Clinical Practice Guidelines and Systematic Reviews: Point of Intersection?
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Some limitations of clinical practice guidelines:

- Limitations in evidence base
- Poor management of conflicts of interest
- Poor coordination with systematic review teams
- Lack of transparency in deriving & rating recommendations
STANDARD 4
Clinical practice guideline–systematic review intersection

4.1 CPG developers should use systematic reviews that meet standards set by the Institute of Medicine’s Committee on Standards for Systematic Reviews of Comparative Effectiveness Research.

4.2 When systematic reviews are conducted specifically to inform particular guidelines, the GDG and systematic review team should interact regarding the scope, approach, and output of both processes.

www.iom.edu/cpgstandards
What is intersection?
Models of Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Complete Isolation (synchronous model)     | No overlap                                       | Prevents biases from one group influencing the other group                                  | • GDC limited to questions addressed by SR  
• GDC has no opportunity to learn nuances of SR  
• SR may not optimally structure synthesis and reporting of review |
| Complete Isolation (asynchronous model)    | No overlap, but a SR team member may participate in GDC | Efficiency in using pre-synthesized and rated evidence                                      | • SR may not fully address GDC’s questions  
• SR may be outdated  
• SR may not optimally structure synthesis and reporting of review |

# Models of Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Limited Interaction    | GDC members interact with SR team, but SR team does not make recommendations | Ensures that major questions of GDC will be addressed by SR                | • SR may not fully address GDC’s questions  
• Persons interacting may be biased, inexperienced |
| Complete Interaction    | Same individuals on SR team and GDC                                         | • All issues are known in both groups  
• GDC will have better understanding of evidence  
• Efficiency of having same group perform review and guideline | • May introduce bias into SR  
• Unlikely same individuals have time and skills to do both |

Purpose

To describe our experience with interaction between a systematic review team and a guideline development committee
Context

- In 2005, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation moved from consensus-based to evidence-based guidelines
- Commissioned systematic reviews to inform guidelines
Description of Guideline Development Committee and Systematic Review Teams

• Guideline Development Committee
  • Members of the CF Center Committee
  • Nurse practitioner
  • People with CF and their families
  • Staff of the CFF
  • Methodologist

• Systematic Review Team
  • Task Leader
  • Research coordinator
  • Reviewers
Description of Interaction - Defining the Scope

Guideline Development Process  Systematic Review Process

Develop and refine scope  Develop and refine questions
Description of Interaction - Defining the Scope

• Initial guideline development meeting
  • Provided training in systematic review processes
  • Participated in developing and refining scope

• Systematic review team
  • Translated scope into review questions
  • Developed PICO document
  • Conducted review of guidelines and systematic reviews
  • Submitted review questions, PICO document and report summarizing guidelines and systematic reviews for feedback

• Point of interaction
  • Systematic review addressed needs of guideline committee
  • Set realistic expectations of the systematic review
Description of Interaction - Assessing the Evidence

Guideline Development Process
- Develop and refine scope
- Assess evidence

Systematic Review Process
- Develop and refine questions
- Conduct search
- Establish inclusion criteria
- Assess quality
- Synthesize the evidence
Description of Interaction - Assessing the Evidence

• Systematic review team
  • Conducted search, established inclusion and exclusion criteria, assessed quality, synthesized evidence, drafted report

• Guideline development committee
  • Reviewed report and provided feedback

• Point of interaction
  • Better understanding of the systematic review
  • Provide more meaningful feedback
Description of Interaction - Developing the Guideline

Guideline Development Process

- Develop and refine scope
- Assess evidence
- Draft recommendations
- Distribute for review
- Dissemination

Systematic Review Process

- Develop and refine questions
- Conduct search
- Establish inclusion criteria
- Assess quality
- Synthesize the evidence
Lessons Learned

• One co-chair should be experienced with process

• Orientation meeting early in process
  • Provide training in systematic reviews and their use in developing guidelines
Limitations

• Not all guideline development committees have resources to commission systematic reviews

• Dependent on the strengths and weaknesses of the methodologist
Summary

• Implemented in 7 evidence-based guidelines
• Ensured appropriate and timely intersection
  • Ensured systematic review met the needs of the guideline committee
  • Ensured systematic review met IOM standards
  • Helped guideline committee understand the methods and outcomes of the systematic review
  • Provided consistency across guideline committees
• Future Research
  • To determine best practices of interaction