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Introduction

Quality improvement initiatives in the NHS rely upon the effective introduction of clinical guidelines. However, even well constructed, evidence-based guidelines appear to have little effect on clinical behaviour unless supported by a combination of development, dissemination and implementation strategies. A recent Cochrane review concluded that while it appeared to be a 'promising approach to modify professional behaviour [in relation to prescribing]' there was a need to assess the effectiveness of educational outreach for other aspects of practice.

The management of dyspepsia in accordance with clinical practice guidelines has been advocated as a means of reducing inappropriate practice and improving efficiency. We describe the impact of educational outreach on dyspepsia management guideline introduction. The study was designed as a pragmatic randomised controlled trial. It was hypothesised that, compared with passive guideline dissemination alone, educational outreach would lead to a greater proportion of appropriate referrals for open-access upper gastrointestinal endoscopy, an increase in the proportion of relevant findings at open-access endoscopy, a reduction in expenditure on acid suppressing drugs, and a greater use of laboratory-based serological tests for Helicobacter pylori as a precursor to eradication therapy.

Method

Practice allocation

The study was carried out in the Salford and Trafford Health Authority catchment area in Greater Manchester, which has a population of approximately 465,000 served by 236 general practitioners (GPs) in 115 general practices. The area is served by two hospitals, Trafford General (TGH) and Hope Hospital.

One-hundred and fourteen general practices were allocated to intervention and control groups using a process of minimisation. This number fell to 113 as one control practice amalgamated with one from the intervention group and was randomly reallocated to the latter (Figure 1). The criteria used for minimisation were practice size, fundholding status, previous expenditure on acid-suppressing drugs, and previous involvement in a local guideline initiative. These characteristics were ascertained from local health authority...
Referrals for open access endoscopy were included if the GP had requested the procedure without a prior hospital consultation. The characteristics of each referral made in the seven months following the initial outreach visit were appraised using predefined medical review criteria based on the guidelines. The identities and trial status of referring practices were masked before the appropriateness of referrals was ascertained. Inter-rater reliability of ratings of appropriateness were carried out in 35 randomly selected referrals, and assessed by a κ statistic.

Findings at open access endoscopy. Findings at open-access endoscopy carried out in the seven months before and after the intervention were recorded. The identities and trial status of referring practices were masked before categorising endoscopic findings according to whether they constituted a major abnormality (neoplasia, peptic ulcer disease, erosive gastritis/duodenitis, or complicated/uncomplicated oesophagitis), a minor abnormality (uncomplicated hiatal hernia, non-specific gastritis/duodenitis), or were normal. All referrals for endoscopy in the departments that receive these requests were checked, as well as all completed endoscopy reports, to ensure completeness of data collection.

Prescribing costs for acid-suppressing drugs. These data were extracted from electronic PACT data provided by the local health authority. These recorded prescriptions for H₂ receptor antagonists (H₂RAs) and proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) by each practice in the six months before and after the intervention. Expenditure was expressed as the net ingredient cost per prescribing unit (NIC/PU) in sterling.

Requests for laboratory-based tests for H. pylori. These data were extracted from the logs of the microbiology departments of each hospital. Requests for this test had to be recorded in these logs as a prerequisite for the test to be performed. The tests were introduced at TGH immediately prior to the circulation of the guidelines, but had already been available at Hope Hospital for 18 months.

Sample size estimation
It was estimated that, given 25 practices in each arm each referring 20 patients, and an intraclass correlation coefficient of 0.07 (based on referrals for open-access endoscopy made by 35 practices in the study area over a six-month period), the study would have a power of 80% to detect a difference of 10% in the proportion of significant open access endoscopy findings at the 5% level of statistical significance. With a similar intraclass correlation coefficient, the study would have a power of 77% to detect a difference of one-third in the proportion of inappropriate referrals (assuming an inappropriate referral rate of 20%) and a power of 82% to detect a difference of 25% in prescribing cost changes for acid-suppressing drugs.

Data analysis
All analyses were performed on an intention-to-treat basis, i.e. all practices in the intervention group were included regardless of whether they accepted the intervention or not. The unit of analysis was the practice. Analysis of covariance was used where appropriate, to assess differences in the
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The following outcome measures were selected:
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change from baseline between intervention and control practices. Otherwise, non-parametric tests were used.

**Results**

*Results of recruitment and characteristics of practices accepting the intervention*

The characteristics of the intervention and control practices are shown in Table 1. Thirty-three out of 57 practices (58%) allocated to the intervention group accepted the invitation to participate. The remainder did not reply to the invitation and were therefore deemed to have ‘refused’ it. There were no significant differences between practices accepting or refusing the intervention with respect to practice location, partnership size, fundholding status, level of expenditure on
acid-suppressing drugs, or previous involvement in a local guideline initiative.

**Seminar attendance**

Thirteen seminars were held over a period of six weeks beginning in September 1997. Fifty-nine GPs (79%) from the 33 intervention-accepting practices attended them. Reasons for non-attendance included annual leave, pregnancy, and unexpected clinical or personal problems.

Twenty-three reinforcement visits were made after three months and all but one of the practices, which declined further input, were revisited. Fifty-five GPs (73%) attended these meetings, comprising 49 who had attended the initial seminars and a further six who had not been able to attend. Therefore, overall, contact was made with 65 of the 75 GPs (87%) who accepted the intervention. Although ten GPs did not attend the initial or reinforcement visits, all of the accepting practices were represented at one or other of them.

**Appropriateness of referral**

Inter-rater reliability for ratings of the appropriateness of referral was high (κ = 0.824). Overall, practices in the intervention group made a significantly greater proportion of appropriate referrals than control practices (Table 2). Practices accepting the intervention made a higher proportion of appropriate referrals than those refusing the intervention although this difference was not statistically significant. The reasons for referral are shown in Table 3.

**Findings at open access endoscopy**

There was no change in the relative proportions of major, minor, and normal endoscopic findings pre- and post-intervention for either group of practices (Table 4).

**Prescription costs for acid-suppressing drugs**

*Overall expenditure.* A t-test of the differences in expenditure (six months post-intervention – six months pre-intervention) on the combined NIC/PU for H₂RAs and PPIs revealed a significantly greater increase in the treatment group than in the control group (t = -2.360, P = 0.020; Table 5). This increase was more apparent in the intervention-accepting practices than in the intervention-refusing practices, although not statistically significant.

*Expenditure on individual drug classes.* The changes in expenditure on H₂RAs for intervention and control practices were in opposite directions, declining in control practices, but increasing in intervention practices. This difference was statistically significant (t = -2.843, P = 0.005). Expenditure on PPIs increased for both groups, although the rise in the intervention group was greater than that in the control group. This difference was not statistically significant (t = -1.340, P = 0.183). Although not significant, the increase in overall expenditure in the intervention practices was attributable primarily to the increase in expenditure on PPIs (Table 6).

*Testing rates for H pylori.* The number of serological tests for H. pylori requested by the intervention practices was greater than that for control practices (median = 4 versus 0, respectively; Mann–Whitney z = -3.31, P<0.001). The practices that accepted the intervention tested more frequently than those that declined it, and more frequently than the controls (median = 8 versus 1 and 0, respectively; Kruskal–Wallis χ² = 19.59, P<0.001).

**Discussion**

This study is important because it shows that quality improvement initiatives utilising referral guidelines will be dependent for their success upon an effective dissemination and implementation strategy. Few publications exist of United Kingdom-based studies of educational outreach as a means of facilitating guideline uptake. None in fact have examined how this strategy affects the appropriateness of referral from primary to secondary care.

In this study, the dissemination of clinical practice guidelines using educational outreach proved to be a more effective means of changing practice than passive guideline dissemination alone, supporting the concept that active educational interventions are an effective means of changing clinical behaviour when applied to guideline introduction. Importantly, this study utilised guidelines that were developed with local GPs and congruent with other guidelines.
Table 2. Percentage of appropriate referrals from control, intervention-accepting, and intervention-refusing practices, showing the median percentage of appropriate endoscopy referrals from practices that made at least one referral. Significance of difference between control and intervention practices: Mann–Whitney $z = -2.235$, 1 df, $P = 0.025$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice status</th>
<th>Control (36 practices)</th>
<th>Intervention (44 practices)</th>
<th>Intervention-accepting (27 practices)</th>
<th>Intervention-refusing (17 practices)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of pre-intervention</td>
<td>Post-intervention</td>
<td>Number of pre-intervention</td>
<td>Post-intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>50.0 (22.1–72.4)</td>
<td>63.9 (50.0–100.0)</td>
<td>72.7 (50.0–100.0)</td>
<td>62.5 (41.4–100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Reasons for referral. Table shows the number (percentage) of referrals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral reason</th>
<th>Control group referrals (%)</th>
<th>Intervention group referrals (%)</th>
<th>All referrals (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 197$</td>
<td>$n = 357$</td>
<td>$n = 554$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presence of sinister features</td>
<td>49 (24.9)</td>
<td>92 (25.8)</td>
<td>141 (25.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient greater than 45 years of age at onset</td>
<td>23 (11.7)</td>
<td>68 (19.1)</td>
<td>91 (16.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A continuing need for/unsatisfactory response to therapy</td>
<td>17 (8.6)</td>
<td>45 (12.6)</td>
<td>62 (11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAID-related dyspepsia</td>
<td>7 (3.6)</td>
<td>14 (3.9)</td>
<td>21 (3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other criteria for appropriate referral</td>
<td>4 (2.0)</td>
<td>3 (0.8)</td>
<td>7 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-treatment prior to referral</td>
<td>15 (7.6)</td>
<td>18 (5.0)</td>
<td>33 (6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A paucity of information in the referral</td>
<td>54 (27.4)</td>
<td>72 (20.2)</td>
<td>126 (22.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-treatment prior to referral</td>
<td>22 (11.2)</td>
<td>29 (8.1)</td>
<td>51 (9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other criteria for inappropriate referral</td>
<td>6 (3.0)</td>
<td>16 (4.5)</td>
<td>22 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Findings at open access endoscopy in the pre- and post-intervention periods, showing the number (percentage) of endoscopies performed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endoscopic findings</th>
<th>Control group (56 practices) (%)</th>
<th>Intervention group (57 practices) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-intervention</td>
<td>Post-intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>83 (37.4)</td>
<td>70 (35.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>55 (24.8)</td>
<td>50 (25.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>84 (37.8)</td>
<td>77 (39.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Mean NIC/PU for combined expenditure on H2RAs and PPIs in the pre- and post-intervention periods (£ sterling).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice status (number of practices)</th>
<th>Six months pre-intervention</th>
<th>Six months post-intervention</th>
<th>Difference (post-intervention – pre-intervention)</th>
<th>Percentage increase</th>
<th>Difference (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control (56)</td>
<td>4.0741</td>
<td>4.1754</td>
<td>0.1012</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>−0.21 (−0.39 to −0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention (57)</td>
<td>4.1102</td>
<td>4.4223</td>
<td>0.3121</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention-accepting (33)</td>
<td>4.1179</td>
<td>4.4915</td>
<td>0.3736</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention-refusing (24)</td>
<td>4.0996</td>
<td>4.3271</td>
<td>0.2275</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Mean NIC/PU for H2RAs and PPIs (£ sterling). Figures in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice status (number of practices)</th>
<th>Six months pre-intervention (H2RAs)</th>
<th>Six months post-intervention (H2RAs)</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Six months pre-intervention (PPIs)</th>
<th>Six months post-intervention (PPIs)</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control (56)</td>
<td>1.3495 (0.49)</td>
<td>1.2843 (0.45)</td>
<td>−0.0652</td>
<td>−4.83</td>
<td>2.7250 (0.84)</td>
<td>2.8907 (0.88)</td>
<td>+0.1657</td>
<td>+6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention (57)</td>
<td>1.3442 (0.58)</td>
<td>1.3874 (0.60)</td>
<td>+0.0432</td>
<td>+3.21</td>
<td>2.7633 (0.94)</td>
<td>3.0344 (1.17)</td>
<td>+0.2691</td>
<td>+9.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All practices (113)</td>
<td>1.3468 (0.53)</td>
<td>1.3363 (0.53)</td>
<td>−0.0105</td>
<td>−0.78</td>
<td>2.7453 (0.88)</td>
<td>2.9632 (1.03)</td>
<td>+0.2179</td>
<td>+7.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*Control – intervention difference = −0.11, 95% CI = −0.18 to −0.03; $t = 2.843$, $P = 0.005$. *b*Control – intervention difference = −0.10, 95% CI = −0.26 to 0.05; $t = 1.340$, $P = 0.183$
available in the UK at the time. The superior effect of educational outreach may have been owing to the fact that it encouraged physician involvement in an educational interaction and included clear descriptions of appropriate management supported by reinforcement visits.4

The intervention successfully enhanced the appropriateness of referral for open access endoscopy. The main differences between the intervention and control groups lay in the proportions of referrals deemed appropriate because patients were over 45 years of age at the onset of dyspepsia or deemed inappropriate because of a paucity of information in the referral letter. As in previous studies,11,13 a key reason for inappropriate referral was insufficient empirical therapy prior to referral. The observed difference with respect to age at referral may indicate either an improved appreciation of age as a potential indicator of neoplasia, or its use to legitimise referral in the absence of other criteria for appropriate referral. The overall number of referrals by intervention practices also increased relative to controls, raising the possibility that control practices may have previously under-referred. The study was unable to test this hypothesis. A second limitation is that the appropriateness of referral in this study was based on GP referral letters. Review of patients’ medical records would have provided insight into the extent to which doctors failed to refer patients who warranted referral, or selectively used guideline criteria to legitimise inappropriate referrals.14 Unfortunately this was beyond our resources.

Contrary to expectation, the intervention did not influence diagnostic yield. Other studies15 have similarly failed to demonstrate a relationship between referral appropriateness and endoscopic findings. This may be because dyspeptic symptoms are poor predictors of underlying pathology, and the use of potent pre-endoscopy therapy may mask any increase in the proportions of non-malignant disorders, such as peptic ulceration or oesophagitis.16

Another unexpected finding was the significant increase in drug expenditure following guideline uptake. Previous studies have suggested that prescribing costs for acid-suppressing drugs may be modified through the use of educational outreach.17-19 The reasons why expenditure on acid-suppressing drugs increased in our study are unclear. The guidelines advocated greater use of acid-suppressing drugs in patients with complicated oesophageal disease and as gastric cytoprotection for at-risk patients using aspirin or NSAIDs. Testing for H pylori increased and presumably therefore the use of eradication therapies also increased. We will also have heightened awareness of the need for appropriate prescribing generally. We do not however have any direct evidence that these changes in prescribing were appropriate, as prescribing data from PACT are not linked to clinical data for individual patients. Medical record audit would have provided better information about appropriateness but was beyond our resources.

Although some GPs may have been attracted by the availability of the relatively new technology of H pylori serology as a means of facilitating the management of dyspepsia, the rate of uptake of new technologies is not always matched by the rate at which other types of behaviour are abandoned or altered.21,22 One explanation for the overall change in behaviour of intervention group practices is that they increased acid-suppressing drug use and testing for H pylori in younger patients while referring older patients for open access endoscopy. All GPs may have felt that the guidelines legitimised a greater use of therapy.

Conclusion

This study supports other research in suggesting that educational outreach is more effective than passive guideline dissemination in promoting changes in clinical behaviour. However, the intervention also produced unintended outcomes, notably an increase in prescribing expenditure. Before it is more widely used, the strategy used here requires further investigation to confirm that changes in GP behaviour improved patient outcomes, and to assess the overall cost-effectiveness of this expensive intervention.
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