheld	<u>119</u> 106		5.2		-0.20	**SNR
	Fatigue	Score unit	Printed note	119		4			**SNR

chronic heart disease questionnaire score (rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. Control group where suggestions in Printed note (rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where suggestions 3.8 -0.20 Emotion Score unit (rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where suggestions 119 4.6 -0.10	Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
EmotionScore unitPrinted note (rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where suggestions1194.6•••••**SNR		chronic heart disease questionnaire		(rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. Control group where suggestions						
Mental Health Score unit Evidence- 119 63 **SNR		Emotion	Score unit	Printed note (rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where					-0.10	

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	Short Form-36: Subscale score		based cardiac care suggestions, approved by a panel of local cardiologists and general internists, were displayed to physicians and pharmacists as they cared for enrolled patients, with a printed note (rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where suggestions	113		65		2.00	
	Overall health	Score unit	were withheld Evidence-	119		4.6			**SNR

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	status (chronic heart disease questionnaire score)		based cardiac care suggestions, approved by a panel of local cardiologists and general internists, were displayed to physicians and pharmacists as they cared for enrolled patients, with a printed note (rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where suggestions	113		4.6		0.00	
	Dyspnea	Score unit	were withheld Evidence-	119		5.2			**SNR

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	(chronic heart disease questionnaire score)		based cardiac care suggestions, approved by a panel of local cardiologists and general internists, were displayed to physicians and pharmacists as they cared for enrolled patients, with a printed note (rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where suggestions were withheld	113		5.2		0.00	
	Fatigue	Score unit	Evidence-	119		4			**SNR

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	(chronic heart disease questionnaire score)		based cardiac care suggestions, approved by a panel of local cardiologists and general internists, were displayed to physicians and pharmacists as they cared for enrolled patients, with a printed note (rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where suggestions were withheld	113		4		0.00	
	Emotion	Score unit	Evidence-	119		4.6			**SNR

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	(chronic heart disease questionnaire score)		based cardiac care suggestions, approved by a panel of local cardiologists and general internists, were displayed to physicians and pharmacists as they cared for enrolled patients, with a printed note (rather than bottle labels) instructing the pharmacist to view the care suggestions in Pharmacist Intervention Recording System vs. control group where suggestions	113		4.7		0.10	
Verheijden, 2004 ¹⁴	Mean perceived social support Mean BMI	Score unit	were withheld Web-based nutrition counseling and social support vs. usual care Web-based	68 61 68	5.7 5.7 29.2	5.63 5.53 29.19	-0.07 -0.17 -0.01	-0.1 -0.10 -0.01	0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention nutrition counseling and	n Final Control n Final Intervention 61	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline 29.5	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final 29.48	Control Change Intervention Change -0.02	Change Difference Final Difference 0.29	P-Value
			social support vs. usual care						
	Mean systolic blood pressure	mm Hg	Web-based nutrition counseling and social support vs. usual care	<u>68</u> 61	136 134	130.8 132.1	-5.2 -1.9	3.3 1.30	0
	Mean diastolic blood pressure	mm Hg	Web-based nutrition counseling and social support vs. usual care	68 61	80 81	76.8 78.5	-3.2 -2.5	0.7 1.70	0
	Mean total cholesterol	mmol/L	Web-based nutrition counseling and social support vs. usual care	68 61	5.4 5.5	5.29 5.42	-0.11 -0.08	0.03 0.13	0
Wakefield, 2008 ¹⁵	Minn Living With Hheart Failure score (higher score= worse quality of life)	Score unit	Videophone follow-up vs. usual care	42 33	60.6 60.2	56.6 54	-4 -6.2	-2.2 -2.60	0
	Minn Living With Heart Failure score (higher score= worse quality of life)	Score unit	Telephone follow-up verses usual care	42 34	60.6 58.4	56.6 41.5	-4 -16.9	-12.9 -15.10	0
	% mortality	% of patients	Videophone follow-up vs. usual care	49 52		22.4 28.9		6.50	0

Study, Year	Outcomes Measure	Unit	Description of Intervention	n Final Control n Final Intervention	Control Outcome Measure at Baseline Intervention Outcome Measure at Baseline	Control Outcome Measure at Final Intervention Outcome Measure at Final	Control Change Intervention Change	Change Difference Final Difference	P-Value
	Mortality		Telephone follow-up vs. usual care. Usual care subjects contacted their primary care nurse case manager by telephone if needed. Intervention subjects contacted their assigned study nurse via telephone if needed after discharge. The intervention nurses reinforced discharge plans, had full access to patient records, and employed strategies to improve subjects' compliance with prescribed treatment plans.	49 47		22.4 21.3		-1.10	0

**SNR: Significance not reported

P-value of "0" denotes a p-value > 0.10

SNR = Significance not reported; ABPM: Ambulatory blood pressure monitoring; CV = Cardiovascular; DVT = Deep vein thrombosis; HbA1c = Glycated hemoglobin; HDL-c; High-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HTN = Hypertension; INR = International normalized ratio; kg = Kilograms; L = Liters; LDL-c = Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; mm Hg = Millimeters Mercury; mmol = Millimoles; PE = Pulmonary embolism; PIRS = Pharmacist Intervention Recording System; Minn = Minnesota

References

- 1 Feldman PH, Murtaugh CM, Pezzin LE, McDonald MV, Peng TR. Just-in-time evidence-based e-mail "reminders" in home health care: impact on patient outcomes. Health Serv Res 2005; 40(3):865-85.
- 2 Jerant AF, Azari R, Nesbitt TS. Reducing the cost of frequent hospital admissions for congestive heart failure: a randomized trial of a home telecare intervention. Med Care 2001; 39(11):1234-45.
- 3 Jerant AF, Azari R, Martinez C, Nesbitt TS. A randomized trial of telenursing to reduce hospitalization for heart failure: patient-centered outcomes and nursing indicators. Home Health Care Services Quarterly 2003; 22(1):1-20.
- 4 Kucher N, Koo S, Quiroz R *et al*. Electronic alerts to prevent venous thromboembolism among hospitalized patients. N Engl J Med 2005; 352(10):969-77.
- 5 Lowensteyn I, Joseph L, Levinton C, Abrahamowicz M, Steinert Y, Grover S. Can computerized risk profiles help patients improve their coronary risk? The results of the Coronary Health Assessment Study (CHAS). Prev Med 1998; 27(5 Pt 1):730-7.
- 6 Mitchell E, Sullivan F, Watt G, Grimshaw JM, Donnan PT. Using electronic patient records to inform strategic decision making in primary care. Stud Health Technol Inform 2004; 107(Pt 2):1157-61.
- 7 Poller L, Keown M, Ibrahim S *et al*. A multicentre randomised clinical endpoint study of PARMA 5 computer-assisted oral anticoagulant dosage. Br J Haematol 2008; 143(2):274-83.
- 8 Poller L, Keown M, Ibrahim S *et al*. An international multicenter randomized study of computer-assisted oral anticoagulant dosage vs. medical staff dosage. J Thromb Haemost 2008; 6(6):935-43.

- 9 Ross SE, Moore LA, Earnest MA, Wittevrongel L, Lin CT. Providing a web-based online medical record with electronic communication capabilities to patients with congestive heart failure: randomized trial. J Med Internet Res 2004; 6(2):e12.
- 10 Roumie CL, Elasy TA, Greevy R *et al.* Improving blood pressure control through provider education, provider alerts, and patient education: a cluster randomized trial. Ann Intern Med 2006; 145(3):165-75.
- 11 Scherr D, Kastner P, Kollmann A *et al.* Effect of home-based telemonitoring using mobile phone technology on the outcome of heart failure patients after an episode of acute decompensation: randomized controlled trial. Journal of Medical Internet Research 2009; 11(3):e34.
- 12 Subramanian U, Fihn SD, Weinberger M et al. A controlled trial of including symptom data in computer-based care suggestions for managing patients with chronic heart failure. Am J Med 2004; 116(6):375-84.
- 13 Tierney WM, Overhage JM, Murray MD *et al*. Effects of computerized guidelines for managing heart disease in primary care. J Gen Intern Med 2003; 18(12):967-76.
- 14 Verheijden M, Bakx JC, Akkermans R *et al*. Web-based targeted nutrition counselling and social support for patients at increased cardiovascular risk in general practice: randomized controlled trial. J Med Internet Res 2004; 6(4):e44.
- 15 Wakefield BJ, Ward MM, Holman JE *et al.* Evaluation of home telehealth following hospitalization for heart failure: a randomized trial. Telemedicine Journal and E-Health : the Official Journal of the American Telemedicine Association 2008; 14(8):753-61.