

1                    Interventions for improving antibiotic prescribing in the  
2                    community: systematic review and meta-analysis

3

4    Rebecca A J Andrews<sup>1\*</sup>, Virginia Hernandez Santiago<sup>2\*‡</sup>, Bruce Guthrie<sup>3</sup>, Charis A Marwick<sup>4</sup>

5

6    1. School of Medicine, University of Dundee, Dundee DD1 9SY, UK

7    2. Honorary Senior Clinical Lecturer i, Division of Population and Behavioural Sciences,

8    School of Medicine, University of St Andrews, KY16 9TF

9    3. Professor of General Practice, Advanced Care Research Centre, Usher Institute, University

10   of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH8 9YL

11   4. Clinical Reader in Infectious Diseases, Population Health & Genomics Division, School of

12   Medicine, University of Dundee, Dundee DD1 9SY, UK

13   \*Authors contributed equally

14   ‡Corresponding author: Dr Virginia Hernandez Santiago, Clinical Lecturer in General Practice,

15   University of St Andrews School of Medicine, North Haugh, St Andrews KY16 9TF

16   Email: [yhs2@st-andrews.ac.uk](mailto:yhs2@st-andrews.ac.uk)

17   Telephone: +44 (0)7847492374

18

19   Short title: Improving community antibiotic prescribing

20

21

22   **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**  
Word count: 3836 (including reference numbering)

## 23 Abstract

### 24 **Background**

25 Antibiotic resistance is a public health priority and antibiotic use in humans is a major  
26 contributing factor to its development. Interventions to improve antibiotic prescribing in the  
27 community, where most antibiotics are prescribed, are widely implemented with varying  
28 effect. The aim was to systematically review and meta-analyse evidence on effectiveness of  
29 different types of antibiotic prescribing interventions in the community.

### 30 **Methods and Findings**

31 Medline, Embase, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, were searched  
32 from database inception to 16 August 2021 to identify randomised controlled trials  
33 comparing antibiotic stewardship interventions versus usual care in community settings.  
34 Two reviewers screened studies, extracted data, and assessed risk of bias. Studies were  
35 grouped according to type of intervention. Meta-analyses employed random effects models.  
36 The outcome for meta-analyses was change in total antibiotic prescribing rates attributable  
37 to the intervention, compared to usual care, calculated as percentage differences. Other  
38 measures of change in antibiotic prescribing were included in narrative description.

39 Of 26,130 studies screened, 74 were included, with 53 comparisons from 45 studies meta-  
40 analysed. 50% of included studies had high risk of bias. Single interventions with statistically  
41 significant reductions in total antibiotic prescribing were point of care tests for antigen  
42 detection (-28.0% reduction, 95%CI -38.2 to -17.8); educational materials (-17.0%, -31.0 to -

43 3.0); printed decision-support systems (-10.8%, -15.7 to -6.0), educational workshops (-  
44 8.7%, -12.8 to -4.7), and; educational outreach (-6.0%, -10.6 to -1.4). Multifaceted  
45 interventions were not more effective than single interventions (education + audit and  
46 feedback -9.9%, -12.8 to -7.0; other multifaceted -9.4%, -17.2 to -1.6). Effect sizes in  
47 sensitivity analyses excluding trials at high risk of bias were similar or larger.

## 48 **Conclusions**

49 Community antibiotic stewardship interventions were effective but with considerable  
50 variation in effect size. The most effective trial interventions may be more difficult to  
51 implement in practice, a key challenge for antibiotic stewardship.

52 **Systematic review registration** PROSPERO CRD42014010160

53

## 54 Introduction

55 Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is an increasing global public health threat,<sup>1</sup> which causes  
56 significant morbidity, mortality, and healthcare costs.<sup>2,3</sup> Predictions published in 2016, of 10  
57 million annual deaths by 2050,<sup>4</sup> are consistent with statistical models using real-world data  
58 which estimated 4.95 million (95% CI 3.62–6.57) deaths associated with bacterial AMR in  
59 2019, with 1.27 million (95% CI 0.91–1.71) attributable to AMR.<sup>5</sup> Drivers of AMR are  
60 multifactorial and include antimicrobial use in animals and agriculture, but inappropriate  
61 use and overuse of antibiotics in humans is a major contributing factor. Stopping antibiotic  
62 use results in the exponential decay of bacterial resistance at the individual microbiome  
63 level,<sup>6</sup> and impacts on resistance rates in serious bacterial infection at the human  
64 population level.<sup>7</sup> Reasons behind inappropriate use or overuse of antibiotics are complex,  
65 where practitioner, patient, societal, and healthcare system factors all interplay.<sup>8,9</sup>  
66 Antimicrobial stewardship is the coordinated set of actions designed to promote  
67 appropriate use of antimicrobials.<sup>10</sup> National and global actions to increase stewardship  
68 include the UK AMR Global Action Plan 2019-2024 focusing on reducing unnecessary  
69 exposure to antibiotics and WHO GLASS system providing a world-wide platform for  
70 surveillance of antibiotic use.<sup>11,12</sup>

71 Community practice or “primary care” is where most antibiotics are prescribed,<sup>13</sup> with up to  
72 50% of prescriptions considered inappropriate.<sup>14-16</sup> Diagnostic uncertainty and fear of  
73 complications contributes,<sup>17</sup> along with lack of clinician awareness of the contribution of  
74 primary care antibiotic use to AMR.<sup>9</sup> Previous literature<sup>18</sup> including systematic reviews of  
75 clinician-targeted interventions for improving antibiotic use in inpatient<sup>19</sup> and outpatient  
76 settings<sup>16</sup> found that interventions using professional education, feedback, clinical decision

77 support and delayed prescribing have some effect, and multi-component interventions may  
78 be more effective.<sup>16</sup> However, the most recent systematic review in the community  
79 including a comprehensive range of intervention and infection types is over 15 years old,  
80 and the included studies were too heterogenous to meta-analyse,<sup>16</sup> limiting quantitative  
81 assessment and comparison of effectiveness. Narrower systematic reviews report that  
82 educational interventions, mainly implementing guidelines, can be effective in general<sup>20</sup> and  
83 for respiratory tract infections,<sup>21</sup> and that point of care testing using C-reactive protein (CRP)  
84 for respiratory tract infections may also be effective.<sup>22, 23</sup> Stewardship interventions should,  
85 ideally, encompass the broader clinical context and results from single intervention or  
86 infection type cannot necessarily be extrapolated to other indications. There is insufficient  
87 up-to-date evidence on which components make a primary care stewardship intervention  
88 more effective.

89

90 The aim of this study is to systematically review and meta-analyse randomised controlled  
91 trials of interventions to improve primary care antibiotic prescribing to estimate their  
92 effectiveness and examine which intervention types are more effective.

93

## 94 **Methods**

95 The review was registered on PROSPERO<sup>24</sup> and is reported according to the preferred  
96 reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) statement<sup>25</sup>.

## 97 **Eligibility criteria**

98 Studies were eligible if they were randomised clinical trials or cluster randomised trials  
99 involving practitioners who prescribe antibiotics in community settings. Community settings  
100 included family and general practice, community paediatrics, nursing and residential homes,  
101 and clinics attached to hospitals if they were described as a primary care clinic (which is the  
102 case in the US). Studies which only involved other hospital clinics or emergency  
103 departments were excluded. Interventions which were only patient focussed or public mass  
104 media campaigns were not eligible.

## 105 **Data sources and search strategy**

106 MEDLINE and EMBASE databases were searched to identify all randomised controlled  
107 clinical trials evaluating interventions for improving antibiotic prescribing published on or  
108 before 16<sup>th</sup> August 2021. The Cochrane EPOC Specialised Register was searched for the  
109 terms antibiotic\* or antimicrobial\* in all fields. There were no language restrictions. The  
110 complete search strategy is in Supplementary Table S1. The search did not specify  
111 healthcare setting, with community interventions identified during screening. Additional  
112 studies were identified from bibliographies of included articles.

## 113 **Outcome measure**

114 Included studies could measure antibiotic prescribing in various ways, including the decision  
115 to prescribe an antibiotic, the choice of which antibiotic to prescribe, the dose or duration  
116 of a prescription, measured as changes in total or targeted prescribing, 'appropriate'  
117 prescribing, compliance with guidelines, or cost.

118 For meta-analyses, the outcome measure was the difference in total antibiotic prescribing  
119 rates in the intervention group, compared to usual care, calculated as the mean percentage  
120 difference. This was either the mean difference between intervention and control groups at  
121 follow-up or, using the mean change score between baseline and follow-up for each group,  
122 the difference in mean change scores between the groups. The latter was preferred if it was  
123 reported or could be calculated. Other measures were described in narrative synthesis.

#### 124 **Study selection and data extraction**

125 Titles and abstracts were independently screened by two reviewers. Full text articles were  
126 appraised by two of four reviewers (RA, VS, BG, CM), after a calibration exercise agreeing  
127 common definitions, and inclusion and exclusion rules. Disagreements or uncertainties were  
128 resolved by a third reviewer. Studies were grouped by similarity of intervention types based  
129 on a modified version of the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care (EPOC)  
130 Group taxonomy of healthcare interventions,<sup>26</sup> which included educational interventions,  
131 audit and feedback, reminders including decision support systems (DSS), and “other”. For  
132 meta-analysis purposes, studies were further categorised into: educational materials,  
133 educational workshops, and educational outreach; audit and feedback; computerised DSS,  
134 and printed DSS; point of care testing (POCT) using antigen detection (throat swabs for  
135 streptococci or influenza), and POCT using inflammatory markers (finger-prick blood tests  
136 for C-reactive protein (CRP) or procalcitonin), and; multifaceted interventions, sub-  
137 categorised into education plus audit and feedback, and “other” (where there was no  
138 apparent dominant intervention). Studies which could not be meta-analysed and/or did not  
139 fit into any group were included in narrative description.

140

141 Data extraction was performed by one of two reviewers (RA, VHS) and checked by a second  
142 reviewer if required. Factorial trials or multiple active arms of a trial were treated as  
143 independent comparisons (*versus* standard care) provided there was no statistically  
144 significant interaction reported.

## 145 **Synthesis of results**

146 Studies were included in meta-analysis if they reported the difference in total antibiotic  
147 prescribing rates between arms in a format that could be synthesised (or provided data  
148 which allowed calculation into that format). The measure for meta-analysis was the mean  
149 percentage difference in total antibiotic prescribing between intervention and control  
150 groups at follow-up, or the difference in the mean change from baseline to follow-up  
151 between groups. The latter was preferred if it was reported or could be calculated. Meta-  
152 analyses were conducted in RevMan 5.4.1 using a random-effects model, which implements  
153 a Mantel-Haenszel method and a generic inverse variance method.<sup>27</sup> Sensitivity analyses  
154 excluded studies with high risk of bias.

## 155 **Risk of bias**

156 Methodological quality and risk of bias were evaluated using the 2013 Cochrane Effective  
157 Practice and Organisation of Care (EPOC) tool (Supplementary Table S2),<sup>26</sup> by two reviewers  
158 (VHS, RA) after a calibration exercise (with BG, CM, who also reviewed cases of discrepancy  
159 or doubt). Overall risk of bias was scored 'Low' if all criteria were scored as low risk of bias,  
160 'Medium' if one or two criteria were scored as unclear or high, and 'High' if more than two  
161 criteria were scored as unclear or high.

162

163



164 **Registration**

165 This review was registered in PROSPERO, international prospective register of systematic  
166 reviews, registration number CRD42014010160. Deviations from the original protocol with  
167 justification are reported in Supplementary Table S3.

168 **Results**


169 **Included studies**

170 Searches returned 26,130 studies of which 25,748 were excluded during title and abstract  
171 screening, with 382 full text articles assessed. 74 studies were included, with 53  
172 comparisons from 45 studies included in meta-analyses (Figure 1, Table 1).

173

Figure 1 - PRISMA of Included Studies

174



175

176

177

**Table 1. Characteristics of Included Studies**

Study	Country	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcome extracted	Overall Risk of Bias	Intervention Group	Meta-analysed
Altiner (2007)	Germany	Patients with acute cough	Communication skills training through education by peers	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as the rate of antibiotic prescriptions for acute cough by GP	Low	Educational Outreach	No
Andreeva (2014)	Russia	Adults with lower respiratory tract infection	Point of Care Testing C-Reactive Protein	Usual care	Rate of total antibiotic prescribing measured as percentage of patients prescribed	High	POCT Inflammatory Markers	Yes
Angunawela (1991)	Sri Lanka	All patients	3 arm trial (2 active arms): - Printed educational material - Face to face education	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as the rate (%) of patients prescribed antibiotics	High	Educational Material  Educational Workshop	Yes
Arnold (2021)	Denmark	Nursing home residents aged 65 and over	Educational workshop consisting of interactive educational session for nursing staff, use of a dialogue tool containing a checklist for symptoms and a flow chat, and use of a communication tool	Usual care	Antibiotic prescriptions for UTI presented as rate ratios	High	Educational Workshop	No

Arroll (2002)	New Zealand	All patients	Delayed prescribing	Usual care	Percentage of patients using antibiotics	Unclear	Other	No
Avorn (1983)	U.S.	All patients	3 arm trial (2 active arms): - Printed educational material - Face to face education - Usual care	Usual care	Specific antibiotic use (cephalexin) measured as mean number of units prescribed per physician	Unclear	Educational Material  Educational Outreach	No
Awad (2006)	Sudan	All patients	Four arm trial (3 active arms): - Audit and feedback - Audit and feedback plus educational workshop - Audit and feedback plus educational outreach	Usual care	Total antibiotic prescribing measured as mean number of encounters with antibiotic prescribed	Unclear	Audit and Feedback  Multifaceted – Education with Audit and Feedback	Yes
Bexell (1996)	Sweden	All patients	3 education seminars within a period of 4 months	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as the rate (%) of patients prescribed antibiotics	Unclear	Educational Workshop	Yes
Bourgeois (2010)	U.S.	Children younger than 18 years old with acute respiratory tract infection	Interactive template for acute respiratory tract infections (called 'ARI-IT')	Usual care	Total antibiotic use measured as the percentage of visits with antibiotic prescribed	Unclear	Computerised DSS	Yes
Briel (2006)	Switzerland	Patients aged 18 years old or older with acute respiratory tract infection	Education about guidelines	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as the dispensing of antibiotic prescriptions within 2 weeks of consultation, as reported by pharmacists	High	Educational Workshop	Yes

Briel (2008)	Switzerland	Patients of any age with acute respiratory tract infection	Point of Care Testing - Procalcitonin	Usual care	Rate of total antibiotic prescribing measured as percentage of patients prescribed	Unclear	POCT Inflammatory Markers	Yes
Burkhardt (2010)	Germany	Adults with acute respiratory tract infection	Point of Care Testing- Procalcitonin	Usual care	Total antibiotic prescribing, measured as rate of patients receiving antibiotics	Unclear	POCT Inflammatory Markers	Yes
Butler (2012)	UK	All patients	STAR educational programme: - Seminar about own prescribing and resistance - Online education - Consultation skills	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as items/1000 registered patients	Low	Educational Workshop	Yes
Cals (2009)		Patients with low respiratory tract infection	2x2 factorial trial: - POCT - CRP - Educational - POCT - CRP with education - Usual care	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as the prescribing rate at index consultation and 1-28 days	Unclear	Educational Workshop  POCT Inflammatory Markers	Yes
Cals (2013)	The Netherlands	Follow up of an included study (see Cals 2009)	Three interventions were carried out: intervention A included physician use of CRP testing; intervention B included physician communication skills training; and intervention C included both intervention A and B combined	Usual care	The main outcome measure was the average number of episodes of respiratory tract infections during follow up for which patients visited their family physicians for per year  The secondary outcome was the percentage of episodes for which patients were	Unclear	Other	No

					treated with antibiotics during follow up			
Chazan (2007)	Israel	All patients	One monthly educational seminar over two years versus sessional education	Seasonal education	Total antibiotic use expressed as DDDs/1000 patients/day	Unclear	Other	No
Chen (2014)	China	Patients with respiratory tract infections	Use of text messages for guideline dissemination	Usual care	Total antibiotic use measured as number of antibiotic prescriptions (% total)	High	Other	No
Christakis (2001)	U.S.	Paediatric population with acute otitis media (AOM)	Evidence presented to providers at point of care through screens	Usual care	Total antibiotic use measured as percentage difference in number of antibiotics for AOM before and after the intervention	High	Computerised DSS	Yes
Coenen (2004)	Belgium	Adults with acute cough	Educational outreach visit (academic detailing) and postal reminder	All intervention and controls received a public campaign	Total antibiotic use, measured as antibiotic prescribing rate by GP for adults with acute cough	Unclear	Educational Outreach	Yes
Cohen (2000)	France	Children ≤10 years old with nasopharyngitis	Printed educational material about the management of paediatric nasopharyngitis following a national consensus. Participating clinicians were also encouraged to share this information with parents	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as rate of patients prescribed	High	Printed Educational Material	Yes

Cohen (2007)	France	Children with influenza	Rapid test for influenza detection	Usual care	Rate of antibiotic prescribing measured as percentage of patients prescribed, both antibiotics and antivirals	High	POCT Antigen Detection	No
Curtis (2021)	UK	NHS General Practices	3 arm trial (2 active arms): - Feedback (plain) monthly for 3 months by letter, fax and email  - Feedback and behavioural impact optimization for engagement	Usual Care	Percentage difference in broad-spectrum antibiotic prescribing during the follow-up periods (5 weeks post each wave of intervention n=3)	High	Audit and Feedback	No
DahlerEriksen (1999)	Denmark	All patients	Point of Care Testing C-Reactive Protein	Crossover trial	Total antibiotic use measured as the rate of patients prescribed in each group	High	POCT Inflammatory Markers	Yes
De Santis (1994)	Australia	Patients with tonsillitis	Pharmacist-led educational outreach visit to GPs to discuss tonsillitis management	Not specified	Specific antibiotic use, measured as the percentage of antibiotic prescriptions compliant with guidelines	High	Educational Outreach	No
Diederichsen (2000)	Denmark	All ages, consulting for RTI	Point of Care Testing C-Reactive Protein	Usual care	Total antibiotic use measured as the rate of patients prescribed in each group	High	POCT Inflammatory Markers	Yes
Dowell (2001)	UK	Adults with respiratory tract infections	Delayed prescribing	Usual care	Collection of antibiotic prescriptions by the patients	Unclear	Other	No

EnriquezPuga (2009)	UK	All patients	Two outreach visits	Control practices had educational outreach about antidepressant use	Specific antibiotic use (co-amoxiclav and quinolones), measured as both: - Number of prescriptions per 1000 registered patients. - % co-amoxiclav and quinolones, of total antibiotic prescribing	Unclear	Educational Outreach	No
Figueiras (2020)	Spain	Primary care physicians	One-hour educational outreach visits with optional use of computerised DSS	Usual care	Outpatient antibiotic use presented as defined daily doses per 1000 inhabitants per day (DID)	High	Educational Outreach	Yes
Filkenstein (2001)	U.S.	Children <6 years old	Two educational meetings with a clinician peer leader using CDC summaries about prudent AB prescribing	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as antibiotic courses per person-year	Low	Educational Outreach	Yes
Fleet (2014)	UK	Nursing home residents	RAMP antibiotic stewardship tool (printed): checklist to complete	Usual care	Total antibiotic use measured as number of prescriptions per 100 residents	High	Printed DSS	Yes
Flottorp (2002)	Norway	Sore throat in people aged 3 years or older. Urinary tract infection in non-pregnant women aged 16 to 55	Multicomponent: - DSS - Education for GPs and patients - Printed material - Financial incentive	Usual care for either sore throat or UTI (each active arm is the control for the condition they are not targeted for)	Total antibiotic use, measured as the rate of patients prescribed antibiotics	Unclear	Multifaceted - Other	Yes



Forrest (2013)	U.S.	Children aged 2 months to 12 years with acute otitis media (AOM)	2x2 factorial trial: - DSS - Audit and feedback - DSS plus audit and feedback - Usual care	Usual care	Percentage of visits in which amoxicillin (first line) was prescribed	High	Multifaceted - Other	No
Francis (2009)	UK	Children with respiratory tract infections	Interactive booklet	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as rate of patients taken antibiotics at two weeks	Unclear	Other	No
Gerber (2013)	U.S.	Children aged 1 to 10 years old with acute respiratory tract infection	One-hour educational session plus feedback about current prescribing at practice and individual prescriber level	Usual care	Proportion of broad-spectrum antibiotic prescriptions	Unclear	Multifaceted – Education with Audit and Feedback	Yes
Gjelstad (2013)	Norway	Patients with acute respiratory tract infections	Two academic detailing visits, reviewing antibiotic guidelines and each GP's prescribing	Control practices received education about inappropriate prescribing in the elderly	Total antibiotic prescribing rates, expressed as number of antibiotic prescriptions for number of episodes of respiratory tract infections	Low	Educational Outreach	No
Gonzales (2013)	U.S.	13 years old and older with acute uncomplicated bronchitis	3 arm trial (2 active arms): - Printed DSS - Computerised DSS	Usual care	Total antibiotic prescribing rates for acute bronchitis measured as the percentage of patients with acute bronchitis prescribed antibiotics	Low	Printed DSS  Computerised DSS	Yes
Hurlimann (2015)	Switzerland	Patients with respiratory tract infections	Audit and feedback on with guidelines sent to all prescribers	Usual care	Rate of patients prescribed specific antibiotic classes	Low	Audit and Feedback	No

Hux (1999)	Canada	Patients over 65 years old with respiratory and urinary tract infections	Posted feedback was provided to prescribers three times in a six months' period about their own individual prescribing practices and how they compared to a group of peers, along with guidelines	Usual care	Proportion of visits in which specific antibiotics were used	Unclear	Audit and Feedback	No
Ilet (2000)	Australia	Patients with respiratory or urinary tract infections	10-15 minutes visit by adviser to individual prescribers to discuss recommended treatments for respiratory tract infections	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as median number of antibiotic prescriptions by GP	High	Educational Outreach	No
Keitel (2017)	Tanzania	Patients aged between 2 and 59 months being treated with febrile illnesses	Multifaceted - Decision Support System (DSS) Computerised based on C-Reactive Protein and procalcitonin point of care testing	Electronic algorithm derived from Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (IMCI) strategy (developed by, WHO and UNICEF).	The proportion of antibiotic prescriptions at day 0. Prescribing between day 1 and day 6 were recorded but involved non-study physicians	High	Multifaceted other	Yes

Lagerlov (2000)	Norway	People with urinary tract infection	2 educational evening meetings, concerning diagnosis and management	Usual care	Rates of “acceptable” and “unacceptable” antibiotic prescribing. The difference in proportions of short (acceptable) and long (unacceptable) treatments for UTI before and after the intervention	Low	Educational Workshop	No
Le Corvosier (2013)	France	People with respiratory tract infection	Interactive seminar presenting evidence-based guidelines on antibiotic prescription for respiratory infections	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as the proportion of prescriptions (of total) that were antibiotics (meta-analysed)	Unclear	Educational Workshop	Yes
Linder (2009)	U.S.	Patients with acute respiratory tract infection	Electronic health record integrated decision support tool providing guidance and treatment options for respiratory tract infections - ‘ARI Smart Form’	Usual care	Antibiotic prescribing rate expressed as percentage of patients consulting with acute respiratory tract infections who are prescribed antibiotics	High	Computerised DSS	Yes
Little (2013a)	UK	Patients aged three years old or older with acute sore throat	Clinical score plus CRP POCT	Usual care	Rate of patients prescribed antibiotics	Low	POCT Inflammatory Markers  Multifaceted - Other	Yes
Little (2013b)	UK	Patients with respiratory tract infection	2x2 factorial trial: - POCT - CRP - Education - POCT - CRP plus education	Usual care	Total antibiotic use measured as the rate of patients prescribed in each group	Unclear	Educational Workshop	Yes

			- Usual care					
Little P (2014)	UK	Patients aged three years old and over with respiratory infection	Delayed prescribing	Immediate antibiotic use	Rate of patients using antibiotics	Unclear	Other	No
Llor (2011)	Spain	Patients aged 14 to 60 years old with acute pharyngitis	Rapid test for Group A <i>Streptococcus</i>	Usual care	Antibiotic prescription rate measured as the rate patients with pharyngitis prescribed antibiotics	Unclear	POCT Antigen Detection	Yes
Loeb (2005)	Canada and U.S.	Nursing home residents with urinary tract infection	30-minute visit to both nurses and GPs presenting case scenarios and a clinical algorithm	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as number of antibiotic courses per 1000 residents-day	Unclear	Educational Outreach	Yes
Lundborg (1999)	Sweden	Women aged 18 to 75 years old with urinary tract infection	Outreach visits on urinary tract infections, using feedback as learning tool in peer groups	Control practices received education on asthma	Total antibiotic use, measured as number of prescriptions for UTI (as % of total antibiotic use)	Unclear	Educational Outreach	Yes
Martens (2007)	The Netherlands	All patients	Computerised prescription model as reminder system tool with integrated prescribing guidelines	Usual care	Total antibiotic use measured as the percentage of visits with antibiotic prescribed)	High	Computerised DSS	Yes
McConnell (1982)	U.S.	Patients with upper respiratory tract infection	30 minute educational visits by expert clinicians	Not specified	Specific antibiotic use, measured as mean number of prescriptions of tetracyclines	High	Educational Outreach	No

Meeker (2014)	U.S.	Adult (over 18 years old) patients with	Display of poster-sized 'commitment letters' in doctors' offices	Usual care	Rate (%) of patients prescribed 'inappropriate' antibiotics for respiratory tract infections	Low	Other	No
Milos (2013)	Sweden	Patients with respiratory tract infections, all ages and aged 0-6 years	Three arm trial comparing two behavioural interventions	Usual care	Total antibiotic use measured as number of antibiotic prescriptions for RTIs per 1000 registered patients	Unclear	Other	No
Naughton (2009)	Ireland	All patients	Half hour educational outreach visit versus postal feedback	Postal feedback	Total antibiotic prescribing measured as prescriptions per 1000 registered patients	Unclear	Other	No
O'Connell (1999)	Australia	All patients	Individualised text and graphical feedback to prescribers about their prescribing rates of five main drug groups	Usual care	Total antibiotic prescribing measured as number of prescriptions per 100 services	Low	Audit and Feedback	No
Pagaiya (2005)	Thailand	All patients	Educational out-reach visit about antibiotic use in respiratory tract infections and diarrhoea	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, expressed as percentage of patients prescribed antibiotics	High	Educational Outreach	Yes
Rebnord (2016)	Norway	Participants aged between 0-6 years old	Point of care testing C-Reactive Protein	Usual care	Total antibiotic use measured as the rate of patients prescribed in each group	High	POCT Inflammatory Markers	Yes

Regev-Yochay (2011)	Israel	Children (younger than 18 years old)	Multifaceted intervention over 3 years. Comparisons included: - Educational workshop (end of year 2) versus usual care - Audit and feedback (year 3 compared to year 2) - Mixed audit and feedback plus education (year 3 compared to baseline)	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as the number of prescriptions per 100 patient-years	Low	Educational Workshop  Audit and Feedback  Multifaceted – Education with Audit and Feedback	Yes
Samore (2005)	U.S.	Patients with acute respiratory tract infection	DSS (printed and computerised) plus professional education in practices plus a community intervention to change help seeking behaviour (one comparison from three arm study where the second active arm only received the community intervention)	Usual care	Total antibiotic use measured as the number of prescriptions per 100 patients-years	Unclear	Multifaceted - Other	Yes
Santoso (1996)	Indonesia	Patients with diarrhoea	3 arm trial (2 active arms): - Educational seminar - Small group face-to-face educational outreach	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as percentage of patients prescribed antibiotics (meta-analysed)	High	Educational Workshop  Educational Outreach	Yes
Shrestha (2006)	Nepal	Adults with respiratory tract infection	Educational outreach visits to health workers presenting WHO guidelines of “Practical Approach to Lung Health” (PAL)	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as % encounters in which antibiotic is prescribed	High	Educational Outreach	No

Sondergaard (2003)	Denmark	Any age with respiratory tract infections	Dissemination of written clinical guidelines with feedback	Usual care	Total antibiotic prescription rate, measured as mean number of antibiotic prescriptions per 1000 registered patients	Unclear	Audit and Feedback	Yes
Van Den Bruel (2016)	UK	Participants aged between 1 month and 16 years	Point of care testing C-Reactive Protein	Usual care	Total antibiotic use measured as the rate of patients prescribed in each group	High	POCT Inflammatory Markers	Yes
Van Driel (2007)	Belgium	Patients with rhinosinusitis	Use of quality circles to promote and discuss guidelines	Usual care	Total antibiotic use measured as rate of patients receiving antibiotics	High	Other	No
Varonen (2007)	Finland	Patients with sinusitis	Implementation of national guidelines with practices randomised to one of two active arms - academic detailing - problem-based learning	Two active arms compared	Specific antibiotic use. Use of first-line drugs, measured as percentage (%) of courses complying with recommended duration	Unclear	Educational Workshop	No
Vellinga (2016)	Ireland	All patients attending one of the 32 eligible Irish Primary Care Research Network practices	Information on national guidelines for antibiotic prescribing with a reminder pop-up of these guidelines. Discussion of the first practice audit report and a monthly audit post intervention	Baseline data collection with a coding workshop to all practices including the control arm	Rate of total antibiotic prescribing measured as percentage of patients prescribed	Unclear	Multifaceted - Education with Audit and Feedback	Yes

Veninga (2000)	The Netherlands	Women aged 18 to 75 years old with urinary tract infection	Two educational meetings about guidelines for management of urinary tract infections (UTI)	People with asthma (no UTI intervention)	Specific antibiotic use, measured as the proportion of DDDs which were for first line drugs	Unclear	Educational Workshop	No
Wei (2017)	China	Participants aged to 14 years old	Educational material, printed and interactive session	Usual care	Rate of total antibiotic prescribing measured as percentage of patients prescribed	Unclear	Educational material	Yes
Welschen (2004)	The Netherlands	Patients of any age with acute respiratory tract infection	Education about first-line antibiotics for respiratory tract infections and enhanced communication, with feedback on prescribing rates.	Usual care	Total antibiotic use, measured as the proportion of practice encounters for respiratory tract infection in which antibiotics are prescribed	Unclear	Multifaceted – Education with Audit and Feedback	Yes
Wilson (2003)	Australia	Children with respiratory tract infections	Intensive intervention with focus groups and workshops for guideline development in the first year, and educational outreach with prescribing feedback and reinforcement of guidelines in the second year	Control practices also received the guidelines and an implementation package	Total antibiotic use, measured as the number of subsidised antibiotic prescriptions per 100 Medicaid claims	High	Multifaceted -Other	Yes
Worrall (2007)	Canada	Adults with acute sore throat	2x2 factorial trial: - Printed DSS - Rapid test for Group A <i>Streptococcus</i>	Usual care	Antibiotic prescribing rate expressed as % visits where antibiotic was prescribed	Unclear	POCT Antigen Detection  Printed DSS	Yes




Yang (2014)	China	Patients with respiratory tract infections	Public reporting of prescribing rates at both individual and institutional level monthly, with comparison and ranking of institutions, and data available to both patients and providers		Proportion of patients (%) with respiratory tract infections receiving antibiotics	High	Other	No
Zahlanie (2021)	USA	Patients between the ages of 3 to 19 months who had received prescriptions for oral antibiotics and/or treatment in 4 outpatient clinics in the USA	A quality improvement project evaluating the impact of EPIC order sets (providing options of antibiotics with dosage and duration time) and educational outreach sessions on antibiotic prescribing for common paediatric bacterial ARIs	Usual Care	Percentage of first-line antibiotic prescribing in both arms, pre and post implementation of the intervention	High	Educational Outreach	Yes
Zwar (1995)	Australia	URTI and people with tonsillitis	Intervention GP trainees attended educational seminar about antibiotic prescribing	GP trainees who attended a seminar about cancer prevention	Total antibiotic prescribing for any condition and for uncomplicated URTIs, measured as the GP trainee antibiotic prescribing rate per patient encounter	High	Educational Workshop	Yes

## Risk of bias

Overall, 30/74 (41%) studies had high risk of bias, 33/74 (46%) had unclear, and 11/74 (15%) had low (Figure 2, Supplementary Figure S1). The most common sources of high risk of bias were lack of reporting of baseline outcome measures 11/74 (15%), lack of reporting of baseline characteristics 8/74 (11%), lack of blinding, and other bias, both 7/74 (9%). Most studies had low risk of bias in relation to selective outcome reporting 72/74 (97%), completeness of outcome data 72/74 (97%) and allocation concealment 67/74 (91%).

**Figure 2 - Overall Risk of Bias – percentage of studies assigned each category**



## Intervention effects


Pooled estimates of intervention effects on total antibiotic prescribing across all intervention types are summarised in Table 2 for primary meta-analyses (Figure 3) and sensitivity meta-analyses (Supplementary Figure S2).

**Table 1 - Pooled meta-analysis estimates of intervention effects on total antibiotic prescribing**

Intervention group	Main analysis			Sensitivity analysis excluding studies with high risk of bias		
	No. of studies	% (95% CI) reduction in total antibiotic prescribing	P value	No. of studies	% (95% CI) reduction in total antibiotic prescribing	P value
Education						
Educational Material	3	-17.0 (-31.0 to -3.0)	0.02	NA	NA	NA
Educational Outreach	10	-8.7 (-12.8 to -4.7)	<0.001	6	-11.5 (-16.4 to -6.5)	<0.001
Educational Workshop	8	-6.0 (-10.6 to -1.4)	0.01	4	-10.2 (-17.0 to -3.4)	0.003
Audit and Feedback	3	-2.1 (-3.5 to -0.6)	0.003	NA	NA	
Point of Care Testing						
Antigen Detection	2	-28.0 (-38.2 to -17.8)	<0.001	NA	NA	NA
Inflammatory Markers	9	-16.8 (-37.0 to 3.3)	0.1	4	-31.3 (-59.6 to -3.0)	<0.001
Decision Support System						
Computerised	5	-3.7 (-10.8 to 3.5)	0.32	2	-14.8 (-19.5 to -10.0)	<0.001
Printed	3	-10.8 (-15.7 to -6.0)	<0.001	2	-9.6 (-19.6 to 0.4)	0.06
Multifaceted						
Education + Audit and Feedback	5	-9.9 (-12.8 to -7.0)	<0.001	NA	NA	NA
Other	5	-9.4 (-17.2 to -1.6)	0.02	3	-9.3 (-20.0 to 1.4)	0.09

NA: not applicable (either no studies or only one study without high risk of bias)

Figure 3 - Forest plots of main intervention effects



## **Education**

### *a. Educational Material*

Four studies compared educational material with usual care. Two had high risk of bias<sup>28, 29</sup> and two unclear.<sup>30, 31</sup> Meta-analysis including three studies<sup>28, 29, 31</sup> found a large, significant reduction in total antibiotic prescribing (mean percentage difference -17.0% [95%CI -31.0, -3.0], p=0.02) (Figure 3a). The fourth trial (a three-armed trial with an educational intervention) found no change in targeted prescribing of a single antibiotic.<sup>30</sup>

### *b. Educational Workshops*

Fourteen studies compared educational workshops with usual care. Five had high risk of bias,<sup>28, 32-35</sup> six unclear,<sup>36-41</sup> and three low.<sup>42-44</sup> Meta-analysis including ten studies<sup>28, 33-38, 41, 42, 44</sup> found a moderate, significant reduction in antibiotic prescribing (-8.7% [-12.8, -4.7], p<0.001) (Figure 3b). Sensitivity analysis including six studies<sup>36-38, 41, 42, 44</sup> found a slightly larger significant reduction (-11.5% [-16.4, -6.5], p<0.001) (Supplementary Figure S2a). Of the four studies not meta-analysed, two reported significant reductions in antibiotic prescribing for urinary tract infections,<sup>32, 40</sup> one reported a 13% improvement in the duration of prescribed antibiotic courses,<sup>43</sup> and one reported increased prescribing of a recommended specific antibiotic.<sup>39</sup>

### *c. Educational Outreach*

Sixteen studies compared educational outreach with usual care. Eight had high risk of bias,<sup>34, 45-51</sup> five unclear,<sup>30, 52-55</sup> and three low.<sup>56-58</sup> Meta-analysis including eight studies<sup>34, 46, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 57</sup> found a small, significant reduction in antibiotic prescribing (-6.0% [-10.6, -1.4], p=0.01) (Figure 3c). The reduction was larger in sensitivity analysis including four studies<sup>52, 54, 55, 57</sup> (-10.2 % [-17.0, -3.4], p=0.003) (Supplementary Figure S2b).

Eight studies were not meta-analysed.<sup>30, 45, 47, 48, 50, 53, 56, 58</sup> Four found significantly lower antibiotic prescribing, with two targeting specific antibiotics<sup>30, 48</sup> and two targeting respiratory tract infections.<sup>56, 58</sup> Two studies found an increase in prescribing of recommended specific antibiotics.<sup>45, 47</sup> Two studies found non-significant reductions in prescribing, one of specific antibiotics<sup>53</sup> and the other for respiratory tract infections.<sup>50</sup>

### ***Audit and Feedback***

Seven studies compared audit and feedback with usual care. One had high risk of bias,<sup>59</sup> three unclear,<sup>60-62</sup> and three low.<sup>44, 63, 64</sup> Meta-analysis of three studies<sup>44, 60, 62</sup> found a small, significant reduction in antibiotic prescribing (-2.1% [-3.5, -0.6], p=0.003) (Figure 3d). Four studies were not meta-analysed. Three reported improvements in prescribing rates for specific antibiotics.<sup>59, 61, 63</sup> One reported no difference in median prescribing rates per 100 consultations.<sup>64</sup>

### ***Point of Care Testing (POCT)***

#### *a. Antigen Detection*

Three studies compared POCT for antigen detection with usual care. One had high risk of bias<sup>65</sup> and two had unclear risk of bias.<sup>66, 67</sup> Meta-analysis of two studies<sup>66, 67</sup> found a large, significant reduction in antibiotic prescribing (-28.0% [-38.2, -17.8], p<0.001) (Figure 3e). In the study not meta-analysed,<sup>65</sup> use of POCT for flu in children increased antibiotic use (9.5% of patients with test performed *versus* 3.9% in those without), particularly among those with a negative test (15.7% *versus* 4.3% of those with a positive test).

### *b. Inflammatory Markers*

Nine studies compared POCT for inflammatory markers with usual care. Five had high risk of bias,<sup>68-72</sup> three unclear<sup>37, 73, 74</sup> and one low.<sup>75</sup> Meta-analysis including all nine studies<sup>37, 68-75</sup> found no significant reduction in antibiotic prescribing (-16.8% [-37.0, 3.3],  $p=0.10$ ) (Figure 3f), but in sensitivity analysis of four studies<sup>37, 73-75</sup> the reduction was larger and statistically significant (-31.3% [-59.6, -3.0],  $p<0.001$ ) (Supplementary Figure S2c).

## **Decision Support Systems (DSS)**

### *a. Computerised*

Five studies compared computerised DSS with usual care. Three had high risk of bias,<sup>76-78</sup> one unclear,<sup>79</sup> and one low.<sup>80</sup> Meta-analysis of all five<sup>76-80</sup> found a small non-significant reduction in prescribing (-3.7% [-10.8, 3.5],  $p=0.32$ ) (Figure 3g). Sensitivity analysis of two studies<sup>79, 80</sup> found a large, significant reduction (-14.8% [-19.5, -10.0],  $p<0.001$ ) (Supplementary Figure S2d).

### *b. Printed*

Three studies compared printed DSS with usual care. One had high risk of bias,<sup>81</sup> one unclear.<sup>67</sup> and one low.<sup>80</sup> Meta-analysis of all three studies<sup>67, 80, 81</sup> found a significant reduction (-10.8% [-15.7, -6.0],  $p<0.0001$ ) (Figure 3h). Sensitivity analysis including two studies<sup>67, 80</sup> found a non-significant reduction of similar magnitude (-9.6% [-19.6, 0.4],  $p=0.06$ ) (see Supplementary Figure S2e).

## **Multifaceted Interventions**

### *a. Education with Audit and Feedback*

Five studies compared education and audit and feedback with usual care. Four had unclear risk of bias,<sup>60, 82-84</sup> and one low.<sup>44</sup> Meta-analysis of all five studies<sup>44, 60, 82-84</sup> identified a significant reduction in total antibiotic prescribing (-9.9% [-12.8, -7.0],  $p < 0.001$ ) (Figure 3i).

### *b. Multifaceted Other*

Six studies reporting seven interventions compared multifaceted interventions other than education with audit and feedback, with usual care. The interventions included various combinations of education for prescribers and patients, audit and feedback, DSS, POCT, and financial incentives (Table 1). Three had high risk of bias<sup>85-87</sup> and three had unclear.<sup>75, 88, 89</sup> Meta-analysis of five studies<sup>75, 86-89</sup> identified a significant reduction (-9.4% [-17.2, -1.6],  $p = 0.02$ ) (Figure 3j). In sensitivity analysis including three studies,<sup>75, 88, 89</sup> the reduction was the same magnitude but no longer significant (-9.3% [-20.0, 1.4],  $p = 0.09$ ) (Supplementary Figure S2f). The study that was not meta-analysed found a combination of audit and feedback and computerised DSS did not change amoxicillin prescribing rates.<sup>85</sup>

## **Other Interventions**

Twelve included studies did not fit into the above intervention groups. Three had high risk of bias,<sup>90-92</sup> eight unclear<sup>93-100</sup> and one low.<sup>101</sup>

One study<sup>94</sup> reported longer term follow-up (avg. 3.7 years later) of another included study.<sup>37</sup> The follow up data could not be extracted or included separately, but the previously reported significant reduction in antibiotic prescribing was not sustained.



Three studies examined delayed prescribing, two compared this with usual care for respiratory tract infections and found significant reductions in antibiotic use,<sup>93, 96</sup> and one compared it with decision support and found no significant difference.<sup>98</sup>

One study compared different types of education and reported a significant reduction in total antibiotic use,<sup>95</sup> while another compared educational outreach with postal feedback and reported no difference.<sup>100</sup> Two studies examined novel ways of guideline dissemination, using text messages<sup>90</sup> and quality circles,<sup>91</sup> but neither had significant effects.

Three studies reported interventions using behavioural techniques, with two finding significant effects on the targeted prescribing for respiratory tract infections,<sup>97, 101</sup> and one finding significant effects in paediatric patients  $\leq 6$  years only but no effect on the general population.<sup>99</sup> Finally, one study examined public reporting of primary care antibiotic prescribing and found a significant effect.<sup>92</sup>

## Discussion

### Principal Findings

This systematic review with meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials in community settings found statistically significant reductions in total antibiotic prescribing with the following interventions compared to usual care: educational material (-17.0%); educational workshops (-8.7%); educational outreach (-6.0%); audit and feedback (-2.1%); POCT for antigen detection (-38.2%), and; printed DSS (-10.9%). Multifaceted interventions incorporating education with audit and feedback (-9.9%) and other combinations of interventions (-9.4%) also significantly reduced total antibiotic prescribing by similar

magnitudes as single interventions (Figure 3, Table 2). Sensitivity analyses, excluding studies with high risk of bias, had similar findings except that the effects of POCT for inflammatory markers (-31.3%) and computerised DSS (-14.8%) were statistically significant, and printed DSS and multifaceted 'other' were no longer statistically significant (Figure S2, Table 2).

### **Strengths and Limitations**

Strengths of the study include the use of a comprehensive search carried out in MEDLINE, EMBASE and The Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care (EPOC) Specialised Register, aiming to identify all potentially relevant studies. No language restrictions were placed and included studies included low- and middle-income countries. The mean percentage difference in total antibiotic prescribing and the generic inverse variance method was used for meta-analysis because of variability in outcome reporting. In this method, larger studies with smaller standard errors are given greater weight, improving the precision of the effect estimate.

A limitation is the heterogeneity among studies, in trial design, interventions, and outcome measures. Analysis therefore grouped similar intervention types and used random-effects meta-analysis. There was still heterogeneity within groups and some studies being 'mixed'. Classification of some studies by intervention type required careful consideration and discussion but a dominant intervention could usually be identified for study allocation. There will be variation in context and implementation across studies but this is not possible to account for in meta-analyses and is a common limitation across any evidence synthesis involving behavioural type interventions.

## Comparison with other studies

All studies from the 2005 Arnold *et al* Cochrane review of primary care stewardship interventions were assessed for eligibility. Of the 40 studies they included, 17 are included and 23 were ineligible, and we included four studies they excluded. Their review included interventions involving printed educational materials, educational meetings, educational outreach visits, audit and feedback, financial and healthcare system changes, physician reminders, patient-based interventions, and multifaceted interventions, with multifaceted interventions the most effective. In our review, multifaceted approaches (categorised as ‘education plus audit and feedback’ and ‘other multifaceted’) were not clearly more effective than single intervention strategies.

The largest effect observed in our review, a -28% reduction in antibiotic use, was with POCT for antigen detection. This intervention was not included in the previous Cochrane review<sup>16</sup> and we only identified two studies - both targeting patients with suspected respiratory infections. POCT for inflammatory markers had more included studies. We found a non-significant decrease (-17%) in antibiotic prescribing across all nine, but the effect was significant in sensitivity analysis including four high quality trials (-31%) (Table 2). Four recent systematic reviews examined POCT for inflammatory markers in respiratory tract infections. One included different intervention types in primary care,<sup>102</sup> but two that included POCT tests for any inflammatory markers<sup>22, 23</sup> each identified 13 studies, with eight overlapping and six of the total combined 18 studies included in our review. Both reported reductions in antibiotic treatment at index consultation with CRP POCT (RR 0.77 [0.69 to 0.86]<sup>22</sup> and RR 0.79 [0.70 to 0.90]<sup>23</sup>), of similar magnitude to our findings. One also reported a reduction (RR 0.81 [0.76 to 0.86]<sup>22</sup> at 28 days, but the other reported no difference, and

an increase in re-consultation.<sup>23</sup> The fourth review, of procalcitonin, found only two of 14 eligible RCTs were in primary care.<sup>103</sup> In those two studies (both in our review),<sup>33, 74</sup> procalcitonin POCT lowered antibiotic use (OR 0.10 [0.07 to 0.14]). Overall, POCT in primary care stewardship shows promise in trial settings but there has been little (or no) evidence of translation into routine clinical practice.

Educational interventions, most often involving guideline implementation, have been associated with improvements in use and appropriateness of antibiotics in primary care,<sup>20</sup> but we found an unexpectedly large effect of printed educational materials (-17% reduction), particularly since workshops (-8.7%) and outreach (-6%) had smaller effects. This large effect contrasts with a recent Cochrane review assessing the effect of printed educational materials on professional practice more generally, which reported that they “probably” improve practice compared to no intervention (median absolute risk difference 0.04 [IQR 0.01 to 0.09]).<sup>104</sup> The differences may be contextual and/or reflect that our meta-analysis included only three studies (compared to 16),<sup>104</sup> one of which had a very large effect (-37%),<sup>31</sup> and two had high risk of bias.<sup>28, 29</sup>

The small but significant effects of audit and feedback on total antibiotic prescribing in our review (-2% reduction) are consistent with a broader systematic review of the effects of audit and feedback on healthcare professional practice reporting a risk difference of 4.3% (IQR 0.5 to 16) across 49 studies with dichotomous outcomes and percent change of 1.3% (IQR = 1.3% to 28.9%) across 21 studies with continuous outcomes.<sup>105</sup>

A systematic review of computerised decision support systems (DSS) to reduce inappropriate antibiotic prescribing included non-randomised studies and hospital settings,

in addition to RCTs in primary care settings.<sup>106</sup> Of 13 RCTs (four included in our review<sup>36, 76, 77, 80</sup>) only two, in hospitals, were included in their meta-analysis. Similar to our review, they report a non-significant effect favouring DSS (OR 1.24 [0.95 to 1.62]).<sup>106</sup> We did, however, find, a significant reduction in antibiotic prescribing (-14.8%,  $p < 0.001$ ) when studies with high risk of bias were excluded (Table 2).

A Cochrane review of 221 studies of antibiotic stewardship in hospital settings included non-randomised studies and clinical and unintended outcomes in addition to prescribing outcomes, and grouped studies for meta-analysis by outcome with meta-regression to estimate the effect of behaviour change functions.<sup>19</sup> It reported a 15% (14 to 16) change in the intended direction across 29 RCTs with a prescribing outcome, and that enablement (defined as ‘increasing means/reducing barriers to increase capability or opportunity’), restriction (‘using rules to reduce the opportunity to engage in the target behaviour [or increase the target behaviour by reducing the opportunity to engage in competing behaviours]’), and targeting antibiotic choice over exposure were significantly associated with greater intervention effect.<sup>19</sup> Although not directly comparable to our primary care review, the overall conclusion that most published stewardship interventions are effective, with some variation in effect size by type of intervention, is consistent with our findings.

### **Implications for clinicians and policy makers**

The evidence synthesised in this review indicates that a wide range of stewardship interventions are effective in reducing antibiotic use in primary care, but defining which intervention component is most effective is complex. With increasingly challenging targets for reductions in antibiotic prescribing in primary care,<sup>107</sup> and AMR a high priority,<sup>108</sup> there is a need for continued implementation of stewardship interventions. Sustained stewardship

programmes in primary care, with sequential interventions and a likely gradual change in prescribing culture, have been effective in reducing total antibiotic prescribing at national level over time,<sup>109-112</sup> and more focused interventions can have large effects on the choice of antibiotic prescribed in primary care over shorter time periods.<sup>113</sup> Designers of antimicrobial stewardship programmes can choose from a range of likely effective intervention components that are appropriate to their context in terms of local feasibility and acceptability.

### **Implications for future research**

Further RCTs of single stewardship interventions are unlikely to significantly add to the evidence, given that, overall, all types of intervention were effective in improving antibiotic prescribing. Better designed comparisons between different multifaceted interventions are likely to be more impactful, given the large effects of multifaceted interventions in real-world analyses,<sup>113</sup> although we did not observe this effect in the small number of multifaceted trials in this review. Improving study quality and standardising outcome measures would facilitate more informative evidence synthesis to compare interventions.

Pragmatic trials of more real-world implementation are also needed to evaluate interventions such as POCT that are promising in trials but have not been adopted into practice. POCT had the largest effect size in this review, but the meta-analyses included small numbers of studies and practices participating are unlikely to be representative of the wider prescriber population. Previously reported barriers to implementation of POCT in primary care included the impact on staff and workflow, as well as concerns around cost, reliability/quality control and patient perception.<sup>114</sup> The widespread use of lateral flow

testing in the COVID-19 pandemic may have had an influence on acceptability but concerns about the impact on primary care workflow, with appointments typically less than 10 minutes and an increase in telephone consultations in the UK, are likely to persist. Implementation research in this area should be high priority.

More research is also needed on the effect of stewardship interventions on outcomes other than prescribing.<sup>115</sup> Outcomes should include intended outcomes such as reductions in AMR<sup>7</sup> and *Clostridioides difficile* infection,<sup>116</sup> and unintended consequences of reduced prescribing such as hospital admissions.<sup>117</sup> These can all be more challenging to evaluate in relatively small RCT populations, with small numbers of outcomes, than in evaluations of real-world interventions across whole populations. Non-randomised evaluation of the effect of real-world stewardship interventions, including multi-faceted stewardship interventions, on prescribing and other outcomes should be prioritised as they can generate valuable evidence.<sup>7, 115-117</sup> However, rigorous evaluation requires more systematic documentation of the components included in real world stewardship interventions.

## **Conclusions**

Published trials of all types of stewardship interventions in primary care were effective in improving antibiotic prescribing. More pragmatic evaluations of multifaceted interventions and technologies in 'real-world' practice could inform the design of future stewardship programmes.

## **Contributorship Statement**

Virginia Hernandez Santiago (VHS) and Rebecca Andrews (RA) contributed equally to this paper and work.

VHS, BG and CM designed the work. All authors contributed to selection and review of studies for inclusion, and risk of bias assessment. RA and VHS carried out data extraction and meta-analysis, with quality checking and resolution of uncertainty by BG and CM. VHS and RA wrote the first draft of the manuscript with all authors contributing to critical review and writing the final version. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

## **Competing interests**

All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare:

VHS: support from the Chief Scientist Office, Scottish Government, for funding her time to undertake this work as part of her PhD. Within the past 3 years, funding from the University of St Andrews (employing institution) to fund a PhD project looking at antimicrobial stewardship in primary care out-of-hours and antimicrobial resistance work, and funding from the Chief Scientist Office for COVID-19 research (unrelated work).

BG: funding from National Institute of Health Research and Legal and General PLC to employing institution for unrelated work.

RA: no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.



CM: RA: no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

### **Ethics approval**

Not required.

### **Transparency statement**

VHS, as the guarantor, affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the work reported; that no important aspects have been omitted; with no discrepancies from the study as originally planned.

### **Funding**

VHS was funded by a Chief Scientist Office Clinical Academic Training (PhD) Fellowship (CAF-12-07) during this work. The funding body had no involvement in the study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the article for publication. The research team undertook this work with independence from funders. All authors had full access to all of the data in the study and can take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

### **References**

1. Gulland A. World leaders pledge action on antimicrobial resistance. *BMJ*. 2016;354:i5171.

2. WHO. The evolving threat of antimicrobial resistance: options for action. Geneva. [http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/44812/1/9789241503181\\_eng.pdf](http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/44812/1/9789241503181_eng.pdf); 2012 (Last accessed 26th July 2017) [
3. Bell BG, Schellevis F, Stobberingh E, Goossens H, Pringle M. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of antibiotic consumption on antibiotic resistance. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2014;14:13.
4. O’neill J Review on antimicrobial resistance:tackling a crisis forthe health and wealth of Nations. 2014. <https://amr-review.org>: 1–20.
5. Collaborators AR. Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019: a systematic analysis. *Lancet.* 2022;399(10325):629-55.
6. Costelloe C, Metcalfe C, Lovering A, Mant D, Hay AD. Effect of antibiotic prescribing in primary care on antimicrobial resistance in individual patients: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2010;340:c2096.
7. Hernandez-Santiago V, Davey PG, Nathwani D, Marwick CA, Guthrie B. Changes in resistance among coliform bacteraemia associated with a primary care antimicrobial stewardship intervention: A population-based interrupted time series study. *PLoS medicine.* 2019;16(6):e1002825.
8. Charani E, Castro-Sanchez E, Sevdalis N, Kyratsis Y, Drumright L, Shah N, et al. Understanding the Determinants of Antimicrobial Prescribing Within Hospitals: The Role of “Prescribing Etiquette”. *Clinical Infectious Diseases.* 2013;57(2):188-96.
9. Wood F, Phillips C, Brookes-Howell L, Hood K, Verheij T, Coenen S, et al. Primary care clinicians' perceptions of antibiotic resistance: a multi-country qualitative interview study. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy.* 2013;68(1):237-43.

10. Barlam TF, Cosgrove SE, Abbo LM, MacDougall C, Schuetz AN, Septimus EJ, et al. Implementing an Antibiotic Stewardship Program: Guidelines by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;62(10):e51-77.
11. GOV.UK. Contained and controlled: the UK's 20-year vision for antimicrobial resistance. 2019.
12. Organization GWH. Global antimicrobial resistance surveillance system (GLASS) report; early implementation 2016-2017. 2017.
13. Goossens H, Ferech M, Vander Stichele R, Elseviers M. Outpatient antibiotic use in Europe and association with resistance: a cross-national database study. *Lancet*. 2005;365(9459):579-87.
14. Mobilizing political will to contain resistance. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 2011;89:168–169. doi:10.2471/BLT.11.030311.
15. Price L, Gozdzielewska L, Young M, Smith F, MacDonald J, McParland J, et al. Effectiveness of interventions to improve the public's antimicrobial resistance awareness and behaviours associated with prudent use of antimicrobials: a systematic review. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*. 2018;73(6):1464-78.
16. Arnold SR, Straus SE. Interventions to improve antibiotic prescribing practices in ambulatory care. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2005(4):CD003539.
17. England PH. Behaviour change and antibiotic prescribing in healthcare settings: Literature review and behavioural analysis. 2015.
18. Lam TT, Dang DA, Tran HH, Do DV, Le H, Negin J, et al. What are the most effective community-based antimicrobial stewardship interventions in low- and middle-income countries? A narrative review. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*. 2021;76(5):1117-29.

19. Davey P, Marwick CA, Scott CL, Charani E, McNeil K, Brown E, et al. Interventions to improve antibiotic prescribing practices for hospital inpatients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2017;2(2):Cd003543.
20. Rocha V, Estrela M, Neto V, Roque F, Figueiras A, Herdeiro MT. Educational Interventions to Reduce Prescription and Dispensing of Antibiotics in Primary Care: A Systematic Review of Economic Impact. *Antibiotics (Basel, Switzerland).* 2022;11(9).
21. Satterfield J, Miesner AR, Percival KM. The role of education in antimicrobial stewardship. *Journal of Hospital Infection.* 2020;105(2):130-41.
22. Smedemark SA, Aabenhus R, Llor C, Fournaise A, Olsen O, Jørgensen KJ. Biomarkers as point-of-care tests to guide prescription of antibiotics in people with acute respiratory infections in primary care. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2022;10(10):Cd010130.
23. Martínez-González NA, Keizer E, Plate A, Coenen S, Valeri F, Verbakel JYJ, et al. Point-of-Care C-Reactive Protein Testing to Reduce Antibiotic Prescribing for Respiratory Tract Infections in Primary Care: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomised Controlled Trials. 2020;9(9):610.
24. Hernandez-Santiago V MC, Guthrie B, Davey P, Brown E. Interventions for improving antimicrobial prescribing in the community: a systematic review. PROSPERO. 2014(CRD42014010160 ).
25. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ.* 2010;8.
26. Effective Practice and Organisation of Care (EPOC). EPOC Taxonomy; 2015. Available at: <https://epoc.cochrane.org/epoc-taxonomy>.
27. Higgins JG, Sally. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 5.1.0 2011 [[https://handbook-5-1.cochrane.org/front\\_page.htm](https://handbook-5-1.cochrane.org/front_page.htm)].

28. Angunawela II DV, Tomson G. Experimental evaluation of the effects of drug information on antibiotic prescribing: a study in outpatient care in an area of Sri Lanka. *Int J Epidemiol.* 1991;1991/06/01(2):558-64.
29. Cohen R AFA, Callens A, Menn S, Urbinelli R, Roden A. . Medico-economic evaluation of an educational intervention to optimize children uncomplicated nasopharyngitis treatment in ambulatory care. *Med Mal Infect.* 2000;30:691-8.
30. Avorn J, Soumerai SB. Improving drug-therapy decisions through educational outreach. A randomized controlled trial of academically based "detailing". *The New England journal of medicine.* 1983;308(24):1457-63.
31. Wei X, Zhang Z, Walley JD, Hicks JP, Zeng J, Deng S, et al. Effect of a training and educational intervention for physicians and caregivers on antibiotic prescribing for upper respiratory tract infections in children at primary care facilities in rural China: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Global health.* 2017;5(12):e1258-e67.
32. Arnold SH, Nygaard Jensen J, Bjerrum L, Siersma V, Winther Bang C, Brostrøm Kousgaard M, et al. Effectiveness of a tailored intervention to reduce antibiotics for urinary tract infections in nursing home residents: a cluster, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2021;21(11):1549-56.
33. Briel M LW, Tschudi P, Young J, Hugenschmidt C, Bucher HC. Communication training and antibiotic use in acute respiratory tract infections. A cluster randomised controlled trial in general practice. *Swiss Medical Weekly.* 2006;136(15-16):241-7.
34. Santoso B, Suryawati S, Prawaitasari JE. Small group intervention vs formal seminar for improving appropriate drug use. *Social science & medicine (1982).* 1996;42(8):1163-8.
35. Zwar NA, Gordon JJ, Sanson-Fisher RW. Evaluation of an educational program in rational prescribing for GP trainees. *Aust Fam Physician.* 1995;24(5):833-8.

36. Bexell A LE, von Hofsten B, Tembo W, Eriksson B, Diwan VK. . Improving drug use through continuing education: a randomized controlled trial in Zambia. *J Clin Epidemiology*. 1996;49:355-7.
37. Cals JW, Butler CC, Hopstaken RM, Hood K, Dinant GJ. Effect of point of care testing for C reactive protein and training in communication skills on antibiotic use in lower respiratory tract infections: cluster randomised trial. *BMJ*. 2009;338:b1374.
38. Le Corvoisier P, Renard V, Roudot-Thoraval F, Cazalens T, Veerabudun K, Canoui-Poitrine F, et al. Long-term effects of an educational seminar on antibiotic prescribing by GPs: a randomised controlled trial. *The British journal of general practice : the journal of the Royal College of General Practitioners*. 2013;63(612):e455-64.
39. Varonen H, Rautakorpi UM, Nyberg S, Honkanen PO, Klaukka T, Palva E, et al. Implementing guidelines on acute maxillary sinusitis in general practice--a randomized controlled trial. *Fam Pract*. 2007;24(2):201-6.
40. Veninga CC, Denig P, Zwaagstra R, Haijjer-Ruskamp FM. Improving drug treatment in general practice. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2000;53(7):762-72.
41. Little P, Stuart B, Francis N, Douglas E, Tonkin-Crine S, Anthierens S, et al. Effects of internet-based training on antibiotic prescribing rates for acute respiratory-tract infections: a multinational, cluster, randomised, factorial, controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2013;382(9899):1175-82.
42. Butler CC, Simpson SA, Dunstan F, Rollnick S, Cohen D, Gillespie D, et al. Effectiveness of multifaceted educational programme to reduce antibiotic dispensing in primary care: practice based randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2012;344:d8173.

43. Lagerlov P LM, Andrew M, Hjortdahl P. Improving doctors' prescribing behaviour through reflection on guidelines and prescription feedback: a randomised controlled study. *Quality in Health Care*. 2000;9:159-65.
44. Regev-Yochay G, Raz M, Dagan R, Roizin H, Morag B, Hetman S, et al. Reduction in antibiotic use following a cluster randomized controlled multifaceted intervention: the Israeli judicious antibiotic prescription study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;53(1):33-41.
45. De Santis G HK, Howard D, Mashford M, Moulds R. Improving the quality of antibiotic prescription patterns in general practice. The role of educational intervention. *The Medical Journal of Australia*. 1994;160:502-5.
46. Figueiras A, López-Vázquez P, Gonzalez-Gonzalez C, Vázquez-Lago JM, Piñeiro-Lamas M, López-Durán A, et al. Impact of a multifaceted intervention to improve antibiotic prescribing: a pragmatic cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control*. 2020;9(1):195.
47. Ilett KF, Johnson S, Greenhill G, Mullen L, Brockis J, Golledge CL, et al. Modification of general practitioner prescribing of antibiotics by use of a therapeutics adviser (academic detailer). *British journal of clinical pharmacology*. 2000;49(2):168-73.
48. McConnell TS, Cushing AH, Bankhurst AD, Healy JL, McIlvenna PA, Skipper BJ. Physician behavior modification using claims data: tetracycline for upper respiratory infection. *West J Med*. 1982;137(5):448-50.
49. Pagaiya N GP. Primary care nurses using guidelines in Thailand: a randomized controlled trial. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2005;10(5):471-7.
50. Shrestha N, Samir KC, Baltussen R, Kafle KK, Bishai D, Niessen L. Practical approach to lung health in Nepal: better prescribing and reduction of cost. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2006;11(5):765-72.

51. Zahlanie Y, Mang NS, Lin K, Hynan LS, Prokesch BC. Improved Antibiotic Prescribing Practices for Respiratory Infections Through Use of Computerized Order Sets and Educational Sessions in Pediatric Clinics. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases*. 2021;8(2):ofaa601.
52. Coenen S, Van Royen P, Michiels B, Denekens J. Optimizing antibiotic prescribing for acute cough in general practice: a cluster-randomized controlled trial. *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy*. 2004;54(3):661-72.
53. Enriquez-Puga A, Baker R, Paul S, Villoro-Valdes R. Effect of educational outreach on general practice prescribing of antibiotics and antidepressants: a two-year randomised controlled trial. *Scandinavian journal of primary health care*. 2009;27(4):195-201.
54. Loeb M, Brazil K, Lohfeld L, McGeer A, Simor A, Stevenson K, et al. Effect of a multifaceted intervention on number of antimicrobial prescriptions for suspected urinary tract infections in residents of nursing homes: cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2005;331(7518):669.
55. Lundborg CS, Wahlstrom R, Oke T, Tomson G, Diwan VK. Influencing prescribing for urinary tract infection and asthma in primary care in Sweden: a randomized controlled trial of an interactive educational intervention. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 1999;52(8):801-12.
56. Altiner A, Brockmann S, Sielk M, Wilm S, Wegscheider K, Abholz HH. Reducing antibiotic prescriptions for acute cough by motivating GPs to change their attitudes to communication and empowering patients: a cluster-randomized intervention study. *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy*. 2007;60(3):638-44.



57. Finkelstein JA, Davis RL, Dowell SF, Metlay JP, Soumerai SB, Rifas-Shiman SL, et al. Reducing antibiotic use in children: a randomized trial in 12 practices. *Pediatrics*. 2001;108(1):1-7.
58. Gjelstad S, Høye S, Straand J, Brekke M, Dalen I, Lindbæk M. Improving antibiotic prescribing in acute respiratory tract infections: cluster randomised trial from Norwegian general practice (prescription peer academic detailing (Rx-PAD) study). *BMJ*. 2013;347:f4403.
59. Curtis HJ, Bacon S, Croker R, Walker AJ, Perera R, Hallsworth M, et al. Evaluating the impact of a very low-cost intervention to increase practices' engagement with data and change prescribing behaviour: a randomized trial in English primary care. *Family Practice*. 2021;38(4):373-80.
60. Awad AI, Eltayeb IB, Baraka OZ. Changing antibiotics prescribing practices in health centers of Khartoum State, Sudan. *European journal of clinical pharmacology*. 2006;62(2):135-42.
61. Hux JE, Melady MP, DeBoer D. Confidential prescriber feedback and education to improve antibiotic use in primary care: a controlled trial. *CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne*. 1999;161(4):388-92.
62. Sondergaard J, Andersen M, Stovring H, Kragstrup J. Mailed prescriber feedback in addition to a clinical guideline has no impact: a randomised, controlled trial. *Scandinavian journal of primary health care*. 2003;21(1):47-51.
63. Hürlimann D, Limacher A, Schabel M, Zanetti G, Berger C, Mühlemann K, et al. Improvement of antibiotic prescription in outpatient care: a cluster-randomized intervention study using a sentinel surveillance network of physicians. *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy*. 2015;70(2):602-8.

64. O'Connell DL, Henry D, Tomlins R. Randomised controlled trial of effect of feedback on general practitioners' prescribing in Australia. *BMJ*. 1999;318(7182):507-11.
65. Cohen R, Thollot F, Lécuyer A, Koskas M, Touitou R, Boucherat M, et al. [Impact of the rapid diagnosis downtown in the assumption of responsibility of the children in period of influenza]. *Archives de pediatrie : organe officiel de la Societe francaise de pediatrie*. 2007;14(7):926-31.
66. Llor C, Madurell J, Balague-Corbella M, Gomez M, Cots JM. Impact on antibiotic prescription of rapid antigen detection testing in acute pharyngitis in adults: a randomised clinical trial. *The British journal of general practice : the journal of the Royal College of General Practitioners*. 2011;61(586):e244-51.
67. Worrall G HJ, Sherman G, Griffiths J. Diagnosing streptococcal sore throat in adults. Randomized controlled trial of in-office aids. *Can Fam Physician*. 2007;53:666-71.
68. Andreeva E, Melbye H. Usefulness of C-reactive protein testing in acute cough/respiratory tract infection: an open cluster-randomized clinical trial with C-reactive protein testing in the intervention group. *BMC family practice*. 2014;15:80.
69. Dahler-Eriksen B LT, Flensted Lassen J, Lund E D, Brandslund I. Near-Patient Test for C-Reactive Protein in General Practice: Assessment of Clinical, Organizational, and Economic Outcomes. *Clinical Chemistry*. 1999;45(4):478-85.
70. Diederichsen HZ, Skamling M, Diederichsen A, Grinsted P, Antonsen S, Petersen PH, et al. Randomised controlled trial of CRP rapid test as a guide to treatment of respiratory infections in general practice. *Scandinavian journal of primary health care*. 2000;18(1):39-43.

71. Rebnord IK, Sandvik H, Batman Mjelle A, Hunskaar S. Out-of-hours antibiotic prescription after screening with C reactive protein: a randomised controlled study. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(5):e011231.
72. Van den Bruel A, Jones C, Thompson M, Mant D. C-reactive protein point-of-care testing in acutely ill children: a mixed methods study in primary care. *Archives of disease in childhood*. 2016;101(4):382-5.
73. Briel M SP, Mueller B. Procalcitonin-guided antibiotic use vs a standard approach for acute respiratory tract infections in primary care. *Archives of internal medicine*. 2008;168:2000-7.
74. Burkhardt O, Ewig S, Haagen U, Giersdorf S, Hartmann O, Wegscheider K, et al. Procalcitonin guidance and reduction of antibiotic use in acute respiratory tract infection. *The European respiratory journal*. 2010;36(3):601-7.
75. Little P, Hobbs FD, Moore M, Mant D, Williamson I, McNulty C, et al. Clinical score and rapid antigen detection test to guide antibiotic use for sore throats: randomised controlled trial of PRISM (primary care streptococcal management). *BMJ*. 2013;347:f5806.
76. Christakis DA ZF, Wright JA, Garrison MM, Rivara FP, Davis RL. . A randomized controlled trial of point-of-care evidence to improve the antibiotic prescribing practices for acute otitis media in children. *Paediatrics*. 2001;107:e15.
77. Linder JA, Schnipper JL, Tsurikova R, Yu T, Volk LA, Melnikas AJ, et al. Documentation-based clinical decision support to improve antibiotic prescribing for acute respiratory infections in primary care: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Informatics in primary care*. 2009;17(4):231-40.

78. Martens JD, van der Weijden T, Severens JL, de Clercq PA, de Bruijn DP, Kester AD, et al. The effect of computer reminders on GPs' prescribing behaviour: a cluster-randomised trial. *International journal of medical informatics*. 2007;76 Suppl 3:S403-16.
79. Bourgeois FC, Linder J, Johnson SA, Co JP, Fiskio J, Ferris TG. Impact of a computerized template on antibiotic prescribing for acute respiratory infections in children and adolescents. *Clinical pediatrics*. 2010;49(10):976-83.
80. Gonzales R, Anderer T, McCulloch CE, Maselli JH, Bloom FJ, Jr., Graf TR, et al. A cluster randomized trial of decision support strategies for reducing antibiotic use in acute bronchitis. *JAMA internal medicine*. 2013;173(4):267-73.
81. Fleet E, Gopal Rao G, Patel B, Cookson B, Charlett A, Bowman C, et al. Impact of implementation of a novel antimicrobial stewardship tool on antibiotic use in nursing homes: a prospective cluster randomized control pilot study. *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy*. 2014;69(8):2265-73.
82. Gerber JS, Prasad PA, Fiks AG, Localio AR, Grundmeier RW, Bell LM, et al. Effect of an outpatient antimicrobial stewardship intervention on broad-spectrum antibiotic prescribing by primary care pediatricians: a randomized trial. *JAMA : the journal of the American Medical Association*. 2013;309(22):2345-52.
83. Vellinga A, Galvin S, Duane S, Callan A, Bennett K, Cormican M, et al. Intervention to improve the quality of antimicrobial prescribing for urinary tract infection: a cluster randomized trial. *CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne*. 2016;188(2):108-15.
84. Welschen I, Kuyvenhoven MM, Hoes AW, Verheij TJ. Effectiveness of a multiple intervention to reduce antibiotic prescribing for respiratory tract symptoms in primary care: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2004;329(7463):431.

85. Forrest CB, Fiks AG, Bailey LC, Localio R, Grundmeier RW, Richards T, et al. Improving adherence to otitis media guidelines with clinical decision support and physician feedback. *Pediatrics*. 2013;131(4):e1071-81.
86. Keitel K, Samaka J, Masimba J, Temba H, Said Z, Kagoro F, et al. Safety and Efficacy of C-reactive Protein-guided Antibiotic Use to Treat Acute Respiratory Infections in Tanzanian Children: A Planned Subgroup Analysis of a Randomized Controlled Noninferiority Trial Evaluating a Novel Electronic Clinical Decision Algorithm (ePOCT). *Clin Infect Dis*. 2019;69(11):1926-34.
87. Wilson E ND, Dear K, Douglas R. Changing GPs' antibiotic prescribing: a randomised controlled trial. *Antimicrobial Resistance in Australia*. 2003:S32-S8.
88. Flottorp S OA, Håvelsrud K, Treweek S, Herrin J. Cluster randomised controlled trial of tailored interventions to improve the management of urinary tract infections in women and sore throat. *BMJ*. 2002;325(367):1-6.
89. Samore M BK, Alder S, Hannah E, et al. . Clinical decision support and appropriateness of antimicrobial prescribing. A randomized trial. *JAMA internal medicine*. 2005;294:2305-14.
90. Chen Y, Yang K, Jing T, Tian J, Shen X, Xie C, et al. Use of text messages to communicate clinical recommendations to health workers in rural China: a cluster-randomized trial. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. 2014;92(7):474-81.
91. van Driel ML, Coenen S, Dirven K, Lobbestael J, Janssens I, Van Royen P, et al. What is the role of quality circles in strategies to optimise antibiotic prescribing? A pragmatic cluster-randomised controlled trial in primary care. *Quality & safety in health care*. 2007;16(3):197-202.

92. Yang L, Liu C, Wang L, Yin X, Zhang X. Public reporting improves antibiotic prescribing for upper respiratory tract infections in primary care: a matched-pair cluster-randomized trial in China. *Health research policy and systems*. 2014;12:61.
93. Arroll B KT, Kerse N. Do delayed prescriptions reduce the use of antibiotics for the common cold?: a singleblind controlled trial. *Journal of Family Practice*. 2002;51:324-8.
94. Cals JW, de Bock L, Beckers PJ, Francis NA, Hopstaken RM, Hood K, et al. Enhanced communication skills and C-reactive protein point-of-care testing for respiratory tract infection: 3.5-year follow-up of a cluster randomized trial. *Annals of family medicine*. 2013;11(2):157-64.
95. Chazan Bea. Antibiotic consumption successfully reduced by a community intervention program. *Israel Medical Association Journal: Imaj*. 2007;9(1):16-20.
96. Dowell J PM, Bain J and Martin S. A randomised controlled trial of delayed antibiotic prescribing as a strategy for managing uncomplicated respiratory tract infection in primary care. *BJGP*. 2001;51:200-5.
97. Francis NA, Butler CC, Hood K, Simpson S, Wood F, Nuttall J. Effect of using an interactive booklet about childhood respiratory tract infections in primary care consultations on reconsulting and antibiotic prescribing: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2009;339:b2885.
98. Little P, Moore M, Kelly J, Williamson I, Leydon G, McDermott L, et al. Delayed antibiotic prescribing strategies for respiratory tract infections in primary care: pragmatic, factorial, randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2014;348:g1606.
99. Milos V, Jakobsson U, Westerlund T, Melander E, Molstad S, Midlov P. Theory-based interventions to reduce prescription of antibiotics--a randomized controlled trial in Sweden. *Fam Pract*. 2013;30(6):634-40.

100. Naughton C, Feely J, Bennett K. A RCT evaluating the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of academic detailing versus postal prescribing feedback in changing GP antibiotic prescribing. *Journal of evaluation in clinical practice*. 2009;15(5):807-12.
101. Meeker D, Knight TK, Friedberg MW, Linder JA, Goldstein NJ, Fox CR, et al. Nudging guideline-concordant antibiotic prescribing: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA internal medicine*. 2014;174(3):425-31.
102. Tonkin-Crine SK, Tan PS, van Hecke O, Wang K, Roberts NW, McCullough A, et al. Clinician-targeted interventions to influence antibiotic prescribing behaviour for acute respiratory infections in primary care: an overview of systematic reviews. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;9(9):Cd012252.
103. Schuetz P, Müller B, Christ-Crain M, Stolz D, Tamm M, Bouadma L, et al. Procalcitonin to initiate or discontinue antibiotics in acute respiratory tract infections. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012;2012(9):Cd007498.
104. Giguère A, Légaré F, Grimshaw J, Turcotte S, Fiander M, Grudniewicz A, et al. Printed educational materials: effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012;10(10):Cd004398.
105. Ivers N, Jamtvedt G, Flottorp S, Young JM, Odgaard-Jensen J, French SD, et al. Audit and feedback: effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012(6):Cd000259.
106. Laka M, Milazzo A, Merlin T. Can evidence-based decision support tools transform antibiotic management? A systematic review and meta-analyses. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*. 2020;75(5):1099-111.
107. Department of Health and Social Care. UK 5-year action plan for antimicrobial resistance 2019 to 2024. 2019:53.

108. (WHO) TWHO. The evolving threat of antimicrobial resistance: options for action. Geneva 2012 [[http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/44812/1/9789241503181\\_eng.pdf](http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/44812/1/9789241503181_eng.pdf)].
109. Agency UHS. English surveillance programme for antimicrobial utilisation and resistance (ESPAUR) report 2014 [<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/english-surveillance-programme-antimicrobial-utilisation-and-resistance-espaur-report>].
110. Antimicrobial Resistance and Health Associated Infection Scotland (ARHAI). Scottish One Health Antimicrobial Use and Antimicrobial Resistance in 2020. 2021.
111. Thomson K, Berry R, Robinson T, Brown H, Bambra C, Todd A. An examination of trends in antibiotic prescribing in primary care and the association with area-level deprivation in England. BMC public health. 2020;20(1):1148.
112. Devine P, O'Kane M, Bucholc M. Trends, Variation, and Factors Influencing Antibiotic Prescribing: A Longitudinal Study in Primary Care Using a Multilevel Modelling Approach. Antibiotics (Basel, Switzerland). 2021;11(1).
113. Hernandez-Santiago V, Marwick CA, Patton A, Davey PG, Donnan PT, Guthrie B. Time series analysis of the impact of an intervention in Tayside, Scotland to reduce primary care broad-spectrum antimicrobial use. Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy. 2015;70(8):2397-404.
114. Hardy V, Thompson M, Alto W, Keppel GA, Hornecker J, Linares A, et al. Exploring the barriers and facilitators to use of point of care tests in family medicine clinics in the United States. BMC family practice. 2016;17(1):149.
115. Toma M, Davey PG, Marwick CA, Guthrie B. A framework for ensuring a balanced accounting of the impact of antimicrobial stewardship interventions. The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy. 2017;72(12):3223-31.



116. Patton A, Davey P, Harbarth S, Nathwani D, Sneddon J, Marwick CA. Impact of antimicrobial stewardship interventions on Clostridium difficile infection and clinical outcomes: segmented regression analyses. The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy. 2018;73(2):517-26.

117. Guthrie I, Malcolm W, Nogueira R, Sneddon J, Seaton RA, Marwick CA. Associations between declining antibiotic use in primary care in Scotland and hospitalization with infection and patient satisfaction: longitudinal population study. Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy. 2022;77(9):2561-8.

## Supporting information

Supplementary Material file which includes:

- Table S1 - Complete Search Strategy
- Table S2 - Cochrane EPOC group risk of bias criteria for RCTs and QRCTs
- Table S3- Deviations from original PROSPERO registration
- Figure S1 - Risk of Bias in Included Studies
- Figure S2 - Forest plots of sensitivity analyses of main intervention effects

Figure 1 - PRISMA of Included Studies




Figure 1

Figure 2 - Overall Risk of Bias – percentage of studies assigned each category




Figure 2

Figure 3 - Forest plots of main intervention effects




Figure 3