YOU CANNOT MAKE INFORMED CHOICES WITHOUT INFORMATION
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Informed choices require information that is relevant, valid and accessible. Systematic reviews of the effects of alternative strategies provide information that is essential but not sufficient for recommendations about how best to manage mild brain injury or other problems. Work such as that of the Task Force on Mild Traumatic Brain Injury make decisions easier and better informed. To achieve better outcomes the information derived from systematic reviews needs to be applied critically and well-informed, context specific recommendations must be effectively implemented.
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INTRODUCTION

Patients, healthcare professionals and policymakers must make choices between alternative forms of care and alternative ways of using limited healthcare resources. Few people would prefer that these decisions should be uninformed. Yet, if a decision is going to be well informed rather than misinformed, we need information that is relevant, valid and accessible.

Often the problem is too much information rather than too little. For example, searching the World Wide Web for “mild brain injury” yields 155,000 hits (1). MEDLINE, the US National Library of Medicine’s bibliographic database, contains over 11 million indexed journal citations and abstracts covering over 4500 journals published in more than 70 countries, and this represents only a fraction of the biomedical literature (2). The Cochrane Controlled Trials Register, a bibliographic database that is restricted to controlled trials of healthcare, contains over 360,000 citations (3). It is not practical, effective or an efficient use of resources for people making decisions about healthcare routinely to search through databases such as these to find the information that is relevant to a particular decision, assess the validity of the information they find, synthesize and interpret it.

For decisions about healthcare to be well informed we need reliable evaluations of the effects of alternative forms of care, systematic reviews of those evaluations, and guidelines based on those reviews.

WHAT IS A RELIABLE EVALUATION?

Dramatically effective healthcare interventions, such as insulin for diabetes, are not common. The majority of healthcare interventions are at best moderately superior to conventional care or a placebo. This is true for prevention, therapy and rehabilitation; and for health policy interventions as well as clinical interventions. Some interventions that are believed to be beneficial are, in fact, not effective and some are even harmful. For example, driver education has a long history as a strategy for preventing traffic injuries and school-based driver education has been widely advocated as a means of reducing traffic injuries among teenagers. Yet, the results of randomized trials of school-based driver education show that it leads to earlier licensing, no reduction in crash involvement, and may lead to a modest but important increase in the proportion of teenagers involved in traffic crashes (4).

The only way to judge the effects of healthcare is through comparisons, either comparing an intervention with no intervention or with alternative interventions. For the results of a comparison to be reliable it must be large enough to avoid random errors – misinterpreting chance associations as causal relationships – and rigorous enough to avoid systematic errors – bias. Bias in evaluations of healthcare interventions can arise from systemic differences in the groups that are compared, differential exposure to factors that affect outcomes besides the interventions of interest, exclusions of people entered into an evaluation, or differences in how outcomes are assessed (5). The validity of an evaluation reflects the degree to which the results are likely to be free from bias.

Judgements about the validity of evaluations of healthcare interventions are complex. There are no simple rules that can be used to make these judgements, even when considering only a single type of evaluation, such as randomized trials (6). However, there are both logical arguments and empirical evidence to support the use of randomized trials to evaluate healthcare interventions (7). Although it is possible to control for differences between comparison groups in observational studies, such as cohort studies and case-control studies, this is only possible for factors that are known and measured. Randomization is the only means of controlling for unknown and unmeasured differences as well as those that are known and measured. Randomization is not, of course, sufficient to ensure that the results of evaluations are valid and frequently randomized trials are not available to answer important questions.

Decisions about healthcare should be based on summaries of the best available evidence that is relevant. To ensure that these
summaries are reliable, they should be compiled systematically and the methods that were used should be reported explicitly.

**WHAT IS A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW?**

Preparing a summary or review of the effects of healthcare entails many judgements. The focus of the review must be decided. Studies that are relevant to the focus of the review must be identified, selected for inclusion and critically appraised to assess their validity. Information must be collected and synthesized from the relevant studies, and conclusions must be drawn. Making these judgements systematically reduces the risk of making errors. Making them explicitly rather than implicitly enables others to appraise the extent to which the results of a review are likely to be valid (8).

For example, failure to conduct a thorough search for studies that are relevant to the focus of a review can result in important studies being overlooked or in a biased selection of studies due to reporting biases, such as publication bias (9). Non-systematic decisions about which studies to include in a review can result in studies being excluded because they do not support the pre-conceived opinions of the authors, and non-systematic analyses of the results of studies can result in small but important effects being overlooked or inappropriate weight being given to some studies in relationship to others. Relying on experts to synthesize the results of evaluations of healthcare is not a substitute for using systematic and explicit methods. Indeed, summaries prepared by experts are frequently not systematic and often are not consistent with the results of systematic reviews (10, 11).

**WHY DO WE NEED GUIDELINES?**

Guidelines for clinical practice are “systematically developed statements to assist practitioner and patient decisions about appropriate healthcare for specific clinical circumstances” (12). Evidence from systematic reviews of the effects of healthcare is necessary, but not sufficient for making informed decisions. At least 3 types of information and 3 types of judgements are needed for this (Fig. 1). Well-developed guidelines help people making decisions by organizing this information and these judgements. They do not eliminate the need for judgement on the part of those making decisions.

First, judgement is needed to identify health problems, to learn what health outcomes are important and to identify what preventive, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation or policy options should be considered. This information comes from epidemiological studies or from individual patients through history-taking, physical examination and diagnostic tests. Second, to estimate the effects of different options on health outcomes, judgements must be made about effectiveness and adverse effects. This information should come from systematic reviews of the best available evidence. Judgements must be made about both the validity and the applicability of this evidence (13).

These first 2 types of information and judgements taken together provide estimates of the expected outcomes associated with the options that are considered. It is then necessary to make judgements about trade-offs between the expected benefits, harms and costs. Sometimes formal economic or decision analysis is used to clarify the trade-offs (14, 15). Whether this is done formally or informally, information is needed about the “value” or desirability of the outcomes from the perspective of those who are affected.

**HOW ARE GUIDELINES TRANSLATED INTO BETTER HEALTH?**

These 3 types of judgements and information, taken together, form the basis for guidelines – recommendations about how to manage a health problem such as mild brain injury. For guidelines to be translated into better healthcare and health, appropriate decisions and actions must be taken. For this to happen, barriers to implementing appropriate actions must be identified and addressed (16). Knowing what to do is necessary, but not sufficient to ensure that the right things are done (17, 18).

**WHAT SHOULD USERS OF GUIDELINES LOOK FOR?**

Because medical knowledge and practise environments evolve continually, guidelines have a “shelf life” after which they should be reassessed. Users of guidelines should always check the shelf-date before applying guidelines.

The development of guidelines is a complex process involving multiple types of judgements and information; it is necessary to involve people with a variety of skills and perspectives. Guidelines developed by multidisciplinary groups are more likely to present balanced judgements than ones produced by specialists (19–24).

If decisions about how guidelines are developed are not made systematically and explicitly, regardless of who made the decisions, it is difficult to evaluate the adequacy of the methods that were used. Potential users of guidelines are then unable to make informed decisions about whether or not it is in the interest of
I thank Murray Enkin, from whom I borrowed the title of this work. We should be systematic methods that are clearly reported. A lot of work has been done to prepare quality guidelines. When they are available they can help us a lot of time and help to improve the quality of healthcare and health outcomes. We should be grateful to groups such as the Task Force on Mild Traumatic Brain Injury who undertake this work. They make decision-making easier. However, the work does not end here. It is now up to users of these guidelines to appraise them critically (26, 27), and implement them (16, 18), if the benefits of this work are to be realized.
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