

Evaluation of clinical practice guidelines on the management of obstetric perineal trauma using the AGREE II instrument

Tsiapakidou, Sofia¹, Campani Nygaard Christiana², Pape, Janna³, Falconi, Gabriele⁴, Betschart, Cornelia³, Doumouchsis, Stergios^{2,5}

1.1st Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, "Papageorgiou" General Hospital, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece 2.Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Epsom and St Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust, London, United Kingdom 3.Department of Gynecology, University Hospital of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland 4.Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, "San Bortolo" Hospital, Vicenza, Italy 5.St George's University of London, London, United Kingdom

CHORUS, An International Collaboration for Harmonising Outcomes, Research, and Standards in Urogynaecology and Women's Health (<https://i-chorus.org/>).

Introduction

International and national clinical practice guidelines provide guidance on OASIS management

The quality & methodology of these guidelines requires evaluation

Aim

To systematically evaluate the quality of clinical guidelines on obstetric perineal trauma and perineal care using the Appraisal of Guidelines, Research and Evaluation II instrument

Materials & Methods

Systematic literature search was performed using Medline and PubMed databases from inception to December 2018

National and international associations and societies were searched manually for published clinical practice guidelines

Five appraisers independently scored each guideline using the AGREE II Reporting checklist¹

Conclusions

This is the 1st systematic review on the assessment of the quality of guidelines on perineal trauma of using the AGREE II validation tool.

The quality among guidelines is significantly variable but high degree of agreement in overall ratings was noted

Results

12 guidelines were included and appraised. Half of the guidelines provided specific guidance on the management of OASIS and the rest on the care of obstetric perineal trauma in general. The mean overall quality rating of the twelve guidelines was between 3.0 and 6.2 and 8 of 12 (ACOG 2016, AUB 2012, AWMF 2014, RCOG 2015, SOGC 2015, Queensland 2018, Spanish 2011, WHO 2018)

A score over 4.5 suggests a high quality of the guidelines. Spanish 2011 received the overall highest scores (82,38%) and RCOM 2012 the lowest scores (36,81%)

Highest scores were noted in the domains related to 'Rigour of Development' and 'Clarity of Presentation' with a mean 67,76 and 65,88 respectively. The lowest ratings were on 'Stakeholder Involvement' with a mean of 54,79 and 'Editorial Independence' with 56,34

RCOG 2015 was rated with the highest recommendation score at overall assessment among the appraisers according to AGREE II criteria

Spanish 2011 received the overall highest scores, a fact that indicates that it has been developed with significant high quality of methodology

The NICE and WHO guidelines are better complying with the AGREE II criteria but deal with many topics and are of considerable size, which makes them difficult to consult in everyday practice

Tools as AGREE II are useful to validate the quality of the existing guidelines and can be considered as a useful guidance