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CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF ADVANCED BREAST CANCER

- Published in 2001
- Evidence-based clinical practice guidelines
- Developed by a multidisciplinary working group
- Endorsed by the National Health and Medical Research Council
- Supported by information for consumers
DISSEMINATION/EVALUATION

• **April 2001**: Copy of guidelines sent to Australian clinicians involved in the care of women with breast cancer; ongoing dissemination on request
• **Sept 2001–Jan 2003**: 13 seminars held for medical professionals
• **March 2003**: National survey of medical and radiation oncologists
• **March 2003–Sept 2003**: Trial of a guide for GPs outlining key recommendations for general practice
SEMINARS

- 571 health professionals attended one of 13 seminars
- Seminars led by local key opinion leaders and provided CME points
- Average attendance: 44 people per seminar

Evaluation findings

- 71%: reported increase in knowledge of the guidelines as a result of seminar attendance
- 80%: presentations ‘very’ or ‘somewhat’ relevant to their work
- 83%: guidelines would have a ‘very high’ to ‘moderate’ impact on current practice
- recommendations relating to multidisciplinary care and psychosocial care perceived as the most difficult to implement
SURVEY

• Postal survey to all medical and radiation oncologists identified through MOGA and RANZCR (FRO) (n=471)
• Of these, 219 clinicians treated women with breast cancer
• 127 clinicians returned a completed questionnaire

Evaluation results
• 83%: received the guidelines
• 54%: read between all and half the guidelines
• 75%: guidelines will be ‘useful’, ‘very useful’ or ‘somewhat useful’ in improving the management of women with advanced breast cancer
• 7%: practice will change as a result of guidelines; 77% reported no change as a result of guidelines
SURVEY

Evaluation results (cont’d)

• 92%: the most important aspect of guideline credibility is that they are evidence-based
• 54%: development of guidelines by a credible organisation is ‘very important’
• 46%: endorsement of guidelines by a professional college is ‘very important’
• 27%: endorsement of guidelines by the NHMRC is ‘very important’
GP GUIDE

• 9 oncologists participated in trial
• 1-page guide about management of metastatic breast cancer sent to referring GP with letter about newly diagnosed patients
• Evaluation forms completed by 46 GPs

Evaluation findings: GPs
• 85%: recommendations relevant/very relevant to their role
• 91%: guide provides new information

Evaluation findings: oncologists
• 83%: agreed/strongly agreed that the inclusion of the guide with their letter to the GP is an effective method of disseminating and promoting the guide
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

• Clinical practice guidelines well received by clinicians
• 1-page version of guideline recommendations for GPs is valuable
• Contradictory response from seminar attendees, GPs and survey respondents about impact of guidelines on practice; may reflect already high standard of care among specialists
• Evidence base for guidelines is crucial to ensuring guideline credibility
• Guidelines may not need to be endorsed by a national body; credibility of the developing organisation is regarded as highly
• Implications for future guideline development, which may streamline and shorten the guideline development process