

Evolution of EBM to Detect Evidence Mutations

Brian S Alper, MD, DynaMed/EBSCO Health, Ipswich, Massachusetts, United States,
balper@ebSCO.com

Zbys Fedorowicz, The Bahrain Branch, The Cochrane Collaboration, Bahrain,
zbysfedorowicz@gmail.com

Sheri Strite, Delfini Group, LLC, Portland, Oregon, United States, sstrite@delfini.org

Michael Stuart, MD, Delfini Group, LLC, Seattle, Washington, United States,
mstuart@delfini.org

Allen F. Shaughnessy, PharmD, Tufts University School of Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts,
United States, allen.shaughnessy@tufts.edu

Corresponding Author: Brian S Alper, MD, balper@ebSCO.com DynaMed/EBSCOHealth,
Ipswich, Massachusetts, United States +19783566500

Abstract

The evidence base for clinical practice evolves in both common recognized ways (assumed and expected pathways for publishing original research results and systematic reviews) and atypical less apparent ways. Atypical evolutionary pathways of evidence development and presentation within the evidence base, such as buried evidence in nontraditional sources, misleading synthesis of dissimilar evidence, and misleading replication of similar biased evidence, threaten the validity of evidence used for clinical decision-making. Evidence-based medicine techniques need to adapt to recognize and adjust for these atypical evolutionary pathways.

Keywords: Evidence, clinical decision-making, evolution, culture

Introduction

Frustrating to some and exhilarating to others, medical knowledge is in continual evolution. Medicine's evidence base evolves in many ways, sometimes in ways that can be compared to random mutations (such as adverse effects of a drug leading to investigation of its use where the effect could be beneficial) and other times through selection pressure that allows substandard evidence to flourish in ecological niches (such as a research community accepting existing reports as an established and unquestioned foundation). We describe several ways in which pathways resembling aberrant evolutionary changes distort our evidence base (How has our evidence evolved?), and discuss areas where evidence-based medicine (EBM) processes can adapt (How does EBM need to evolve?).

The Need to Unearth Buried Evidence

Evidence published as original research reports in peer-reviewed journals which are indexed in MEDLINE is more likely to be identified, evaluated, synthesized, and referenced in our view of medical knowledge than evidence which is not published in this manner.

Evolution itself, described in *On the Origin of the Species*, was rapidly accepted following its publication. However, "natural selection," without a plausible biologic mechanism, was not accepted for another 60 years. Mendel's work on the heredity of pea plants, published around the same time, could have provided this support. However, the link was not made until Mendel's work, buried in an obscure journal, was rediscovered decades later.¹

Similar delays occur in our understanding of evidence for guiding clinical practice.

Sometimes not all research findings on a topic are published, with the remainder being

either not reported, withheld, or “buried in plain sight” by reporting in places not traditionally viewed. For example, the publication of the Celecoxib Long-term Arthritis Safety Study (CLASS) reported less gastrointestinal toxicity with celecoxib than with other non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs.² As was later revealed, this report was based on interim results; data reported to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) describing results of the complete study did not support a difference in gastrointestinal toxicity. It wasn’t until this report was unearthed and these results published in two letters to the editor that the medical public was made aware of this lack of difference.^{3,4}

Similar problems occur with reports of off-label use for medications. While the published evidence of the treatment of molluscum contagiosum with imiquimod reported a partial benefit when used in children,⁵ two unpublished studies found no benefit. Although these unpublished data were publicly available through FDA reports,⁶ we learned about them years later from a “perspectives” article⁷ that typically would not be classified as evidence or identified in usual evidence searches.

Even research buried in pharmaceutical manufacturers’ archives can be accessed, although with substantial work. Unpublished research, made available following persistent public pressure, revealed the ineffectiveness of reboxetine for treating depression and oseltamivir for reducing complications of influenza.^{8,9}

The Evidentiary Piltdown Man: Limits to Scientific Veracity

Invalid evidence (whether fraudulent in origin, or inappropriately analyzed or synthesized) can have serious consequences when it contributes to our evidence base.

The “Piltdown Man” was a fossilized skull and jawbone discovered in Piltdown, East Sussex in 1912. At the time it was thought to represent evidence of a previously unknown species of human (*Homo piltdownensis*). Actually, a human skull and orangutan jawbone had been artificially aged and modified; it took 40 years to be revealed as a forgery.

Some research results are also distorted. Two of the key trials supporting the use of perioperative beta blockers were conducted by a researcher who had five trials (including one of these two trials) discredited in 2011 due to negligence and scientific misconduct.¹⁰ These articles were not retracted and the effect on our evidence base was not reported in a systematic way until a meta-analysis was published two years later.¹⁰ Guideline developers are still wrestling with revising current recommendations following these developments.¹¹

At other times disparate “species” of studies are combined, resulting in misleading conclusions. Two systematic reviews reported that dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors (gliptins) reduce the risk of cardiovascular events in patients with type 2 diabetes compared with placebo.^{12,13} However, this conclusion was primarily supported by a single atypical trial in which patients had severe renal failure, and the placebo group only received placebo for 12 weeks followed by glipizide for 42 weeks.¹⁴ Critical appraisal methods for systematic reviews typically include checking for similarity of studies being combined, but may not include evaluation of the relative influence of atypical studies. Two subsequent large trials have since reported that gliptins do not decrease risk for cardiovascular events and may increase risk for hospitalization for heart failure.^{15,16}

Aberrant Evidence Evolution Due to Inbreeding

Synthesis of evidence with meta-analysis which finds consistency and increases precision of effect estimates is an accepted method for advancing our medical knowledge with confidence in the findings we consider most valid. But the increased confidence is misleading if it is based on systematic replication of a misleading view of the evidence.

Biased medical research can appear strong and consistent when the same flaws are compounded, a concept we refer to as academic inbreeding. Genetic inbreeding occurs when children are born to consanguineous parents. The likelihood of congenital disorders increases because genetic faults are more likely to be combined.

A recent systematic review concluded *increased* mortality with sodium restriction in patients with heart failure treated with daily diuretics and fluid restriction.¹⁷ Since diuretics, fluid restriction, and sodium restriction are common components of heart failure treatment, this analysis could have been considered a major evolutionary jump in our understanding.

However, the review and all six trials included in the analysis had the same or overlapping authors. The review was retracted soon after publication because of concern over reporting of duplicate data and the inability of the authors to provide the original data for verification.¹⁸ Even without duplicate publication amplifying the results, the data represented a “congenital defect” passed on in the literature. Trials included in the review used abnormally high doses of furosemide (up to 1,000 mg/day) so it is unlikely the results apply to conventional clinical practice. If you overdose someone on diuretics, salt restriction may kill them, but this does not apply for routine medical care.

Evolving EBM to Remain Valid

EBM needs to develop new methods as new evidence problems occur. To overcome the problem of buried evidence we must become evidence archeologists. Following one of the largest evidence digs in recent history, reviewers unearthed 22,000 pages of clinical data that undermined oseltamivir's role.¹⁹ They noted such discrepancies they abandoned use of published trial reports and are developing new methods of reliable evidence synthesis to identify and appraise clinical study reports from industry.

To overcome the problem of passing forward invalid evidence interpretations we have to look carefully behind the published prose for evidence of fraud or inappropriate analyses. We need to consider what data is selected and how it is combined in meta-analyses and not simply accept the statistical result as reported. Along with rigorously applying our own critical appraisal for validity and relevance, we need to use other important evidence quality issues that are brought to light in information exchanges, such as letters to the editor and discussion lists.

To overcome academic inbreeding, we have to check when the preponderance of data comes from a single source such as the same institution or overlapping authors, and we need to recognize that when a substantial proportion of studies have the same bias affecting them a meta-analysis showing consistency and increased precision does not make the evidence any more reliable.

We need to continue to evolve our search and critical appraisal methods to keep pace with new evolutionary paths that evidence may take. As the Evidence Based Medicine Renaissance Group promotes a reappraisal and renaissance of EBM (a campaign described as "real EBM"), advancing our evidence capture and analysis should be coupled with other

strategies to better integrate it with improved contextualization and shared decision making.²⁰

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

We have read and understood the policy on declaration of interests and declare the following interests: BSA is a full-time employee of EBSCO Publishing, Inc. which publishes DynaMed. ZF and AFS receive consulting fees from EBSCO Publishing, Inc. SS and MS are principals in Delfini, LLC which provides consultation services for evidence-based clinical improvement training and other services.

Funding Acknowledgement

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. BSA, ZF, and AFS used time under contractual employment or consulting with EBSCO Publishing, Inc. to edit the paper.

Contributorship Statement

BSA identified four unique "game-changing" instances in DynaMed editing in 2013 that stimulated attention to areas where evidence analysis required extraordinary evaluation beyond traditional critical appraisal protocols. BSA, AFS, ZF, SS, and MS engaged in multiple conversations regarding thematic considerations and how this relates to other EBM developments, including dialogs on the evolution of EBM. AFS conceptualized classic history of evolution concepts to provide a thematic approach. All authors reviewed the manuscript for accuracy and readability.

¹ Bowler PJ. *Evolution: the history of an idea*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 2003.

² Silverstein FE, Faich G, Goldstein JL, Simon LS, Pincus T, Whelton A, et al. Gastrointestinal toxicity with celecoxib vs nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for osteoarthritis and rheumatoid arthritis: the CLASS study: A randomized controlled trial. Celecoxib Long-term Arthritis Safety Study. *JAMA* 2000;284(10):1247-55.

³ Hrachovec JB, Mora M. Reporting of 6-month vs 12-month data in a clinical trial of celecoxib. *JAMA* 2001;286 (19):2399-400.

⁴ Wright JM, Perry TL, Bassett KL, Chambers KG. Reporting of 6-month vs 12-month data in a clinical trial of celecoxib. *JAMA* 2001;286 (19):2398–2399.

⁵ Theos AU, Cummins R, Silverberg NB, Paller AS. Effectiveness of imiquimod cream 5% for treating childhood molluscum contagiosum in a double-blind, randomized pilot trial. *Cutis* 2004 Aug;74(2):134-8, 141-2.

⁶ Papadopoulos EJ. Clinical Executive Summary. 15 Mar 2007. <http://www.fda.gov/>

⁷ Katz KA, Swetman GL. Imiquimod, molluscum, and the need for a better “best pharmaceuticals for children” act. *Pediatrics* 2013 Jul;132(1):1-3.

⁸ Eyding D, Leigemann M, Grouven U, Harter M, Kromp M, Kaiser T, et al. Reboxetine for acute treatment of major depression: systematic review and meta-analysis of published and unpublished placebo and selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor controlled trials.

BMJ 2010; 341 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.c4737>

⁹ Jefferson T, Jones M, Doshi P, Del Mar CB, Hama R, Thompson MJ, et al. Neuraminidase inhibitors for preventing and treating influenza in healthy adults and children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* [Internet] 2014 Apr 10;4:CD008965.PMID:24718923. Available from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD008965.pub4/abstract>

¹⁰ Bouri S, Shun-Shin MJ, Cole GD, Mayet J, Francis DP. Meta-analysis of secure randomized controlled trials of B-Blockade to prevent perioperative death in non-cardiac surgery.

Heart 2014 Mar; 100 (6): 456-64. Doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2013-304262. Epub 2013 Jul 31.

¹¹ American College of Cardiology, American Heart Association and the European Society of Cardiology. 2013. Joint Statement: issued by the American College of Cardiology, American Heart Association and the European Society of Cardiology. [press release] 15 Aug 2013

¹² Monami M, Ahrén B, Dicembrini I, Mannucci E. Dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors and cardiovascular risk: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2013 Feb;15(2):112-20. doi: 10.1111/dom.12000. Epub 2012 Sep 20

¹³ Patil HR, Al Badarin FJ, Al Shami HA, Bhatti SK, Lavie CJ, Bell DS, O'Keefe JH. Meta-analysis of effect of dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors on cardiovascular risk in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Am J Cardiol* 2012 Sep 15;110(6):826-33. doi: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2012.04.061. Epub 2012 Jun 15. PMID 22703861

¹³ Monami M, Ahrén B, Dicembrini I, Mannucci E. Dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors and cardiovascular risk: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2013 Feb;15(2):112-20. doi: 10.1111/dom.12000. Epub 2012 Sep 20

¹⁴ Chan JC, Scott R, Arjona Ferreira JC, et al. Safety and efficacy of sitagliptin in patients with type 2 diabetes and chronic renal insufficiency. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2008;10:545–555.

¹⁵ Scirica BM, Bhatt DL, Braunwald E et al. SAVOR-TIMI 53 Steering Committee and Investigators. Saxagliptin and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med* 2013 Oct 3;369(14):1317-26. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1307684. Epub 2013 Sep 2.

¹⁶ White WB, Cannon CP, Heller SR, Nissen SE, Bergenstal RM, Bakris GL et al. EXAMINE Investigators. Alogliptin after acute coronary syndrome in patients with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2013 Oct 3;369(14):1327-35. PMID 23992602

¹⁷ DiNicolantonio JJ, Di Pasquale P, Taylor RS, Hackam DG. Low sodium versus normal sodium diets in systolic heart failure: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heart* 2013 Mar;12. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2012-302337.

¹⁸ [No authors listed] Retraction. Low sodium versus normal sodium diets in systolic heart failure: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heart* 2013 Jun;99(11):820. doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2012-302337. [Published Online First: 21 August 2012]

¹⁹ Doshi P, Jones M, Jefferson T. Rethinking credible evidence synthesis. *BMJ* 2012 Jan 17;344:d7898. doi: 10.1136/bmj.d7898

²⁰ Greenhalgh T, Howick J, Maskrey N, Evidence Based Medicine Renaissance Group. Evidence based medicine: a movement in crisis? *BMJ* 2014 Jun 13;348:g3725.