Guidelines Often Ignored Without a 'Champion'

BY JOYCE FRIEDEN
Associate Editor, Practice Trends

WASHINGTON — One of the biggest barriers to guideline implementation is lack of a champion to encourage use of the guidelines at a particular institution, Dr. Rodger Winn said at a conference sponsored by Elsevier Oncology.

The idea of practice guidelines "is about as apple pie and motherhood as you can get," said Dr. Winn, director of the Quality of Care Measures Project at the National Quality Forum (NQF), a nonprofit organization. "How can that not be translated into practice? Yet we know from a lot of studies that it hasn't happened."

Several of the barriers to guideline use are fairly obvious, according to Dr. Winn. For instance, "if a guideline is too complex and you just can't follow it, it's not going to be used."

There are patient-related barriers, as well. That can span everything from the

recommended treatment not being paid for by the insurer to the recommendation being for radiation but the patient living 100 miles from the nearest radiation facility, he said.

Attitudinal barriers on the part of providers also are a problem. Providers may not agree with the guideline; the guideline may recommend something the provider doesn't believe he can accomplish; and the provider may not believe a particular guideline is going to work.

"If you don't believe the next monoclonal antibody really adds 3 months' median survival, you're not going to go along with it," Dr. Winn said.

But one of the tougher barriers is clinical inertia—"you know it's sort of right but you don't do it anyway," he said. "It's a well-known phenomenon in medicine."

Randomized trials have shown that one way to overcome that inertia is to use "trusted leaders" to implement the guideline. "You literally have to go back to your own institutions and become champions for this," Dr. Winn urged the audience.

He cited a clinical trial done in 16 Canadian hospitals in which some hospitals were assigned "audit and feedback" sessions regarding guidelines for repeat C-sections, while others also included an "opinion leader" to educate physicians about the new guideline. Those that used an opinion leader did much better at implementing the guideline (JAMA 1991;265:2202-7).

All the focus on guidelines is now leading up to quality measurement, Dr. Winn said. He noted that one expert split health care quality into three parts: structure (what's already in place, such as how many certified nurses you have); outcomes (what happens to the patient); and process (what you do to the patient that leads to those outcomes). "We'd like to say that outcomes are what ultimately define quality, but the problem is, it's not always as simple as that" because outcomes may vary for a variety of legitimate reasons. As a result, "outcomes in medicine may not be the proper measure of quality; it may be process. What did we do to the patient?

Clinical practice guidelines, in fact, are process maps, he said. "They tell you what you should do to the patient. Therefore, if you measure adherence to guidelines, you're doing process measurement. The big assumption there is that the guidelines are valid and that these processes do lead to better outcomes."

One question that is bound to come up more often as guidelines come into wider use is accountability. "Let's take breast-conserving surgery postop radiation therapy," Dr. Winn said. "Is it the hospital's job to [make sure that] the patient got radiation after breast-conserving surgery? If you're at Memorial Sloan-Kettering and the patient goes back [home] to Queens, is that your job to make sure they got it? Which physician is in charge?"

Dr. Winn predicted two organizations will become increasingly prominent as guidelines proliferate: the NQF and the Cancer Quality Alliance. The NQF helps organizations decide which quality measures are worth using; its voluntary measure sets are already accepted by Medicare, "and we make sure that consumers, payers, health plans, and providers are there for a very formal review process," he said. The Cancer Quality Alliance, set up by the American Society of Clinical Oncology and the National Coalition for Cancer Survivorship, "is still trying to define what its role is," he said.

Elsevier Oncology and this newspaper are both wholly owned subsidiaries of Elsevier.

ADVERTISEMENT

The face of migraine the life your patients may be missing

Migraine impacts family

Consider Karen, a 33-year-old mother with 2 young children. Although she only gets about 2 migraines a month, the disruption she endures keeps her from the things that are most important to her. A migraine recently prevented her from attending her daughter's preschool graduation. Another attack caused her to miss her son's little league baseball game. Karen is tired of missing out because of migraine.

Migraine impacts work

Now imagine Elena, a talented young designer who experiences at least 3 migraines a month. When asked how her migraines affect her daily routine, she admits that she can't concentrate at work during a migraine—a recent attack kept her from an important meeting with a client. Despite the fact that she has tried 2 different triptans, she just can't be at her best when she has a migraine. Elena is concerned how her career could be affected.

What treatment would you recommend for these patients?

Conservative estimates indicate 40% of migraine sufferers meet the criteria for prevention.²

Migraine prevention can help make a difference

Conservative estimates indicate 40% of migraine sufferers meet the criteria for prevention and the need may be as high as 60%.^{2.6} Preventive therapy could help reduce migraine frequency by 50%, on average. It can also help reduce the severity and duration of migraines that do occur.³ Yet migraine prevention is underutilized and many migraine sufferers are not offered prevention as part of their treatment regimen.³

Many more migraine patients could benefit from prevention than are currently receiving it.

Study Investigators: Richard B. Lipton, Stephen D. Silberstein, Merle Diamond, Frederick G. Freitag, Marcelo Bigal, Walter F. Stewart, Michael L. Reed, Seymour Diamond; Elizabeth Loder. 1.7

*A validated, self-administered headache questionnaire was mailed to a representative sample of US households in 2004. Migraine cases were identified using ICDH-2 symptom criteria for migraine with and without aura. Cases reporting at least 1 severe headache in the past year were included; cases with daily (28+ per month) headaches were excluded.

*With support from Ortho-McNeil Neurologics, Inc.

References: Lipton Rb. Diamond Nr, Freitag FG, Bigal M, Stewart WF, Reed ML. Migraine prevention patterns in a community sample: results from the American Migraine Prevalence and Prevention (AMPP) study [abstract]. Mount Royal. NJ: American Headache Society; March 24, 2005.

2. Lipton RB, Diamond M, Freitag FG, Bigal M, Stewart WF, Reed ML. Migraine prevention patterns in a community sample: results from the American Migraine Prevalence and Prevention (AMPP) study. Poster presented at: American Headache Society 47th Annual Scientific Meeting: June 23-26, 2005; Philadelphia, Pa. 3. National Headache Foundation Web site. American Migraine Prevalence and Prevention (AMPP) study fact sheet. Available at: http://www.headaches.org/consumer/AMPP/AMPPFactSheet. pdf. Accessed July 28, 2005. 4. Ramadan NM, Silberstein SD, Freitag FG, Gilbert TT, Frishberg BM, and the US Headache Consortium. Evidence-based guidelines for migraine headache in the primary care setting: pharmacological management for prevention of migraine. American Academy of Neurology. US Headache Consortium. 2000:1-55.

5. Snow V, Weiss K, Wall EM, Mottur-Pilson C. for the American Academy of Family Physicians and the American College of Physicians-American Society of Internal Medicine. Pharmacologic management of acute attacks of migraine and prevention of migraine headache. Ann Intern Med. 2002;137:840-849. 6. Data on file. Ortho-McNeil Neurologics, Inc. 7. Silberstein S. Diamond S, Loder E, Reed ML, Lipton RB. Prevalence of migraine sufferers who are candidates for preventive therapy: results from the American Migraine Prevalence and Prevention (AMPP) study [abstract]. Mount Royal, NJ: American Headache Society; March 24, 2005.

References: 1. Lipton RB, Diamond M, Freitag FG.



OOMN 2006 02M487 January 2006