

1 **PREOPERATIVE CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES FOR ELECTIVE SURGERY.**
2 **METHODOLOGICAL AND QUALITY APPRAISAL STUDY.**

3

4 **PREOPERATIVE CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES. QUALITY APPRAISAL STUDY.**

5

6 Gustavo Angel¹, Cristian Trujillo¹, Mario Mallama¹, Pablo Alonso-Coello², Markus Klimek³,
7 Jose A. Calvache^{1,3}

8

- 9 1. Department of Anesthesiology, Universidad del Cauca, Colombia.
10 2. Iberoamerican Cochrane Centre, Clinical Epidemiology and Public Health Department, Hospital de la
11 Santa Creu i Sant Pau, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain.
12 3. Department of Anesthesiology, Erasmus University Medical Centre Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

13

14 * **Corresponding author:** Jose A. Calvache, Department of Anesthesiology, Erasmus MC, Dr.
15 Molewaterplein 40, 3015 GD Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Phone/Fax: +57 8234185, E-mail:
16 jacalvache@unicauca.edu.co

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 **Background:** Clinical practice guidelines (CPG) are statements that provide recommendations
29 regarding the approach to different diseases and aim to increase quality while decrease the risk of
30 complications in health care. Numerous guidelines in the field of perioperative care have been
31 published in the previous decade but their methodological quality and transparency are relatively
32 unknown.

33 **Objective:** To critically evaluate the transparency and methodological quality of published CPG in
34 the preoperative assessment and management of adult patients undergoing elective surgery.

35 **Design:** Descriptive methodological study and quality appraisal.

36 **Data sources:** We searched for eligible CPG published in English or Spanish between January 1,
37 2010, and June 30, 2022, in MEDLINE, Embase, the Cochrane Library, as well as in
38 representatives' medical societies of Anaesthesiology and developers of CPG.

39 **Eligibility criteria:** CPG dedicated on preoperative fasting, cardiac assessment for non-cardiac
40 surgery, and the use of routine preoperative tests were included. Methodological quality and
41 transparency of CPG were assessed by 3 evaluators using the 6 domains of the AGREE-II tool.

42 **Results:** We included 20 CPG of which 14 were classified as recommended guidelines. The
43 domain of "applicability" scored the lowest (44%), while the domains "scope and objective" and
44 "editorial interdependence" received the highest median scores of 93% and 97% respectively. The
45 remaining domains received scores ranging from 44% to 84%. The top mean scored CPG in
46 preoperative fasting was ASA 2017 (93%); among cardiac evaluation, CPG for non-cardiac surgery
47 were CCS 2017 (91%), ESC-ESA 2014 (90%), and AHA-ACC 2014 (89%); in preoperative testing
48 ICSI 2020 (97%).

49 **Conclusions:** In the last ten years, most published CPG in the preoperative assessment or
50 management of adult patients undergoing elective surgery focused on preoperative fasting, cardiac
51 assessment for non-cardiac surgery, and use of routine preoperative tests, present moderate to

52 high methodological quality and can be recommended for their use or adaptation. Applicability and
53 stakeholder involvement domains must be improved in the development of future guidelines.

54 **KEYWORDS:** clinical practice guidelines, quality evaluation, methodological transparency, elective
55 surgery.

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75 **INTRODUCTION**

76 Much of the global burden of disease requires surgical intervention and over 234 million operations
77 are conducted each year worldwide (1,2). Lack of timely access to high-quality surgical care
78 remains a major problem in much of the world, even though surgical interventions can be cost-
79 effective interventions in terms of lives saved and disabilities avoided (3). In addition, perioperative
80 period is frequently associated with morbidity and mortality (4); in high-income countries, major
81 complications are occurring in 3 to 16% of in-hospital surgeries leading to permanent disability or
82 mortality ranging from 0.4 to 0.8%, while increased to 5% to 10% in low- and middle-income
83 countries (5).

84 Clinical practice guidelines (CPG) are statements containing evidence-based recommendations
85 aimed at providing better patient care and helping physicians and patients to make the best
86 decisions for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of different diseases (6). The use of CPG
87 during preoperative assessment and treatment of patients before surgical procedures can
88 contribute to reducing the risk of complications, increase patient safety, improve the quality of care,
89 enable the implementation of effective interventions, decrease treatment variability, and finally
90 improve patient outcomes (7).

91 The development of high-quality CPG is a complex, lengthy, and systematic scientific process
92 involving developers, stakeholders, and users, and therefore, the development process and
93 produced recommendations can present varying degrees of quality (6,8). CPG have been
94 evaluated by several authors including numerous conditions and years of development and
95 publication (from 1980 to 2019). In general, the applicability domain has received the lowest mean
96 score, and improvement in time is still a matter of controversy (9-12).

97 On perioperative care, Nava et al., evaluated 22 CPG from 1990 up to 2008 describing their quality
98 as moderate for most of the domains with the lowest scores in stakeholder involvement, applicability
99 and editorial independence (7). Ciapponi et al. reported the domain “applicability” as the worst
100 score in preoperative (2010 to 2017) CPG (13). In addition, a recent evaluation of guidelines in
101 airway management, as part of perioperative care, showed applicability scores of around 23% (14).
102 Studies were not able to detect any improvement over time in CPG quality, specifically in this
103 context (7,14), and show opportunities to improve the quality of CPG development (13).

104 We aimed to critically evaluate the transparency and methodological quality of the development of
105 published CPG in the preoperative assessment and management of adult patients undergoing
106 elective surgery published in the last decade, by using the AGREE-II tool.

107

108 **METHODS**

109 **Design**

110 Descriptive methodological study and quality appraisal (15) including published CPG in
111 preoperative care.

112

113 **Search strategy**

114 We conducted an extensive search in PubMed MEDLINE, TRIP Database, Embase, and the
115 Cochrane Library, as well as on 12 specific dedicated websites for CPG developers (Supporting
116 information File 1). In addition, we explored all relevant medical societies (World Federation of
117 Societies of Anaesthesiologists (WFSA), American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA), European
118 Society of Anaesthesiology (ESA), Association of Anaesthetists of Great Britain and Ireland
119 (AAGBI), and Canadian Anesthesiologists' Society (CAS)). Our search was limited to CPG
120 published between January 1, 2010, and June 30, 2022, that were written or published in English or
121 Spanish. The protocol of this study was previously published (PROSPERO ID 200026)(16).

122

123 **Selection process**

124 We defined a CPG as any document comprising clinical recommendations for the preoperative
125 assessment or treatment of adult patients undergoing elective surgery classifying them into three
126 categories related to 1) Preoperative fasting, 2) Cardiac assessment for non-cardiac surgery, and 3)
127 Use of routine preoperative tests (laboratory test, X-ray, pulmonary function test, and
128 electrocardiogram). CPG designed for the assessment and management of specific conditions or
129 designed for specific individuals were excluded (i.e., obstructive sleep apnoea, diabetes mellitus,
130 specific surgeries, or designed only for obstetric patients, paediatric patients, or other specific
131 populations).

132

133 **Data collection process and quality appraisal**

134 Two reviewers (C.T. and G.A) screened independently the records based on the eligibility criteria
135 and three independent reviewers (C.T., G.A., and M.M.) conducted data extraction and assessment
136 by using a validated form in the online tool My Agree Plus (<https://www.agreetrust.org/>). All
137 evaluators underwent thorough a detailed training for the AGREE-II tool application by following two
138 major online-training modules to assist users in effectively applying the tool. The first one contains
139 an avatar-guided overview of the AGREE II tool and follows a step-by-step process to complete
140 each item and domain. It also provides immediate feedback on how the trainees' responses
141 compare with those of expert ratings. The second one is an online-based tutorial with a virtual
142 coach accompanied by a practice appraisal exercise. This strategy has been previously tested (17).

143 Any discrepancy was solved by consensus with the advice of a fourth reviewer (J.A.C.). The
144 following data were obtained: the main category of the CPG, the number of authors, year of
145 publication or update, type of institution (governmental institution, specialty society or consortium,
146 and university), version of the guideline (first and revision/updated), region of origin, reported

147 funding (yes/no), the method for guideline development (systematic review, consensus or narrative
148 review, adaptation or adoption, and not mentioned), methods to formulate recommendations
149 (formal, informal consensus, and not mentioned), and methods to grade evidence (yes/no).

150 We used the revised version of the Appraisal of Guidelines for Research and Evaluation (AGREE-II)
151 to assess the quality of CPG. The AGREE is a validated and widely used tool to assess CPG
152 quality, and its components are based on the elements for high-quality CPG defined by the National
153 Academy of Medicine (formerly Institute of Medicine) and by the Guidelines International Network
154 (8). AGREE-II comprises 23 items organized in six domains and two global rating items (overall
155 assessments). Each domain assesses a different dimension of the CPG quality: scope and purpose
156 (domain 1), stakeholder involvement (domain 2), rigor of development (domain 3), clarity of
157 presentation (domain 4), applicability (domain 5), and editorial independence (domain 6) (8). Each
158 item was rated using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly
159 agree).

160

161 **Data Analysis**

162 The score for each AGREE-II domain was calculated as the sum of all scores of the individual items
163 in the domain and the total was standardized as a percentage of the maximum possible score for
164 that domain, using the following formula: $(\text{score obtained} - \text{minimum possible score}) / (\text{maximum}$
165 $\text{score} - \text{minimum possible score}) \times 100$. With the results from each evaluator, a summary table was
166 designed to generate median values for each domain and interquartile range (IQR). Another
167 researcher (J.A.C.) analysed results to obtain the degree of concordance of the evaluation; in which
168 'score obtained' was the sum of the scores by individual evaluators, maximum score = 7 (strongly
169 agree) x 3 (evaluators) x number of items in the domain and minimum score = 1 (strongly disagree)
170 x 3 (evaluators) x number of items in the domain (14, 18).

171 The overall mean quality score classified the CPG as 'recommended' (>60%), 'recommended with
172 modifications' (30 to 60%), or 'not recommended' (<30%). Finally, an absolute agreement among

173 the three reviewers was determined by using the intraclass correlation coefficient with its 95%
174 confidence interval, based on a mean-rating (k = 3), two-way random-effects model. A standardized
175 score was calculated separately for each of the six domains, and it was classified as a poor
176 agreement (<0.50), moderate (0.50 to 0.75), good (0.75 to 0.90), and excellent (>0.90). The data
177 were analysed with the IBM SPSS 25.0 package for Windows (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.), and R
178 Statistics.

179

180 **RESULTS**

181 We included 20 CPG in the analysis (Figure 1, Table 1). A total of 16 of the CPG (80%) were
182 produced by medical societies, 12 (60%) were new guidelines (first version), and only 10 (50%)
183 explicitly reported the source of funding for development. Most CPG (95%) described they used a
184 systematic review process and only six (20%) reported a formal method for achieving consensus.

185

186 **Figure 1. Search and selection process of CPG.**

187

188 **Table 1. Characteristics of included CPG (n=20)**

Characteristic	No. (%)
Main topic	
Preoperative fasting	6 (30)
Cardiac assessment for non-cardiac surgery	11 (55)
Use of routine preoperative tests	3 (15)
Year of publication	
2010	1 (5)
2011	5 (25)
2014	3 (15)

2016	3 (15)
2017	4 (20)
2018	1 (5)
2019	1 (5)
2020	1 (5)
2021	1 (5)
Number of authors	
≤ 5	1 (5)
6 – 10	5 (25)
11 – 20	6 (30)
≥ 20	8 (40)
Type of institution	
Governmental institution	2 (10)
Specialty society or consortium	16 (80)
University or academic institution	2 (10)
Region	
United States	4 (20)
United Kingdom	2 (10)
Belgium	2 (10)
Argentina	2 (10)
Brazil	2 (10)
Canada	1 (5)
Germany	1 (5)
Denmark	1 (5)
Spain	1 (5)
Japan	1 (5)
Mexico	1 (5)

Singapore	1 (5)
South Africa	1 (5)
Guideline version	
First version	12 (60)
Revision or updated version	8 (40)
Method for guideline development	
Systematic review	19 (95)
Not mentioned	1 (5)
Recommendation methods	
Not mentioned	4 (20)
Informal consensus	10 (50)
Formal consensus	6 (30)
Funding clearly reported	10 (50)

189

190

191 Considering all CPG, the highest AGREE-II median scores were observed in the domains “scope
192 and objective” (93%), “clarity of presentation” (84%), and “editorial independence” (97%). The
193 lowest median scores were assigned to “stakeholder involvement” and “applicability” (56% and
194 44%, respectively) (Figure 2, Table 2). Overall, CPG focused on the use of routine preoperative
195 tests were rated higher than CPG related to cardiac assessment for non-cardiac surgery and CPG
196 related to preoperative fasting (81% versus 73% and 74% respectively).

197

198 The highest mean rated CPG among the preoperative fasting category was the ASA 2017 (93%)
199 (19); among the cardiac evaluation for non-cardiac surgery CPG were CCS 2017 (91%) (20), ESC-
200 ESA 2014 (90%) (21), and AHA-ACC 2014 (89%) (22). Finally, ICSI 2020 (23) was the best-rated

201 CPG in the preoperative testing category (97%) (Table 2). Inter-rater agreement was rated as good
 202 to excellent for all domains (Table 3).

203

204 **Figure 2. Median scores of CPG evaluated in six domains of the**
 205 **AGREE-II instrument stratified by category (n = 20).**

206

207

208

209 **Table 2. Scores of the AGREE-II domains for 20 included CPG.**

Category	CPG	AGREE-II domains						
		Scope and objective (%)	Stakeholder involvement (%)	Rigour of development (%)	Clarity of presentation (%)	Applicability (%)	Editorial independence (%)	Mean score (%)
Preoperative fasting	AAA 2016 (24)	70	20	34	59	6	89	46*
	ASA 2011 (25)	96	65	78	78	56	0	62**
	ASA 2017 (19)	98	89	85	94	90	100	93**
	CAS 2019 (26)	72	28	25	54	10	33	37*
	ESA 2011 (27)	91	61	67	83	32	100	72**
	ESN 2017 (28)	98	52	83	83	68	100	81**
Cardiac assessment for non-cardiac surgery	AHA-ACC 2014 (22)	93	85	89	91	78	100	89**
	BSC 2011 (29)	65	28	25	85	38	53	49*
	BSC 2017 (30)	85	39	34	91	43	94	64**
	CCS 2017 (20)	91	93	90	96	75	100	91**
	ESA 2018 (31)	98	69	90	89	72	83	84**
	ESA 2011 (32)	98	70	77	83	36	100	78**
	ESC-ESA 2014 (21)	98	83	76	98	86	100	90**
GFM 2010 (33)	100	56	67	74	40	97	72**	

	JCS 2011 (34)	57	54	41	65	44	0	44*
	SAC 2016 (35)	81	30	64	87	38	0	50*
	SA 2021 (36)	72	50	56	78	39	83	63**
Use of routine preoperative tests	ICSI 2020 (23)	94	98	95	98	97	100	97**
	NICE 2016 (37)	98	56	61	93	81	100	81**
	SEA 2014 (38)	93	52	31	65	3	97	57*
Overall results	Median score	93	56	67	84	44	97	
	IQR	79 to 98	47 to 74	39 to 84	77 to 91	37 to 76	75 to 100	

210 CPG classification: **recommended (n=14), *recommended with modifications (n=6).

211 **Table 3. Inter-rater agreement of AGREE II domains.**

Domain	Inter-rater agreement*		
	Intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC)	95% CI	Degree of agreement
Scope and objective	0.92	0.84 to 0.96	Excellent
Stakeholder involvement	0.96	0.92 to 0.98	Excellent
Rigour of development	0.96	0.92 to 0.98	Excellent
Clarity of presentation	0.86	0.59 to 0.94	Good
Applicability	0.95	0.90 to 0.98	Excellent
Editorial independence	0.96	0.90 to 0.98	Excellent

212 *Intra-class correlation coefficient. Poor agreement (<0.50), moderate (0.50 to 0.75), good (0.75 to 0.90), and
 213 excellent (>0.90).

214

215

216 Mean AGREE-II scores among the included CPG ranged from 37% to 97% without major changes
217 in the mean CPG scores over time (Table 2). Among the recommended CPG (n=14, 62% to 97%),
218 10 reported funding, 2 were produced by governmental institutions, 10 by medical societies, and 2
219 by universities or academic institutions. In contrast, none of the CPG recommended with
220 modifications reported funding, none were developed by governmental or academic institutions, and
221 all were produced by medical societies. Preoperative test CPG was rated higher in comparison with
222 other CPG. The characteristics of CPGs by the recommendation status are available in Supporting
223 information File 2. Overall, the most frequent characteristics presented in the recommended CPGs
224 were being produced by governmental institutions (2 of 2, 100%), involving more than 20 authors (6
225 of 8, 75%), being the first version (9 of 12, 75%), reporting funding (10 of 10, 100%), and being
226 developed by following a systematic review process (14 of 19, 73%). The number of included
227 guidelines in this study prevents a more detailed analysis of associated factors.

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246 **DISCUSSION**

247 This study included 20 CPG related to preoperative assessment and management of adult patients
248 undergoing elective surgery. In the cardiac evaluation for non-cardiac surgery guidelines, two CPG
249 (CCS 2017 (20) and ESC-ESA 2014 (21)) obtained AGREE-II scores above 90%; In preoperative
250 fasting, one CPG (ASA 2017 (19)) obtained a score of 93%, and in preoperative testing, one CPG
251 (ICSI 2020 (23)) obtained a score of 97%. In general, 14 of 20 included CPG were classified as
252 recommended to be used in clinical practice.

253 The domain “applicability” had the lowest scores; this has also been found extensively in other
254 related studies (9-12, 39). On perioperative care and airway management, applicability has been
255 rated low (7,13,14). Considering CPG are designed to be widely used, these findings represent
256 important challenges to the guideline’s development and implementation. Many of the current CPG
257 do not consider the inclusion of tools and strategies that facilitate their application in real clinical
258 scenarios or barriers that limit their use. Sometimes, CPG do not provide insights on how the
259 recommendations can be put into practice or regarding the resource consequences of applying
260 them (i.e., in limited resources settings). That can be translated into a low score in this domain. In
261 addition, the opinion of patients or patients’ representatives is rarely described in the development
262 of recommendations resulting in low scores found in the domain “stakeholder involvement”.

263 Recent developments of CPG may be reflected by a continuous increase in some domains (40).
264 The domain "scope and objective" received a high score, showing that most included guidelines
265 have a clear objective, a well-defined population under consideration, and some specific focused
266 clinical questions. In the perioperative scenario, this remains a high-rated domain without major
267 differences from previous assessments (7,13).

268 Editorial independence is critical in the process of developing high-quality CPG (41) and it has been
269 previously reported as one of the lowest scored domains (7). Results of this study show that in the
270 preoperative assessment and treatment of adult patients before elective surgery, most available
271 guidelines of the last decade can be considered independent, in line with a recent assessment (13).
272 Across domains, editorial independence obtained the highest score (97%). This finding adds
273 confidence to the provided recommendations by reducing the risk of delivering biased
274 recommendations or being influenced by sponsors (seeking their benefits) or by the pharmaceutical
275 industry. Most of the included CPG were produced by specialty societies but specific conflicts of
276 interest are declared as well as their potential effect on the development process and content of the
277 guideline with transparency.

278 Methodological procedures used to generate recommendations are critical steps outlined by
279 AGREE-II as the "rigour of development" domain. In comparisons to previous studies (9) and other
280 related perioperative scenarios (14), included guidelines presented high scores (67%) being higher
281 for CPG produced in Europe, United States, and Canada. From 1980 to 2007, a very slow increase
282 in quality in CPG was reported (9). However, in the last decade, the AGREE-II tool has become the
283 most widely used international "gold standard" for guidelines development (42), potentially
284 supporting the improvement in this area.

285 Recently Ciaponni et al., published a systematic review focused to summarize and compare
286 recommendations presented in evidence-based CPG for preoperative care (13). Including 16 CPG,
287 they reported many strong recommendations ready to be considered for implementation. In line with
288 these findings, our results classified most included CPG as "recommended". In addition, when

289 comparing our findings, they do not differ to a greater extent, being consistent that the domains top-
290 scored were “scope and objective”, "Clarity of presentation", and "editorial independence". Also,
291 “applicability” was the lowest rated.

292 Low applicability can be explained by the difference in the populations to which the intervention is
293 directed or by the lack of technological resources to perform such intervention in different settings.
294 In addition, as stated by Ciapponi et al., an inadequate adoption of guidelines (due to the tendency
295 of many physicians to practice a "defensive medicine"), results in unnecessary interventions only to
296 avoid legal problems and concerns derived from the care (13). This is especially important for the
297 use of routine preoperative tests.

298 There are three major barriers to CPG implementation described in the literature. Personal factors
299 (related to physicians’ knowledge and attitudes), guideline-related factors, and external factors (43).
300 In addition, central elements of successful strategies for CPG implementation include
301 dissemination, education and training, social interaction, decision support systems, and standing
302 orders. A whole adjusted and adapted process is needed in advance when surgical teams are
303 trying to implement a new guideline. Recent evidence indicates that only by following a structured
304 process that includes an analysis of the potential local-related barriers, implementation and
305 adherence can be effective (43).

306 This study did have some limitations. First, AGREE-II items do not include a category “does not
307 apply”. In some cases, information to evaluate a single domain is missing and doubt remains as to
308 how this should be scored and rated. Second, the degree of training required to allow an adequate
309 and valid evaluation of a CPG is always a matter of concern, and certain subjective judgments may
310 be present between evaluators. In our case, a detailed training process was implemented for the
311 three evaluators regarding the application of the AGREE II tool, resulting in an agreement rated
312 from good to excellent for all included areas.

313 Healthcare providers use CPG considering guidelines to provide recommendations based on the
314 best available evidence (44). However, a 2009 study reported that most of the evidence used in the

315 American College of Cardiology / American Heart Association CPG was based on expert
316 recommendations (45), commonly non scientifically validated opinions. A systematic review of the
317 evidence-based CPG published by the American and European scientific societies in
318 anaesthesiology has recently been published. Their authors evaluated the quality of the evidence
319 used to provide recommendations, finding that only 16% of them were based on level A of
320 evidence, 33% on level B of evidence, and 51% on level C of evidence. These findings imply a
321 critical need for greater efforts to improve the evidence used in the future CPG (44). In our study,
322 the limited number of CPG prevents a more detailed analysis of the factors associated with high
323 methodological quality; further studies to assess the relationship between characteristics of CPG
324 developers and the quality of CPG are warranted as they are available in other scenarios (46).

325 In 2022, O'Shaughnessy et al, assessed the quality of CPG published during the last 5 years in top
326 anesthesia journals. With a scope beyond the preoperative care, they included 51 CPG with low
327 scores to "stakeholder involvement", "rigor of development" and "applicability" domains (47).
328 Additionally, Mai et al in 2021, evaluated 96 CPG in anesthesiology practice finding "rigor of
329 development" and "applicability" as the lowest rated domains (48). Publication of a CPG in a peer-
330 reviewed high-quality journal may enhances the scientific credentials of the process (49) while
331 reducing the potential inclusion CPG produced by low- and middle-income countries or in any
332 language different from English. In addition, time barriers, peer review and the overall editorial
333 process may distort and delay the original message and recommendations as part of the
334 development of the guideline (50,51).

335 In conclusion, CPG in the preoperative assessment or management of adult patients undergoing
336 elective surgery including preoperative fasting, cardiac assessment for non-cardiac surgery, and
337 use of routine preoperative tests present moderate to high methodological quality and can be
338 recommended for their use or adaptation. Domains of applicability and stakeholder involvement
339 must be improved in the development of future guidelines.

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

350 **Assistance with the study:** The authors are grateful to the Medical Library, Erasmus University
351 Medical Centre Rotterdam for assistance with the literature search.

352 **Financial support and sponsorship:** This work was supported by departmental funding
353 (Department of Anesthesiology, Universidad del Cauca, Colombia, and Department of
354 Anesthesiology, Erasmus University Medical Centre Rotterdam, The Netherlands).

355 **Conflicts of interest:** None declared.

356 **Presentation:** Preliminary data for this study were presented as a poster presentation at the
357 Colombian Society of Anesthesiology meeting, 5-7 August 2021.

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371 **GLOSSARY OF TERMS OF INCLUDED CPG:**

372 **Preoperative fasting**

373 **AAA 2016:** Guidelines of the Association of Anaesthesia, Analgesia and Recovery of Buenos Aires on pre-operative fasting
374 in adults and paediatrics in elective procedures (24)

375 **ASA 2011:** Practice Guidelines for Preoperative Fasting and the Use of Pharmacologic Agents to Reduce the Risk of
376 Pulmonary Aspiration: Application to Healthy Patients Undergoing Elective Procedures. American Society of
377 Anaesthesiologists (25)

378 **ASA 2017:** Practice Guidelines for Preoperative Fasting and the Use of Pharmacologic Agents to Reduce the Risk of
379 Pulmonary Aspiration: Application to Healthy Patients Undergoing Elective Procedures. American Society of
380 Anaesthesiologist (19)

381 **CAS 2019:** Preoperative fasting in patients undergoing elective surgery and procedures. College of Anaesthesiologists
382 Singapore (26)

383 **ESA 2011:** Perioperative fasting in adults and children: guidelines from the European Society of Anaesthesiology (27)

384 **ESN 2017:** European Society for Clinical Nutrition and Metabolism. ESPEN guideline: Clinical nutrition in surgery (28)

385

386 **Cardiac assessment for non-cardiac surgery**

- 387 **AHA-ACC 2014:** American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association. Guideline on Perioperative Cardiovascular
388 Evaluation and Management of Patients Undergoing Noncardiac Surgery (22)
- 389 **BSC 2011:** II Guidelines for Perioperative Evaluation of the Brazilian Society of Cardiology (29)
- 390 **BSC 2017:** 3rd Guideline for perioperative Cardiovascular evaluation of the Brazilian Society of Cardiology (30)
- 391 **CCS 2017:** Canadian Cardiovascular Society Guidelines on Perioperative Cardiac Risk Assessment and Management for
392 Patients Who Undergo Noncardiac Surgery (20)
- 393 **ESA 2018:** Pre-operative evaluation of adults undergoing elective noncardiac surgery. Updated guideline from the European
394 Society of Anaesthesiology (31)
- 395 **ESA 2011:** Preoperative evaluation of the adult patient undergoing non-cardiac surgery: guidelines from the European
396 Society of Anaesthesiology (32)
- 397 **ESC-ESA 2014:** Guidelines on non-cardiac surgery: cardiovascular assessment and management. European Society of
398 Cardiology (ESC) and the European Society of Anaesthesiology (21)
- 399 **GFM 2010:** Clinical practice guide for preoperative assessment in non-cardiac surgery in adults Mexico (33)
- 400 **JCS 2011:** Guidelines for Perioperative Cardiovascular Evaluation and Management for Noncardiac Surgery. Japanese
401 Circulation Society (34)
- 402 **SAC 2016:** Argentine Consensus for the Evaluation of Cardiovascular Risk in Non-Cardiac Surgery (35)
- 403
- 404 **Use of routine preoperative tests**
- 405 **ICSI 2020:** Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement. Health Care Guideline: Perioperative (23)
- 406 **NICE 2016:** Preoperative tests (update) Routine preoperative tests for elective surgery. National Institute for Health and
407 Care Excellence (36)
- 408 **SEA 2014:** Recommendations for preoperative tests in adult patients for procedures in outpatient surgery. Spanish Society
409 of Anesthesiology, Resuscitation and Pain Therapeutics (37)
- 410
- 411
- 412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420 **REFERENCES**

421

422 1. Murray CJL, Vos T, Lozano R, Naghavi M, Flaxman AD, Michaud C, et al. Disability-
423 adjusted life years (DALYs) for 291 diseases and injuries in 21 regions, 1990–2010: a
424 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The Lancet* 2012;
425 **380**:2197-223.

426 2. Rose J, Chang DC, Weiser TG, Kassebaum NJ, Bickler SW. The Role of Surgery in Global
427 Health: Analysis of United States Inpatient Procedure Frequency by Condition Using the
428 Global Burden of Disease 2010 Framework. *PLoS ONE* 2014; **9**: 2:e89693.

429 3. Rose J, Weiser TG, Hider P, Wilson L, Gruen RL, Bickler SW. Estimated need for surgery
430 worldwide based on prevalence of diseases: a modelling strategy for the WHO Global
431 Health Estimate. *Lancet Glob Health* 2015; **3**:S13-20

432 4. De Hert S, Staender S, Fritsch G, Hinkelbein J, Afshari A, Bettelli G, et al. Pre-operative
433 evaluation of adults undergoing elective noncardiac surgery: Updated guideline from the
434 European Society of Anaesthesiology. *European Journal of Anaesthesiology* 2018; **35**:407-
435 65.

- 436 5. WHO/World Alliance for Patient Safety. Second global patient safety challenge: safe
437 surgery saves lives. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2008.
438 https://www.who.int/patientsafety/safesurgery/knowledge_base/SSSL_Brochure_finalJun08
439 .pdf [accessed 30 November 2020].
- 440 6. Murad MH. Clinical Practice Guidelines: A primer on development and Dissemination. *Mayo*
441 *Foundation for medical education and Research* 2017; **92**:(3):423-33.
- 442 7. Barajas-Nava L, Solà I, Delgado-Noguera M, Gich I, Villagran CO, Bonfill X, et al. Quality
443 assessment of clinical practice guidelines in perioperative care: A systematic appraisal.
444 *Quality and safety in Health Care* 2010; **19**:1-8.
- 445 8. Brouwers MC, Kho ME, Browman GP, Burgers JS, Cluzeau F, Feder G, et al. AGREE II:
446 advancing guideline development, reporting and evaluation in health care. *Canadian*
447 *Medical Association* 2010; **182**:E839-42.
- 448 9. Alonso-Coello P, Irfan A, Sola I, et al. The quality of clinical practice guidelines over the last
449 two decades: a systematic review of guideline appraisal studies. *Qual Saf Health Care*
450 2010; **19**:e58.
- 451 10. Gagliardi AR, Brouwers MC. Do guidelines offer implementation advice to target users? A
452 systematic review of guideline applicability. *BMJ Open* 2015; **5**:e007047.
- 453 11. Armstrong JJ, Goldfarb AM, Instrum RS, MacDermid JC. Improvement evident but still
454 necessary in clinical practice guideline quality: a systematic review. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2017;
455 **81**:13-21.
- 456 12. Rabassa M, Garcia-Ribera Ruiz S, Sola I, Pardo-Hernandez H, Alonso-Coello P, Martinez
457 Garcia L. Nutrition guidelines vary widely in methodological quality: an overview of reviews.
458 *J Clin Epidemiol* 2018; **104**:62-72.

- 459 13. Ciapponi A, Tapia-López E, Virgilio S, Bardach A. The quality of clinical practice guidelines
460 for preoperative care using the AGREE II instrument: a systematic review. *Systematic*
461 *Reviews* 2020; **9**(1):159.
- 462
- 463 14. Merchan-Galvis AM, Caicedo JP, Valencia-Payán CJ, Calvache JA. Methodological quality
464 and transparency of clinical practice guidelines for difficult airway management using the
465 appraisal of guidelines research & evaluation II instrument. *European Journal of*
466 *Anaesthesiology* 2020; **37**:451–456.
- 467
- 468 15. Mbuagbaw L, Lawson DO, Puljak L, Allison DB, Thabane L. A tutorial on methodological
469 studies: the what, when, how and why. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2020; **20**(1):226
- 470 16. Angel G, Mallama MF, Calvache JA, Trujillo CD, Klimek M, Coelho PA. Methodological
471 transparency and factors associated with high quality of preoperative clinical practice
472 guidelines for elective surgery. A systematic review. PROSPERO 2020 CRD42020200026
473 Available from:
474 https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42020200026.
- 475 17. Brouwers MC, Makarski J, Durocher LD, *et al*. E-learning interventions are comparable to
476 user's manual in a randomized trial of training strategies for the AGREE II. *Implementation*
477 *Science* 2011; **6**:81.
- 478 18. Hoffmann-Eßer W, Siering U, Neugebauer EAM, Brockhaus AC, Lampert U, Eikermann M.
479 Guideline appraisal with AGREE II: Systematic review of the current evidence on how users
480 handle the 2 overall assessments. *Plos one* 2017;**12**(3):e0174831.
- 481 19. American Society of Anesthesiologists: Practice guidelines for preoperative fasting and the
482 use of pharmacologic agents to reduce the risk of pulmonary aspiration: An updated report.
483 *Anesthesiology* 2017; **126**:376–93.

- 484 20. Duceppe E, Parlow J, MacDonald P, Lyons K, McMullen M, Srinathan S, et al. Canadian
485 Cardiovascular Society Guidelines on Perioperative Cardiac Risk Assessment and
486 Management for Patients Who Undergo Noncardiac Surgery. *Canadian Journal Cardiology*
487 2017 ;**33(1)**:17-32.
- 488 21. European society of Cardiology and European society of Anaesthesiology. Guidelines on
489 non-cardiac surgery: cardiovascular assessment and management: The Joint Task Force
490 on non-cardiac surgery: cardiovascular assessment and management of the European
491 Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Society of Anaesthesiology (ESA).
492 *European Heart Journal* 2014; **35(35)**:2383-431.
- 493 22. Fleisher LA, Fleischmann KE, Auerbach AD, Barnason SA, Beckman JA, Bozkurt B, et al.
494 2014 ACC/AHA Guideline on Perioperative Cardiovascular Evaluation and Management of
495 Patients Undergoing Noncardiac Surgery. *Journal of American College of Cardiology* 2014;
496 **64(22)**:e77-137.
- 497 23. Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement. Health Care Guideline: Perioperative.
498 December 2019. Sixth edition. <https://www.icsi.org/guideline/perioperative-guideline>
499 [accessed 01 July 2020].
- 500 24. Folcini M, Casáis M, Fernández Cerroti H, Flores L, González M, Longhi N, et al.
501 Guidelines of the Association of Anaesthesia, Analgesia and Recovery of Buenos Aires on
502 pre-operative fasting in adults and paediatrics in elective procedures. *Argentine Journal of*
503 *Anesthesiology* 2016; **74(1)**:10-8.
- 504 25. American Society of Anesthesiologists: Practice guidelines for preoperative fasting and the
505 use of pharmacologic agents to reduce the risk of pulmonary aspiration: An updated report.
506 *Anesthesiology* 2011; **114**:495–511.

- 507 26. Kwong Fah k, Tseng P, Tsong Huey S, Lim M. et al. Preoperative fasting in patients
508 undergoing elective surgery and procedures, April 2019. <https://www.ams.edu.sg> [accessed
509 01 July 2020].
- 510 27. Smith I, Kranke P, Murat I, Smith A, O'Sullivan G, Sreide E, et al. Perioperative fasting in
511 adults and children: guidelines from the European Society of Anaesthesiology. *European*
512 *Journal Anaesthesiology* 2011; **28(8)**:556-69.
- 513 28. Weimann A, Braga M, Carli F, Higashiguchi T, Hübner M, Klek S, et al. ESPEN guideline:
514 Clinical nutrition in surgery. *Clinical Nutrition* 2017; **36(3)**:623-50.
- 515 29. Gualandro D, Yu P, Caramelli B, Marques A, Calderaro D, Fornari L, et al. 2nd guideline for
516 perioperative cardiovascular evaluation of the brazilian society of cardiology. *Arquivos*
517 *Brasileiros de Cardiologia* 2011; **96(3 suppl.1)**:1-68.
- 518 30. Gualandro D, Yu P, Caramelli B, Marques A, Calderaro D, Fornari L, et al. 3rd guideline for
519 perioperative cardiovascular evaluation of the brazilian society of cardiology. *Arquivos*
520 *Brasileiros de Cardiologia* 2017;**109(3Suppl.1)**:1-104.
- 521 31. De Hert S, Staender S, Fritsch G, Hinkelbein J, Afshari A, Bettelli G, et al. Pre-operative
522 evaluation of adults undergoing elective noncardiac surgery: Updated guideline from the
523 European Society of Anaesthesiology. *European Journal Anaesthesiology* 2018; **35(6)**:407-
524 65.
- 525 32. De Hert S, Imberger G, Carlisle J, Diemunsch P, Fritsch G, Moppett I, et al. Preoperative
526 evaluation of the adult patient undergoing non-cardiac surgery: guidelines from the
527 European Society of Anaesthesiology. *European Journal Anaesthesiology*
528 2011;**28(10)**:684-722.

- 529 33. National Center of Technological Excellence in Health Government of Mexico. Clinical
530 practice guide for preoperative assessment in non-cardiac surgery in adults Mexico:
531 Secretary of health, 2010. www.cenetec.salud.gob.mx [accessed 30 November 2020].
- 532 34. The Japanese Circulation Society, The Japanese Coronary Association, The Japanese
533 Association for Thoracic Surgery, The Japan Surgical Society, The Japanese Society of
534 Pediatric Cardiology and Cardiac Surgery et al. Guidelines for Perioperative Cardiovascular
535 Evaluation and Management for Noncardiac Surgery. *Circulation Journal* 2011;**75(4)**:989-
536 1009.
- 537 35. Krauss DJ, Lucas DL, Bagnati DR, Arakaki DD, Belcastro DF, Cobo DAL, et al. Argentine
538 Consensus for the Evaluation of Cardiovascular Risk in Non-Cardiac Surgery. *Revista*
539 *Argentina de Cardiologia* 2016;**84**: 39.
- 540 36. Alphonsus CS, Naidoo N, Chakane PM, Cassimjee I, Firfiray L, Louwrens H, et al. South
541 African cardiovascular risk stratification guideline for non-cardiac surgery. *South African*
542 *Medical Journal* 2021;**111(10b)**:1019-1025.
- 543 37. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Preoperative tests (update)
544 Routine preoperative tests for elective surgery/1-294, 2016.
545 www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng45 [accessed 01 July 2020].
- 546 38. Zaballos M, López-Álvarez S, Argente P, López A. Preoperative tests recommendations in
547 adult patients for ambulatory surgery. *Revista Española de Anestesiología y Reanimación*
548 2015; **62(1)**:29-41.
- 549 39. Dijkers MP, Ward I, Annaswamy T, Dedrick D, Feldpausch J, Moul A, Hoffecker L. Quality
550 of Rehabilitation Clinical Practice Guidelines: An Overview Study of AGREE II Appraisals.
551 *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2020; **101(9)**:1643-1655.

- 552 40. Sinclair D, Isba R, Kredo T, Zani B, Smith H, Garner P. World Health Organization guideline
553 development: an evaluation. *PloS One* 2013;**8**: e63715
- 554 41. Cosgrove L, Bursztajn HJ, Erlich DR, Wheeler EE, Shaughnessy AF. Conflicts of interest
555 and the quality of recommendations in clinical guidelines. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical*
556 *Practice* 2013; **19(4)**: 674-81.
- 557 42. Brouwers MC, Kerkvliet K, Spithoff K. The AGREE Reporting Checklist: a tool to improve
558 reporting of clinical practice guidelines. *British Medical Journal* 2016; **352**: i1152.
- 559 43. Fischer F, Lange K, Klose K, Greiner W, Kraemer A. Barriers and Strategies in Guideline
560 Implementation-A Scoping Review. *Healthcare* 2016; **29**:4(3):36.
- 561 44. Laserna A, Rubinger DA, Barahona-Correa JE, Wright N, Williams MR, Wyrobek JA, et al.
562 Levels of Evidence Supporting the North American and European Perioperative Care
563 Guidelines for Anesthesiologists between 2010 and 2020: A Systematic Review.
564 *Anesthesiology* 2021; **135(1)**:31–56.
- 565 45. Tricoci P, Allen J, Kramer J, Califf R, Smith S. Scientific Evidence Underlying the ACC/AHA
566 Clinical Practice Guidelines. *JAMA* 2009; **301(8)**:831-841.
- 567 46. Molino C de GRC, Leite-Santos NC, Gabriel FC, Wainberg SK, Vasconcelos LP de,
568 Mantovani-Silva RA, et al. Factors Associated With High-Quality Guidelines for the
569 Pharmacologic Management of Chronic Diseases in Primary Care. *JAMA Intern Med* 2019;
570 179:553.
- 571
- 572 47. O'Shaughnessy SM, Lee JY, Rong LQ, Rahouma M, Wright DN, Demetres M, et al. Quality
573 of recent clinical practice guidelines in anaesthesia publications using the Appraisal of
574 Guidelines for Research and Evaluation II instrument. *Br J Anaesth* 2022; **128(4)**:655-663.
575 doi: 10.1016/j.bja.2021.11.037.

576

577 48. Mai HT, Croxford D, Kendall MC, De Oliveira G. An appraisal of published clinical
578 guidelines in anesthesiology practice using the AGREE II instrument. *Can J Anaesth* 2021;
579 **68(7)**:1038-1044. doi: 10.1007/s12630-021-01973-9.

580

581 49. Rong LQ, Audisio K, O'Shaughnessy SM. Guidelines and evidence-based
582 recommendations in anaesthesia: where do we stand? *Br J Anaesth* 2022;**128(6)**:903-908.
583 doi: 10.1016/j.bja.2022.02.025.


584



585 50. Shekelle P, Woolf S, Grimshaw J.M, Schünemann HJ, Eccles MP. Developing clinical
586 practice guidelines: reviewing, reporting, and publishing guidelines; updating guidelines;
587 and the emerging issues of enhancing guideline implementability and accounting for
588 comorbid conditions in guideline development. *Implementation Sci* 2012; 7: 62.

589


590 51. Wilson KC, Irwin RS, File TM Jr, Schünemann HJ, Guyatt GH, Rabe KF. Reporting and
591 Publishing Guidelines. *Proc Am Thorac Soc* 2012; **9:293–7**.
592 <https://doi.org/10.1513/pats.201208-065st>.

Figure 1. Search and selection process of CPG.






Preoperative fasting



Cardiac assessment for non-cardiac surgery



Use of routine preoperative tests