

Consensus methodological approaches in guideline development manual: a systematic review

INPLASY202370057

doi: 10.37766/inplasy2023.7.0057

Received: 14 July 2023

Published: 14 July 2023

Corresponding author:

Changhao Liang

changhaoliang@bucm.edu.cn

Author Affiliation:

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

Liang, CH¹; Liu, WT²; Wang, YQ³; Liu, SQ⁴; Yin, DR⁵; Yin, GX⁶; Su, CY⁷; Ren, SM⁸; Li, YY⁹; Fei, YT¹⁰.

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Support - Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region Key R&D Project (No. 2022B03011-4), China Association of Traditional Chinese Medicine Research and Evaluation Special Project grant number CACMRE2021-A-04.

Review Stage at time of this submission - Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria.

Conflicts of interest - None declared.

INPLASY registration number: INPLASY202370057

Amendments - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 14 July 2023 and was last updated on 14 July 2023.

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective The analysis will provide a comprehensive overview of consensus methodological approaches in guideline development manuals. Commonalities, variations, strengths, and limitations of the identified approaches will be discussed to inform the standardization and improvement of guideline development practices.

Rationale Clinical guidelines are essential tools for informing evidence-based decision-making in healthcare. Consensus methodological approaches, which involve the systematic development of guidelines through expert consensus, have gained recognition as a means to achieve methodological standardization. However, there is a need to assess the current landscape of consensus methodological approaches in

guideline development to identify commonalities, gaps, and areas for improvement.

Condition being studied The condition being studied focuses on the application of consensus methods in the development of guidelines. Previous research and studies have primarily centered around examining the effectiveness and implementation of consensus methods within this specific context.

Numerous studies have explored the use of consensus methods, such as the Delphi method, in developing guidelines across various disciplines and sectors. These studies have assessed the benefits, limitations, and challenges associated with employing consensus methods in guideline development.

However, despite the existing research, there are still gaps and inconsistencies in the application and reporting of consensus methods within

guideline development processes. These gaps indicate the need for further investigation and improvement in the utilization of consensus methods to ensure their effectiveness and validity in shaping guidelines.

The condition being studied acknowledges the importance of consensus methods in guideline development while recognizing the need to address the challenges and discrepancies that may arise during their implementation. By examining the current state of consensus methods in this context, the research aims to contribute to the refinement and enhancement of guideline development processes through the utilization of robust and transparent consensus methodologies.

METHODS

Search strategy

#1 guideline[title]
 #2 clinical guideline[title]
 #3 practice guideline[title]
 #4 clinical practice guideline[title]
 #5 evidence-based guideline[title]
 #6 evidence-based clinical practice guideline[title]
 #7 guideline[mesh]
 #8 clinical consensus statement[title]
 #9 clinical consensus guideline[title]
 #10 #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9
 #11 Hand book[title]
 #12 Handbook[title]
 #13 Manual[title]
 #14 Tool[title]
 #15 Development manual[title]
 #16 Procedure manual[title]
 #17 Methodology manual[title]
 #18 Method*[title]
 #19 guidance[title]
 #20 Guide[title]
 #21 Guides[title]
 #22 #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21
 #23 #10 and #22.

Participant or population Guideline development manuals.

Intervention Consensus Method.

Comparator Not applicable.

Study designs to be included Systematic review.

Eligibility criteria 1. Language and Publication Period: We included manuals published primarily in Chinese or English, covering the period from database establishment to December 31, 2022. The

clinical practice guideline development manuals published by national health administrative departments, official guideline development agencies, and medical-related societies or associations.² .Inclusion of Most Recent Version: If multiple versions of a guideline development manual existed, we included only the most recent version to ensure the inclusion of the most up-to-date methodological points.

Information sources Electronic databases, including China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), VIP Database, Wanfang Database, as well as international databases including PubMed and Embase, were searched using appropriate keywords and MeSH terms. The search strategy combined terms related to guideline development and manuals. The identified guideline development manuals were cross-referenced with the official websites of the publishing associations to confirm the most recent version and gather additional information such as attachments. The guideline databases and association websites are listed in Appendix. Manual searches were conducted to supplement the included literature by examining the reference lists of relevant articles.

Main outcome(s) Data extraction from the included GDM (guideline development manuals) will be performed using a standardized form. The forms included: (1) the basic characteristics of included GDM (such as title, publication/update date, and developer); (2) capturing key information such as guideline characteristics, consensus methodological approaches employed, panel composition, handling of conflicts of interest, patient involvement, and the considerations during the consensus process.

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis Not applicable.

Strategy of data synthesis A narrative synthesis of the findings will be conducted, summarizing the consensus methodological approaches identified in the included GDM. Commonalities, variations, strengths, and limitations of the identified approaches will be discussed, providing a comprehensive overview of the current landscape of guideline development methodologies.

Subgroup analysis Not applicable.

Sensitivity analysis Not applicable.

Country(ies) involved China, Australia.

Keywords Methodology, Consensus Method, Clinical Practice Guidelines, Evidence-based Medicine, Expert Consensus.

Contributions of each author

Author 1 - Changhao Liang - Author 1 drafted the manuscript.

Email: changhaoliang@bucm.edu.cn

Author 2 - Weiting Liu - Author 2 revised the manuscript.

Email: weitingl@our.ecu.edu.au

Author 3 - Yaqi wang.

Author 4 - Siqi Liu.

Author 5 - Dingran Yin.

Author 6 - Guanxiang Yin.

Author 7 - Chengyuan Su.

Author 8 - Shumeng Ren.

Author 9 - Yuanyuan Li.

Author 10 - Yutong Fei.