

Visual Evidence

Increasing Usability of Systematic Reviews in Health Systems Guidelines Development

THE OWNER

DATE: NOVEMBER 3rd, 2018

PRESENTED BY: Connor Smith, B.S., Informatics Research Associate and Rebecca Jungbauer, Dr.P.H., Research Associate Pacific Northwest Evidence-based Practice Center Department of Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology

Disclaimer

This project was funded under Contract No. HHSA290201500009I from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The authors of this presentation are responsible for its content. Statements in the presentation do not necessarily represent the official views of or imply endorsement by AHRQ or HHS.

We do not have any conflicts to disclose.

"Research is creating new knowledge."

-Neil Armstrong

Integrating research and practice





Large volume of complex data

300+ pages

1,398 pages





Extensive executive summary

25 pages

Complex evidence tables

62 tables

Detailed figures

52 figures



Dissemination challenges

- Increasing dimensionality
 - 5 types of pain
 - 8 interventions
 - 6 outcomes
- Rigid structure
 - Defined scope
 - Set template
 - Research questions



Chronic pain report

Condition \rightarrow intervention \rightarrow outcome •

Author, Year, Followup,^a Pain Duration,

Study Quality

Miyamoto,

4.5 months

Duration of

to 6 years

Fair

pain: Mean 5

Nassif, 201131

4 months

pain: NR

Poor

Duration of

Natour, 20143

3 months

Duration of

pain: >1 year

201332

Key Question 1: Ch

Exercise for Chronic

Key Points

7

- Exercise was associated care, an attention control difference [SMD] -0.3 were no effects on inter -0.48 to 0.18, I²=51%) Disability Index [ODI].
- Exercise was associated care, an attention control -0.81 on a 0 to 10 scale pooled MD -1.37, 95% 95% CI -2.38 to -0.32 term and long-term). No trial evaluated exercise
- Comparisons involving Fair in the sections for the other therapies.

| | Intervention | Populati | Figure 4. Exer low back pain | | | | attenti | on co |
|------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| | A. Muscle | A vs. B | low back pain | . encoto | on runctio | | | |
| | performance (Pilates) (n=43),12 | Age: 41 v years | | | | | | |
| | sessions over 6 weeks | Female: 4 vs. 79% Baseline | Study, Year | Comparison | Exercise | Scale | Duration of follow -up Months | Control N, Mear |
| | B. Attention control | 9.7 vs. 1(| Short-term | | | | | |
| | (n=43) (education) | Baseline (0-10 VA | Costa, 2009 | Placebo | motor control | RDQ (0-24 | 4 | 77,12.2 |
| | | vs. 6.5 | Goldby, 2006 | AC/M | motor control | ODI (0-100 |) 3 | 40,28.1 |
| | | | Kankaaanpaa, | 1999 AC/M | gen. exercise | PDI (0-70) | 3 | 24,12.6 |
| I | A. Combined | A vs. B Age: 45 v | Myamoto, 2013 | AC/M | Plates | RDQ (0-24 | 4.5 | 43,6.7 (|
| exercise (n=37) | | | Nassif, 2011 | UC/NE/WL | gen. exercise | RDQ (0-24 | 4 | 38,10.6 |
| | (stretching, stability, | Female: | Natour, 2014 | UC/NE/WL | Plates | RDQ (0-24 | 3 | 30,10.7 |
| coord muscl streng exerci | coordination, and muscle strengthening | Baseline 13.9 vs. 1 Baseline (0-10 VA | Subtotal (I-squ Intermediate-ter | | o = 0.041) | | | |
| | exercises), 24 sessions over 8 | | Costa, 2009 | Placebo | motor control | RDQ (0-24 | 10 | 77,12.3 |
| | weeks | V5. 4.5 | Goldby, 2006 | AC/M | motor control | ODI (0-100 |) 6 | 40,23.9 |
| | | | Kankaaanpaa, | 1999 AC/M | gen. exercise | PDI (0-70) | 9 | 24,11.4 |
| | B. Usual care (n=38) | | Subtotal (Esqu | ared = 51.0%, p | p = 0.130) | | | |
| | A. Exercise (Pilates) (n=30), 24 | A vs. B Age: 48 v | Long-term Goldby, 2006 | AC/M | motor control | ODI (0-100 |) 24 | 40,27.0 |
| | sessions over 12 weeks | Female: 1 | Subtotal (I-squ | | | | , | |
| | | Baseline | | | | | | |
| | B. Usual care (n=30) (no | 1.1 vs. 1(Baseline | | | | | | |

ontrol, or a placebo intervention for chronic

| u OI | HLA2 (U-24) | | 11,12.2 (0.1) | 11,10.5(1.0) | | -0.20 (-0.03, 0.04) |
|------|-------------|-----|----------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------|
| trol | ODI (0-100) | 3 | 40,28.1 (17.3) | 84,31.0 (17.1) | | 0.17 (-0.21, 0.55) |
| ise | PDI (0-70) | 3 | 24,12.6 (10.2) | 30,5.7 (6.6) | | -0.81 (-1.37, -0.25) |
| | RDQ (0-24) | 4.5 | 43,6.7 (5.6) | 43,4.5 (4.5) | | -0.43 (-0.86, -0.00) |
| ise | RDQ (0-24) | 4 | 38,10.6 (5.4) | 37,10.0 (5.1) | - | -0.11 (-0.57, 0.34) |
| | RDQ (0-24) | 3 | 30,10.7 (6.2) | 30,7.0 (5.4) | | -0.63 (-1.15, -0.11) |
| | | | | | \diamond | -0.31 (-0.58, -0.04) |
| trol | RDQ (0-24) | 10 | 77,12.3 (6.4) | 77,11.4 (7.8) | - | -0.13 (-0.44, 0.19) |
| trol | ODI (0-100) | 6 | 40,23.9 (17.8) | 84,25.8 (17.8) | | 0.11 (-0.27, 0.48) |
| ise | PDI (0-70) | 9 | 24,11.4 (11.4) | 30,5.7 (8.1) | | -0.58 (-1.13, -0.03) |
| | | | | | \diamond | -0.15 (-0.48, 0.18) |
| trol | ODI (0-100) | 24 | 40,27.0 (18.0) | 84,27.0 (21.0) | + | 0.00 (-0.38, 0.38) |
| | | | | | \Diamond | 0.00 (-0.38, 0.38) |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | -1.5 | 5 -15 0 .5 | |
| | | | | Favors E | xercise Favo | ors Control |

Exercise

N. Mean (SD)

77,10.3 (7.0)

SMD (95% CI)

-0.28 (-0.59, 0.04)



Comparing evidence

Drill down

I have a patient with chronic low back and neck pain. What is an effective treatment to help with short and intermediate-term pain?

Slice and dice

I have a patient who wants to try acupuncture to relieve chronic low back and neck pain. Will this be effective in the short and intermediate term?



Current approach

• Condition \rightarrow intervention \rightarrow outcome

| | Chronic low back pain | Chronic neck pain |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Exercise | Pages 19-25 Table 5 Figures 4-5 | Pages 97-106 Table 18 Figures 26-27 |
| | Appendix D: 883 pages Appendix E: 18 pages | Pages 120-128 Table 23 Figures 30-31 |
| Summary | Tables A-B | Tables C-D |
| Individual Studies | Appendices D-E | Appendices D-E |



AHRQ EPC pilot projects

- **Problem**: AHRQ wants to improve accessibility and usability of evidence from systematic reviews
- **Solution**: Engage EPCs to develop and pilot test potential tools to enhance evidence uptake
- **Purpose**: Identify and test interactive methods to make the large amount of data included in an EPC systematic review more accessible for developers of clinical practice guidelines



EPC project plan

- Use published systematic review on chronic pain
- Software selection criteria
 - Existing, off the shelf product
 - No or minimal need for informatics training
- Gather feedback from guideline developers (stakeholders)



Unscrambling the eggs

- Data extracted from PDF, organized into relational structure
 - 356 rows of data, 202 different studies
 - 80% of work
- Developed report for a Guidelines Committee



DEMONSTRATION

Live Demo



Reception of Design

• Interviews with six OHSU guideline development and implementation stakeholders





Caveats/Limitations

- Supplement, not replace
- Quantitatively focused
- Aggregation cannot be changed
- Heavy reliance on data structure



Next Steps/Call to Action

- Integration of informatics professionals
- A step towards improving dissemination
 - New ways to present data
 - Integrate pilot project into future reviews
 - Accessibility
 - Feedback from additional stakeholders





Thank You

Connor Smith <u>smitco@ohsu.edu</u>

Becky Jungbauer jungbaue@ohsu.edu

To learn more about the Pacific Northwest Evidence-based Practice Center, visit <u>www.ohsu.edu/epc</u>

To learn more about the Department of Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology, visit <u>www.ohsu.edu/dmice</u>

