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In November 1995, my friend Ruth Holland, book reviews editor of the *British Medical Journal*, suggested that I write a book to demystify the important but often inaccessible subject of evidence-based medicine. She provided invaluable comments on earlier drafts of the manuscript, but was tragically killed in a train crash on August 8, 1996. This book is dedicated to her memory.
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Foreword to the first edition by Professor Sir David Weatherall

Not surprisingly, the wide publicity given to what is now called evidence-based medicine has been greeted with mixed reactions by those who are involved in the provision of patient care. The bulk of the medical profession appears to be slightly hurt by the concept, suggesting as it does that until recently all medical practice was what Lewis Thomas has described as a frivolous and irresponsible kind of human experimentation, based on nothing but trial and error, and usually resulting in precisely that sequence. On the other hand, politicians and those who administrate our health services have greeted the notion with enormous glee. They had suspected all along that doctors were totally uncritical and now they had it on paper. Evidence-based medicine came as a gift from the gods because, at least as they perceived it, its implied efficiency must inevitably result in cost saving.

The concept of controlled clinical trials and evidence-based medicine is not new, however. It is recorded that Frederick II, Emperor of the Romans and King of Sicily and Jerusalem, who lived from 1192 to 1250 AD, and who was interested in the effects of exercise on digestion, took two knights and gave them identical meals. One was then sent out hunting and the other ordered to bed. At the end of several hours, he killed both and examined the contents of their alimentary canals; digestion had proceeded further in the stomach of the sleeping knight. In the 17th century, Jan Baptista van Helmont, a physician and philosopher, became sceptical of the practice of blood-letting. Hence he proposed what was almost certainly the first clinical trial involving large numbers, randomisation and statistical analysis. This involved taking 200–500 poor people, dividing them into two groups by casting lots, and protecting one from phlebotomy while allowing the other to be treated with as much blood-letting as his colleagues thought appropriate. The number of funerals in each group would be used to assess the efficacy of blood-letting. History does not record why this splendid experiment was never carried out.
If modern scientific medicine can be said to have had a beginning it was in Paris in the mid-19th century and where it had its roots in the work and teachings of Pierre Charles Alexandre Louis. Louis introduced statistical analysis to the evaluation of medical treatment and, incidentally, showed that blood-letting was a valueless form of treatment, although this did not change the habits of the physicians of the time, or for many years to come. Despite this pioneering work, few clinicians on either side of the Atlantic urged that trials of clinical outcome should be adopted, although the principles of numerically based experimental design were enunciated in the 1920s by the geneticist Ronald Fisher. The field only started to make a major impact on clinical practice after the Second World War following the seminal work of Sir Austin Bradford Hill and the British epidemiologists who followed him, notably Richard Doll and Archie Cochrane.

But although the idea of evidence-based medicine is not new, modern disciples like David Sackett and his colleagues are doing a great service to clinical practice, not just by popularising the idea but by bringing home to clinicians the notion that it is not a dry academic subject but more a way of thinking that should permeate every aspect of medical practice. While much of it is based on mega-trials and meta-analyses, it should also be used to influence almost everything that a doctor does. After all, the medical profession has been brain-washed for years by examiners in medical schools and Royal Colleges to believe that there is only one way of examining a patient. Our bedside rituals could do with as much critical evaluation as our operations and drug regimes; the same goes for almost every aspect of doctoring.

As clinical practice becomes busier, and time for reading and reflection becomes even more precious, the ability effectively to peruse the medical literature and, in the future, to become familiar with a knowledge of best practice from modern communication systems, will be essential skills for doctors. In this lively book, Trisha Greenhalgh provides an excellent approach to how to make best use of medical literature and the benefits of evidence-based medicine. It should have equal appeal for first year medical students and grey-haired consultants, and deserves to be read widely.

With increasing years, the privilege of being invited to write a foreword to a book by one’s ex-students becomes less of a rarity. Trisha Greenhalgh was the kind of medical student who never let her teachers get away with a loose thought and this inquiring attitude seems to have flowered over the years; this is a splendid and timely book and I wish it all the success it deserves. After all, the concept of evidence-based medicine is nothing more than the state of
mind that every clinical teacher hopes to develop in their students; Dr Greenhalgh’s sceptical but constructive approach to medical literature suggests that such a happy outcome is possible at least once in the lifetime of a professor of medicine.

DJ Weatherall

Oxford
Preface to the first edition: do you need to read this book?

This book is intended for anyone, whether medically qualified or not, who wishes to find their way into the medical literature, assess the scientific validity and practical relevance of the articles they find, and, where appropriate, put the results into practice. These skills constitute the basics of evidence-based medicine.

I hope this book will help you to read and interpret medical papers better. I hope, in addition, to convey a further message, which is this. Many of the descriptions given by cynics of what evidence-based medicine is (the glorification of things that can be measured without regard for the usefulness or accuracy of what is measured, the uncritical acceptance of published numerical data, the preparation of all-encompassing guidelines by self-appointed ‘experts’ who are out of touch with real medicine, the debasement of clinical freedom through the imposition of rigid and dogmatic clinical protocols, and the over-reliance on simplistic, inappropriate and often incorrect economic analyses) are actually criticisms of what the evidence-based medicine movement is fighting against, rather than of what it represents.

Do not, however, think of me as an evangelist for the gospel according to evidence-based medicine. I believe that the science of finding, evaluating and implementing the results of medical research can, and often does, make patient care more objective, more logical, and more cost-effective. If I didn’t believe that, I wouldn’t spend so much of my time teaching it and trying, as a general practitioner, to practise it. Nevertheless, I believe that when applied in a vacuum (that is, in the absence of common sense and without regard to the individual circumstances and priorities of the person being offered treatment or to the complex nature of clinical practice and policymaking), ‘evidence-based’ decision-making is a reductionist process with a real potential for harm.

Finally, you should note that I am neither an epidemiologist nor a statistician, but a person who reads papers and who has developed a pragmatic (and at times unconventional) system for testing their merits. If you wish to
Preface to the first edition: do you need to read this book?

pursue the epidemiological or statistical themes covered in this book, I would encourage you to move on to a more definitive text, references for which you will find at the end of each chapter.

Trisha Greenhalgh
Preface to the fifth edition

When I wrote this book in 1996, evidence-based medicine was a bit of an unknown quantity. A handful of academics (including me) were already enthusiastic and had begun running ‘training the trainers’ courses to disseminate what we saw as a highly logical and systematic approach to clinical practice. Others – certainly the majority of clinicians – were convinced that this was a passing fad that was of limited importance and would never catch on. I wrote How to Read a Paper for two reasons. First, students on my own courses were asking for a simple introduction to the principles presented in what was then known as Dave Sackett’s Big Red Book (Sackett DL, Haynes RB, Guyatt GH, Tugwell P. Clinical epidemiology – a basic science for clinical medicine. London: Little, Brown & Co., 1991) – an outstanding and inspirational volume that was already in its fourth reprint, but which some novices apparently found a hard read. Second, it was clear to me that many of the critics of evidence-based medicine didn’t really understand what they were dismissing – and that until they did, serious debate on the political, ideological and pedagogical place of evidence-based medicine as a discipline could not begin.

I am of course delighted that How to Read a Paper has become a standard reader in many medical and nursing schools, and that it has so far been translated into French, German, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese, Polish, Japanese, Czech and Russian. I am also delighted that what was so recently a fringe subject in academia has been well and truly mainstreamed in clinical service. In the UK, for example, it is now a contractual requirement for all doctors, nurses and pharmacists to practise (and for managers to manage) according to best research evidence.

In the 18 years since the first edition of this book was published, evidence-based medicine has waxed and waned in popularity. Hundreds of textbooks and tens of thousands of journal articles now offer different angles on the ‘basics of EBM’ covered briefly in the chapters that follow. An increasing number of these sources point out genuine limitations of
Preface to the fifth edition

evidence-based medicine in certain contexts. Others look at evidence-based medicine as a social movement – a ‘bandwagon’ that took off at a particular time (the 1990s) and place (North America) and spread dramatically quickly with all sorts of knock-on effects for particular interest groups.

When preparing this fifth edition, I was once again minded not to change too much apart from updating the examples and the reference lists, as there is clearly still room on the bookshelves for a no-frills introductory text. In the last (fourth edition), I also added two new chapters (on quality improvement and complex interventions), and in this latest edition I have added two more – one on applying evidence-based medicine with patients (the science of shared decision making) and another on common criticisms of EBM and responses to those. As ever, I would welcome any feedback that will help make the text more accurate, readable and practical.

Trisha Greenhalgh
January 2014
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Chapter 1  Why read papers at all?

Does ‘evidence-based medicine’ simply mean ‘reading papers in medical journals’?

Evidence-based medicine (EBM) is much more than just reading papers. According to the most widely quoted definition, it is ‘the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of current best evidence in making decisions about the care of individual patients’ [1]. I find this definition very useful but it misses out what for me is a very important aspect of the subject – and that is the use of mathematics. Even if you know almost nothing about EBM, you probably know it talks a lot about numbers and ratios! Anna Donald and I decided to be upfront about this in our own teaching, and proposed this alternative definition:

Evidence-based medicine is the use of mathematical estimates of the risk of benefit and harm, derived from high-quality research on population samples, to inform clinical decision-making in the diagnosis, investigation or management of individual patients.

The defining feature of EBM, then, is the use of figures derived from research on populations to inform decisions about individuals. This, of course, begs the question ‘What is research?’ – for which a reasonably accurate answer might be ‘Focused, systematic enquiry aimed at generating new knowledge’. In later chapters, I will explain how this definition can help you distinguish genuine research (which should inform your practice) from the poor-quality endeavours of well-meaning amateurs (which you should politely ignore).

If you follow an evidence-based approach to clinical decision-making, therefore, all sorts of issues relating to your patients (or, if you work in public
health medicine, issues relating to groups of people) will prompt you to ask questions about scientific evidence, seek answers to those questions in a systematic way and alter your practice accordingly.

You might ask questions, for example, about a patient’s symptoms (‘In a 34-year-old man with left-sided chest pain, what is the probability that there is a serious heart problem, and, if there is, will it show up on a resting ECG?’), about physical or diagnostic signs (‘In an otherwise uncomplicated childbirth, does the presence of meconium [indicating fetal bowel movement] in the amniotic fluid indicate significant deterioration in the physiological state of the fetus?’), about the prognosis of an illness (‘If a previously well two-year-old has a short fit associated with a high temperature, what is the chance that she will subsequently develop epilepsy?’), about therapy (‘In patients with an acute coronary syndrome [heart attack], are the risks associated with thrombolytic drugs [clot busters] outweighed by the benefits, whatever the patient’s age, sex and ethnic origin?’), about cost-effectiveness (‘Is the cost of this new anti-cancer drug justified, compared with other ways of spending limited healthcare resources?’), about patients’ preferences (‘In an 87-year-old woman with intermittent atrial fibrillation and a recent transient ischaemic attack, does the inconvenience of warfarin therapy outweigh the risks of not taking it?’), and about a host of other aspects of health and health services.

Professor Sackett, in the opening editorial of the very first issue of the journal *Evidence-Based Medicine* summarised the essential steps in the emerging science of EBM [2]:

1. To convert our information needs into answerable questions (i.e. to formulate the problem);
2. To track down, with maximum efficiency, the best evidence with which to answer these questions – which may come from the clinical examination, the diagnostic laboratory, the published literature or other sources;
3. To appraise the evidence critically (i.e. weigh it up) to assess its validity (closeness to the truth) and usefulness (clinical applicability);
4. To implement the results of this appraisal in our clinical practice;
5. To evaluate our performance.

Hence, EBM requires you not only to read papers but to read the *right* papers at the right time, and then to alter your behaviour (and, what is often more difficult, influence the behaviour of other people) in the light of what you have found. I am concerned that how-to-do-it courses in EBM too often concentrate on the third of these five steps (critical appraisal) to the exclusion of all the others. Yet if you have asked the wrong question or sought answers from the wrong sources, you might as well not read any papers at all. Equally,
all your training in search techniques and critical appraisal will go to waste if you do not put at least as much effort into implementing valid evidence and measuring progress towards your goals as you do into reading the paper. A few years ago, I added three more stages to Sackett’s five-stage model to incorporate the patient’s perspective: the resulting eight stages, which I have called a context-sensitive checklist for evidence-based practice, are shown in Appendix 1 [3].

If I were to be pedantic about the title of this book, these broader aspects of EBM should not even get a mention here. But I hope you would have demanded your money back if I had omitted the final section of this chapter (Before you start: formulate the problem), Chapter 2 (Searching the literature), Chapter 15 (Implementing evidence-based practice) and Chapter 16 (Applying evidence with patients). Chapters 3–14 describe step three of the EBM process: critical appraisal – that is, what you should do when you actually have the paper in front of you. Chapter 16 deals with common criticisms of EBM.

Incidentally, if you are computer literate and want to explore the subject of EBM on the Internet, you could try the websites listed in Box 1.1. If you’re not, don’t worry at this stage, but do put learning/use web-based resources to on your to-do list. Don’t worry either when you discover that there are over 1000 websites dedicated to EBM – they all offer very similar material and you certainly don’t need to visit them all.

**Box 1.1 Web-based resources for Evidence-based medicine**

**Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine:** A well-kept website from Oxford, UK, containing a wealth of resources and links for EBM. http://cebm.net.

**National Institute for Health and Care Excellence:** This UK-based website, which is also popular outside the UK, links to evidence-based guidelines and topic reviews. http://www.nice.org.uk/.

**National Health Service (NHS) Centre for Reviews and Dissemination:** The site for downloading the high-quality evidence-based reviews is part of the UK National Institute for Health Research – a good starting point for looking for evidence on complex questions such as ‘what should we do about obesity?’ http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/.

**Clinical Evidence:** An online handbook of best evidence for clinical decisions such as ‘what’s the best current treatment for atrial fibrillation?’ Produced by BMJ Publishing Group. http://clinicalevidence.bmj.com.
Why do people sometimes groan when you mention evidence-based medicine?

Critics of EBM might define it as ‘the tendency of a group of young, confident and highly numerate medical academics to belittle the performance of experienced clinicians using a combination of epidemiological jargon and statistical sleight-of-hand’ or ‘the argument, usually presented with near-evangelistic zeal, that no health-related action should ever be taken by a doctor, a nurse, a purchaser of health services, or a policymaker, unless and until the results of several large and expensive research trials have appeared in print and approved by a committee of experts’.

The resentment amongst some health professionals towards the EBM movement is mostly a reaction to the implication that doctors (and nurses, midwives, physiotherapists and other health professionals) were functionally illiterate until they were shown the light, and that the few who weren’t illiterate wilfully ignored published medical evidence. Anyone who works face-to-face with patients knows how often it is necessary to seek new information before making a clinical decision. Doctors have spent time in libraries since libraries were invented. In general, we don’t put a patient on a new drug without evidence that it is likely to work. Apart from anything else, such off-licence use of medication is, strictly speaking, illegal. Surely we have all been practising EBM for years, except when we were deliberately bluffing (using the ‘placebo’ effect for good medical reasons), or when we were ill, overstressed or consciously being lazy?

Well, no, we haven’t. There have been a number of surveys on the behaviour of doctors, nurses and related professionals. It was estimated in the 1970s in the USA that only around 10–20% of all health technologies then available (i.e. drugs, procedures, operations, etc.) were evidence-based; that figure improved to 21% in 1990, according to official US statistics [4]. Studies of the interventions offered to consecutive series of patients suggested that 60–90% of clinical decisions, depending on the specialty, were ‘evidence-based’ [5]. But as I have argued elsewhere, such studies had methodological limitations [3]. Apart from anything else, they were undertaken in specialised units and looked at the practice of world experts in EBM; hence, the figures arrived at can hardly be generalised beyond their immediate setting (see section ‘Whom is the study about?’). In all probability, we are still selling our patients short quite most of the time.

A recent large survey by an Australian team looked at 1000 patients treated for the 22 most commonly seen conditions in a primary care setting. The researchers found that whilst 90% of patients received evidence-based care for coronary heart disease, only 13% did so for alcohol dependence [6].
Furthermore, the extent to which any individual practitioner provided evidence-based care varied in the sample from 32% of the time to 86% of the time. These findings suggest room for improvement all round.

Let’s take a look at the various approaches that health professionals use to reach their decisions in reality – all of which are examples of what EBM isn’t.

**Decision-making by anecdote**

When I was a medical student, I occasionally joined the retinue of a distinguished professor as he made his daily ward rounds. On seeing a new patient, he would enquire about the patient’s symptoms, turn to the massed ranks of juniors around the bed, and relate the story of a similar patient encountered a few years previously. ‘Ah, yes. I remember we gave her such-and-such, and she was fine after that’. He was cynical, often rightly, about new drugs and technologies and his clinical acumen was second to none. Nevertheless, it had taken him 40 years to accumulate his expertise, and the largest medical textbook of all – the collection of cases that were outside his personal experience – was forever closed to him.

Anecdote (storytelling) has an important place in clinical practice [7]. Psychologists have shown that students acquire the skills of medicine, nursing and so on by memorising what was wrong with particular patients, and what happened to them, in the form of stories or ‘illness scripts’. Stories about patients are the unit of analysis (i.e. the thing we study) in grand rounds and teaching sessions. Clinicians glean crucial information from patients’ illness narratives – most crucially, perhaps, what being ill means to the patient. And experienced doctors and nurses rightly take account of the accumulated ‘illness scripts’ of all their previous patients when managing subsequent patients. But that doesn’t mean simply doing the same for patient B as you did for patient A if your treatment worked, and doing precisely the opposite if it didn’t!

The dangers of decision-making by anecdote are well illustrated by considering the risk–benefit ratio of drugs and medicines. In my first pregnancy, I developed severe vomiting and was given the anti-sickness drug prochlorperazine (Stemetil). Within minutes, I went into an uncontrollable and very distressing neurological spasm. Two days later, I had recovered fully from this idiosyncratic reaction, but I have never prescribed the drug since, even though the estimated prevalence of neurological reactions to prochlorperazine is only one in several thousand cases. Conversely, it is tempting to dismiss the possibility of rare but potentially serious adverse effects from familiar drugs – such as thrombosis on the contraceptive pill – when one has never encountered such problems in oneself or one’s patients.