

INPLASY PROTOCOL

To cite: Gao et al. The structure and expression of clinical questions in most Chinese guidelines were poor standardized: empirical analysis. *Inplasy protocol* 202350047. doi:10.37766/inplasy2023.5.0047

Received: 11 May 2023

Published: 11 May 2023

Corresponding author:

Yutong Fei

feiyt@bucm.edu.cn

Author Affiliation:

Centre for Evidence-Based Chinese Medicine, Beijing University of Chinese Medicine.

Support: This work was supported by the Key Research and Development Program of Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region [grant numbers: 2021B03006-4].

Review Stage at time of this submission: Preliminary searches.

Conflicts of interest:

None declared.

The structure and expression of clinical questions in most Chinese guidelines were poor standardized: empirical analysis

Gao, YC¹; Su, CY²; Cao, R³; Liu, ZH⁴; Liu, MJ⁵; Liao, YD⁶; Feng, YT⁷; Guan, XM⁸; Fang, R⁹; Liu, JC¹⁰; Li, YY¹¹; Deng, YJ¹²; Xiang, WY¹³; Fei, YT¹⁴.

Eligibility criteria: We included the GRADE CPGs published from 1st Jan 2018 to 31st Dec 2022 (guidelines developed with the participation of the GRADE Working Group or two co-chairs, professors Gordon H. Guyatt and Holger J. Schünemann) and Chinese CPGs. Among them, the inclusion of Chinese CPGs adopts the following approach: 90 CPGs were randomly selected from all CPGs. We discarded older versions and duplicate published guidelines.

Information sources: Two English databases (Embase, PubMed) and four Chinese databases (Wanfang, Chinese Biomedical Literature Database, VIP Database for Chinese Technical Periodicals and China National Knowledge Infrastructure) were searched. We also searched the website (<https://www.GRADEpro.org/>) and methodological literature published by two co-chairs to detect GRADE CPGs; the official website of eight Chinese authority societies were searched to uncover more Chinese CPGs.

INPLASY registration number: This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 11 May 2023 and was last updated on 11 May 2023 (registration number INPLASY202350047).

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective: Not applicable.

Rationale: Notwithstanding a considerable amount of research into the formulation of clinical questions, the structured and priority selection of clinical questions is the majority, and the research on the reporting of clinical questions in the CPGs is still

inadequate and limited. It is currently unclear about the deficiencies of Chinese CPGs for the development and reporting of clinical questions and their gaps with the high-quality CPGs. The purpose of this methodological study was to determine the reporting of clinical questions in the Chinese CPGs and to understand the gaps with them and the high-quality guidelines.

Condition being studied: Not applicable.

METHODS

Search strategy: Two English databases (Embase, PubMed) and four Chinese databases (Wanfang, Chinese Biomedical Literature Database, VIP Database for Chinese Technical Periodicals and China National Knowledge Infrastructure) were searched. We also searched the website (<https://www.GRADEpro.org/>) and methodological literature published by two co-chairs to detect GRADE CPGs; the official website of eight Chinese authority societies were searched to uncover more Chinese CPGs.

Participant or population: No patient will be involved.

Intervention: Not applicable.

Comparator: Not applicable.

Study designs to be included: Guidelines.

Eligibility criteria: We included the GRADE CPGs published from 1st Jan 2018 to 31st Dec 2022 (guidelines developed with the participation of the GRADE Working Group or two co-chairs, professors Gordon H. Guyatt and Holger J. Schünemann) and Chinese CPGs. Among them, the inclusion of Chinese CPGs adopts the following approach: 90 CPGs were randomly selected from all CPGs. We discarded older versions and duplicate published guidelines.

Information sources: Two English databases (Embase, PubMed) and four Chinese databases (Wanfang, Chinese Biomedical Literature Database, VIP

Database for Chinese Technical Periodicals and China National Knowledge Infrastructure) were searched. We also searched the website (<https://www.GRADEpro.org/>) and methodological literature published by two co-chairs to detect GRADE CPGs; the official website of eight Chinese authority societies were searched to uncover more Chinese CPGs.

Main outcome(s): (1) the basic characteristics of the guidelines, including guideline type, scope, whether clinical questions is presented, clinical questions formulation structure, Whether there is a correspondence between the clinical questions and the recommendations, etc, (2) the structure and content of clinical questions information, including the number of clinical questions and recommendations and their correspondence, the structure and expression of clinical questions, the structure elements of the clinical questions are reflected in the recommendation, etc.

Data management: We strictly adhered to the approach of the systematic reviews (e.g., double screening, study selection, data extraction, unresolved disagreement was adjudicated by a third reviewer).

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis: Not applicable.

Strategy of data synthesis: Descriptive statistical analysis was conducted, and the proportion of relevant items was calculated.

Subgroup analysis: Not applicable.

Sensitivity analysis: Not applicable.

Language restriction: Not applicable.

Country(ies) involved: China.

Keywords: Formulation of clinical questions; Clinical practice guidelines; Traditional Chinese Medicine; The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation.

Contributions of each author:

Author 1 - Yicheng Gao - Conceptualization, Investigation, Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: 20210941071@bucm.edu.cn

Author 2 - Chengyuan Su - Extracting data, Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: scy19990527@163.com

Author 3 - Rui Cao - Extracting data, Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: caorui0706@163.com

Author 4 - zhihan Liu - Extracting data, Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: liuzhihan262@163.com

Author 5 - Meijun Liu - Extracting data, Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: 503164360@qq.com

Author 6 - Yingdi Liao - Extracting data, Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: 349799862@qq.com

Author 7 - Yuting Feng - Extracting data, Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: fyt819385438@163.com

Author 8 - Xinmiao Guan - Extracting data, Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: xinmiaoguan@163.com

Author 9 - Rui Fang - Extracting data, Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: xjqzzykj@126.com

Author 10 - Junchang Liu - Extracting data, Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: 625854402@qq.com

Author 11 - Yuanyuan Li - Extracting data, Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: lyy_914@163.com

Author 12 - Yingjie Deng - Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: 935943371@qq.com

Author 13 - Wenyuan Xiang - Formal analysis, Writing original draft.

Email: 601309096@qq.com

Author 14 - Yutong Fei - Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Writing - review & editing, Project administration.

Email: feiyt@bucm.edu.cn