

# Our Guidelines Are Not Good Enough

Alexandra Wojtaszewska<sup>1</sup> and Martin Hirsch<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Watford General Hospital

<sup>2</sup>Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

September 25, 2021

## BJOG-21-0667.R1: Our Guidelines Are Not Good Enough

Alexandra Wojtaszewska<sup>a</sup>, Martin Hirsch<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Watford General Hospital, Watford, United Kingdom

<sup>b</sup>Oxford Endometriosis CaRe Centre, Nuffield Department of Women's & Reproductive Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom.

Declarations of interest: none

Financial support received: none

## BJOG-21-0667.R1: Our Guidelines Are Not Good Enough

Amoah et al. highlight the lack of high-quality fibroid guidelines in their appraisal of uterine fibroid management guidelines. This paper sheds light on the association between low quality research informing low quality clinical guidance. The authors included nine national and international guidelines on fibroid management in their analysis and screened 189 recommendations and statements made across these documents. Guideline quality was assessed using the AGREE-II instrument and no high-quality guidelines were identified. No guidelines reported involvement of patients with fibroids in their development and across all guidelines consensus was reached on only three (1.6%) of 189 statements. The authors explored the quality of evidence base behind the recommendations concluding that 25.3% were developed from good-quality evidence while 27.7% were based on lowest quality evidence (expert opinion or clinical consensus).

These findings of poor quality and high discrepancy between guideline recommendations for fibroids are not unique to the condition. Other systematic reviews found similar results when analysing guidelines for management of endometriosis (Hirsch et al. BJOG 2018;125:556-564) and uncomplicated birth (Zhao et al. BJOG 2020;127:789-797).

When writing or updating guidelines, locally or nationally, authors must consider how to ensure highest possible quality. There are several validated tools for quality assessment available (including AGREE II, ADAPTE, AMTAR and INAHTA and iCAHE Guideline Quality Checklists).

The landscape for guideline development is changing. The rapid development of novel technologies requires a prompt response and evaluation of not only efficacy but the wider environmental impact and health economic assessment. The current system of laborious static single point assessments of evidence-based medicine producing clinical guidelines every few years is no longer appropriate. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) acknowledge the need for proactive, fluid, and flexible processes to enable the digitalisation of health systems to inform practice through real-world evidence (NICE 2021, *The NICE Strategy 2021 to 2026* ). Guidelines will respond in a dynamic manner to population changes using contemporaneous evaluation of clinical data available from digitalised care systems. We look forward to

integrated care systems delivering population-based healthcare on a regional basis. Guidelines will extend across health, social care, and public health focusing on health prevention, reducing health inequality, and delivering those interventions that offer the greatest benefit.

As highlighted by this study, the development of guidelines without standardised methods is commonplace. This may lead to exclusion of beneficial treatments, a paucity of comparable recommendations, recommendations based on poor quality data, and poor patient outcomes. Looking to the future we do not see the need to fix a fractured guideline development system but rather build a new one. We must adapt and adopt the integration of digitalised real-world health system data to facilitate rapid and robust clinical decisions on a regional or national basis.