

## **Reporting quality appraisal of clinical practice guidelines on pancreatic cancer**

Juan Ling<sup>1,2</sup>, Long Ge<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Yao Long Chen<sup>1,2</sup>, KeHu Yang<sup>\*1,2</sup>

1. Evidence-Based Medicine Center, School of Basic Medical Sciences, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, China

2. Key Laboratory of Evidence-Based Medicine and Knowledge Translation of Gansu Province, Lanzhou, China

3. First clinical medical college of Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, China

### **Abstract**

#### **Background:**

Clinical practice guidelines (CPGs) are of great importance to the treatment by clinical physicians, so the quality of CPGs would be an essential issue for clinical work. As a consequence, adaptation of high-quality existing guidelines should be a very important job to fulfill perfect clinical practice. Though pancreatic cancer are being increasingly detected, their evaluation and management are still debated and the CPGs of it were unclear. Therefore, It is very necessary to determine the quality of CPGs on pancreatic cancer. The RIGHT (Reporting Items for practice Guidelines in Healthcare) checklist consisting of 22 items can assist guideline developers in reporting guidelines, support journal editors and peer reviewers when considering guideline reports, and help health care practitioners understand and implement a guideline.

**Aims:** To analyze available CPGs on pancreatic cancer with RIGHT checklist in order to evaluate their reporting quality.

**Methods:** We systematically searched electronic databases including PubMed, Cochrane Library, the Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure, the Chinese Biomedical Literature Database, the Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure WanFang Database from the inception to February, 2017. The Guidelines International Network database, the National Guideline Clearinghouse, the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network, National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence and Google also were searched to identify additional potential guidelines. The RIGHT instrument was used by two independent assessors to create a systematic appraisal in 22 items to determine the guidelines fulfilling the inclusion and exclusion criteria. We assessed each item was rated as “Yes” for total compliance, “Unclear” for partial compliance or “No” for non-compliance, respectively. The number and proportion of reported items for each items were also calculated. Statistical analyses were produced using SPSS version 15.0 for Windows.

**Results and cocnclusions:** This study is ongoing and results will be presented at the Evidence summit as available.