

Updating the guideline development methodology of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee (HICPAC)

Craig A. Umscheid, MD, MSCE, Rajender K. Agarwal, MD, MPH, and Patrick J. Brennan, MD, for the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

This article describes the recent update to the guideline development methodology of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee (HICPAC). These methods are being used to develop future HICPAC guidelines, beginning with the guideline on preventing catheter-associated urinary tract infections released in 2009. The article includes a background on HICPAC, the strengths and limitations of the methods it's used over the last two decades, and the rationale behind these recent updates. In addition, we describe the new infrastructure used to develop guidelines at HICPAC, key changes in methodology, and new elements of HICPAC guidelines, like the implementation and audit section. We also describe current challenges to the development of infection control guidelines. The current update builds on past strengths and current advances in guideline development and implementation, and enables HICPAC to improve the validity and usability of its guidelines while also addressing emerging challenges in guideline development in the area of infection prevention and control.

Key Words: Practice guideline, as topic; infection control; evidence-based medicine; quality of health care; methods; HICPAC.

Copyright © 2010 by the Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, Inc. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved. (*Am J Infect Control* 2010;38:264-73.)

The Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee (HICPAC) is a federal advisory committee made up of 14 external infection control and public health experts, who provide guidance to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) regarding the practice of health care infection prevention and control, strategies for surveillance, and

prevention and control of health care-associated infections (HAIs) in United States health care facilities. As such, one of the primary functions of the committee is to issue recommendations for preventing and controlling HAIs in the form of guidelines and less formal communications.^{1,2} Currently, HICPAC guidance documents are available on its Web site for download,¹ and a number of additional documents have been published since HICPAC's inception, most commonly in *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR)*, *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology (ICHE)*, and the *American Journal of Infection Control (AJIC)*.

The strength of the HICPAC guidance documents stem from their process of development as well as their content and organization. HICPAC's processes were set in motion at the time of its creation by the Secretary of DHHS in 1991. The committee was organized at the request of CDC to provide a setting for guideline development that was free from political or financial influence and that enabled multidisciplinary and public input. Members are recommended by the CDC and appointed by the Secretary of DHHS from experts in the fields of infectious diseases, HAIs, nursing, surgery, epidemiology, public health, health outcomes, and related areas of expertise. In fact, the Federal Advisory Committee Act mandates that membership include individuals with a variety of interests, backgrounds,

From the Center for Evidence-based Practice, University of Pennsylvania Health System, Philadelphia, PA.

Address correspondence to Craig A. Umscheid, MD, MSCE, University of Pennsylvania, 3535 Market St. Mezzanine, Suite 50, Philadelphia, PA 19104. E-mail: craig.umscheid@uphs.upenn.edu.

Members of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee are included in [Appendix I](#).

Conflicts of interest: The authors C.A.U., R.K.A., and P.J.B. report no actual or potential conflicts of interest. C.A.U. and R.K.A. received funding from the CDC to support the guideline development process.

Disclaimer: The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

0196-6553/\$36.00

Copyright © 2010 by the Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, Inc. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2009.12.005

and expertise.² All HICPAC members are required to regularly disclose potential conflicts of interest. The committee also has ex officio members such as the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality as well as liaisons from professional organizations such as the Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, Inc., and the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America. Other such nonvoting representatives are included as the secretary deems necessary to carry out the functions of the committee effectively. Since the creation of the HICPAC, guidelines have been drafted by the CDC in collaboration with outside experts, reviewed and revised within HICPAC, and published in the *Federal Register* for public comment before final publication.¹⁻³

The content and organization of HICPAC's guidance documents include the following: (1) a thorough yet concise review of the guideline topic and (2) a recommendations section that communicates strength of recommendations as well as supporting evidence grades. This structure has enabled the committee to differentiate those practices for which the available scientific evidence provides strong support or rejection (category I) from those practices where there is only suggestive or less definitive evidence (category II). The grading of the evidence behind the recommendation has also allowed the committee to differentiate strong recommendations with a firm scientific foundation (category IA) from strong recommendations with a weaker scientific foundation (category IB). The more recent introduction of category IC recommendations has enabled a further distinction of strong recommendations mandated by federal and/or state statutes, regulations, or standards.

The value of HICPAC documents is reflected in their use by individual infection preventionists and health care epidemiologists,⁴ as well as national societies committed to infection prevention and control.⁵ In addition, the value of HICPAC documents is reflected in a growing body of evidence suggesting that they enhance the quality and safety of patient care.⁶⁻¹⁰ For example, Manangan et al demonstrated an association between a high level of awareness and adoption of HICPAC recommendations with a decrease in the incidence of ventilator-associated pneumonia among 188 hospitals.¹⁰ Likewise, almost 90% of direct care providers were aware of recommendations in the CDC's Hand Hygiene Guideline, and increased adherence with these recommendations correlated with a lower incidence of central line-associated bloodstream infections.⁷ Several other recent investigations have provided indirect evidence that HICPAC recommendations applied in "bundles" can result in significant reductions in the incidence of central line-associated bloodstream infections.^{6,8,9}

STRENGTHENING HICPAC GUIDELINES TO ADDRESS EMERGING NEEDS

Despite the strengths of HICPAC's guidance documents and the processes used in their development, a number of recent advances in guideline development and implementation have emerged that offer HICPAC an opportunity to further strengthen the validity and impact of their guidelines. Many of these advances have been integrated into the guideline development processes of societies on the forefront of guideline development, providing HICPAC with excellent models for updating its guideline methodology.¹¹⁻¹⁶ Advances in guideline development and implementation have also been promoted by authors, committees, and organizations focused on improving the validity and usability of guidelines.¹⁷⁻²¹

Importantly, these advances also allow the HICPAC to address emerging challenges in guideline development in the area of infection prevention and control. Such challenges include the following: (1) an immense and rapidly growing evidence base that makes it more important than ever to utilize strategies that allow one to efficiently locate and use the most valid and clinically relevant studies available; (2) emerging infections for which infection preventionists require guidance yet for which there is little evidence on which to base recommendations; (3) increasing attention to infection prevention and control by surveyors, regulatory agencies, government, and commercial payors in the United States and abroad, making the need for rigorous evidence-based guidelines more pressing^{22,23}; and (4) escalating quantity of guidelines available to guide care on any given topic, which makes clear communication, recommendation bundles, and implementation plans key to any guideline's success.^{24,25} In addition, the threats of commercial and political bias are as important now as they were at the time the HICPAC was created, particularly with the potential financial benefits to industry of guideline endorsements^{21,26} and the challenge that payors and health care facilities have to improve the value of their health care dollar.

Given these challenges, the needs of HICPAC are clear. The committee must (1) create the processes necessary to rapidly develop and update guidelines to allow an appropriate response to emerging needs and new scientific evidence, (2) address the key clinical questions of infection preventionists and providers in a targeted way, (3) use the best available evidence to answer those questions efficiently, (4) provide transparent recommendations without bias, and (5) prioritize recommendations for implementation. This document provides an update on the methods used by the HICPAC to address these needs. Specifically, we describe how the HICPAC is using emerging methods in guideline development to create




Fig 1. Stakeholders in HICPAC guideline development.

guidelines based on targeted systematic reviews of the best available evidence, with explicit links between the evidence and recommendations, which can be efficiently updated and provide priorities for practitioners as well as future research agendas. We also discuss methods used to enhance the reach and impact of these guidelines on the quality, safety, and value of patient care. These methodologies are approved by the HICPAC and will be used for subsequent guidelines issued by the HICPAC, beginning with the Prevention of Catheter-Associated Urinary Tract Infection Guideline, which was initiated in the fall of 2007.

ORGANIZING TO ACCOMPLISH OUR GOALS

To re-engineer its guideline development process, the HICPAC first restructured its approach. In its new approach, each guideline is developed by a working group in consultation with a panel of content experts and HICPAC (Fig 1). All funding is provided by the CDC. Financial conflicts of interest are vetted and disclosed for all working group, content experts, and HICPAC members.

The working group has accountability for all phases of methodology, including development of the key questions around which the guideline is based, the systematic review of the evidence, and the guideline itself. It also is responsible for providing content experts and HICPAC members with progress updates at agreed-on dates. Each working group includes but is not limited to 3 main stakeholders: a HICPAC member, a staff member from the CDC, and outside experts in the methodology of guideline development. Each member has individual as well as overlapping accountabilities.

The HICPAC member is responsible for helping to develop the key questions, reviewing abstracts and full text articles for inclusion in the guideline, reviewing summaries of the evidence and the guideline recommendations, and communicating the progress of the working group at regular HICPAC meetings, as well as

communicating progress to and soliciting input from experts who are external to HICPAC.

The CDC staff member comes from the Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion in the National Center for Preparedness, Detection, and Control of Infectious Diseases, and responsibilities include helping to develop key questions, reviewing abstracts and full text for inclusion, and writing the evidence summaries and recommendations as well as the following guideline sections: the executive summary, summary of recommendations, implementation and audit, recommendations for further research and background.

The experts in guideline methodology include a project manager, an analyst, and a medical librarian. The role of the project manager includes developing and maintaining guideline methods, setting the time line, and reviewing and integrating all aspects of guideline development. The analyst extracts data from included studies, builds evidence tables, and grades the overall quality of the evidence for guideline questions using formal processes. The librarian assists the working group in developing search strategies and choosing resources to find relevant references, run searches, and manage included and excluded references.

The panel of content experts consists of 3 or more content experts both internal and external to the HICPAC. These experts are chosen at the discretion of the HICPAC. The expert panel participates and provides feedback in regular progress updates and provides in-depth reviews of key questions, the bibliography resulting from the initial literature search, the draft evidence report, and the guideline recommendations.

HICPAC members and liaisons participate in the guideline development process and provide feedback in regular progress updates, as well as on the draft evidence report and guideline recommendations. HICPAC members then vote to approve the final guideline.

The expertise and experience of relevant professional societies is also critical to this process. As




Fig 2. The guideline development process.

such, representatives of these societies can participate through multiple routes, including as HICPAC liaisons, content experts, or working group members.

METHODS IN GUIDELINE DEVELOPMENT

HICPAC guidelines are now based on targeted systematic reviews of the best available evidence. The grading of recommendations assessment, development, and evaluation (*GRADE*) approach is used to provide explicit links between the available evidence and the resulting recommendations.²⁷⁻³⁰ The guideline development process is outlined in Fig 2.

Development of key questions

Each HICPAC guideline begins with the drafting and refining of the key questions most critical to infection prevention and control personnel and providers for the given guideline topic. These questions then serve as a foundation for the guideline and guide the systematic review of the evidence and the development of the guideline recommendations. To develop the key questions, the working group first conducts a search of medical literature databases and Web sites for all relevant guidelines and narrative reviews on the topic of interest and then drafts key questions based on their review of these documents. Databases commonly searched include MEDLINE and the National Guideline Clearinghouse. Web sites commonly searched include those of government technology assessment programs such as the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) in the United Kingdom,³¹ commercial payors such as BlueCross/BlueShield in the United States,³² or federal or state Web sites in the United States. Once a preliminary list of key questions is developed from an examination of the relevant guidelines and reviews identified in the search, the key questions are vetted and revised by the content experts and then are presented to and finalized by HICPAC members.

Literature search

Following the development of the key questions, search terms are developed for identifying the literature most relevant to those questions. For the purposes of quality assurance, these terms are compared with those used in relevant guidelines, reviews, and seminal studies. These search terms are then incorporated into search strategies for the relevant electronic medical literature databases. Searches are commonly performed in MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, and Cochrane, and the resulting references are imported into reference management software, where duplicates can be resolved. Cochrane reviews ultimately included in guidelines are checked for updates prior to completion of the first guideline draft.

Study selection

In general, a best available evidence approach is used to review articles for inclusion. For example, if there are randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that address a therapy question, then evidence lower in the evidence hierarchy may not be considered. Inclusion and exclusion criteria that are general or specific to individual key questions are developed and used to review references, starting with titles and abstracts. Full text articles are reviewed using the same criteria and are retrieved if they meet inclusion criteria. Studies that are commonly included are those that are (1) relevant to one or more key questions; (2) primary analytic research, a systematic review, or meta-analysis; and (3) written in English. Disagreements between reviewers regarding whether an individual study meets inclusion/exclusion criteria are resolved by consensus of those reviewers.

Data extraction and synthesis

For those studies meeting inclusion criteria, data relevant to the evidence review and guideline development are extracted into evidence tables. This data commonly includes the study author, year, design, quality, objective, population, setting, sample size, power, follow-up, and definitions and results of clinically relevant outcomes. Evidence tables are developed for each key question, with study data being extracted into the relevant evidence tables. Next, studies are organized by the common themes that emerge within each evidence table. Data are extracted by one or more authors, and disagreements are resolved by the remaining authors. Data and analyses are most often extracted as originally presented in the included studies. Meta-analyses are performed only where their use is deemed critical to a recommendation and only in circumstances in which multiple studies with sufficiently homogenous populations, interventions, and outcomes can be analyzed. Systematic reviews may also be included in a guideline if there are a large number of relevant reviews available in the literature.³³ Otherwise, systematic reviews will be used as a source of primary references for the guideline. To ensure that all relevant studies are captured in the search, the bibliography is vetted by the content experts.

Grading of evidence

First, the quality of each study is assessed using scales adapted from existing methodology checklists,³⁴⁻³⁸ and scores are recorded in the evidence tables. Next, the quality of the evidence base is assessed using methods adapted from the GRADE Working Group.^{27-30,39} In summary, GRADE tables are

developed for each of the interventions or questions addressed within the evidence tables. Included in the GRADE tables are the intervention of interest, any outcomes listed in the evidence tables that are judged to be clinically important by the working group, the quantity and type of evidence for each outcome, the relevant findings, and the GRADE of evidence for each outcome, as well as an overall GRADE of the evidence base for the given intervention or question. For therapy or harm questions, the initial GRADE of evidence for each outcome is deemed high if the evidence base includes a RCT or a systematic review of RCTs, low if the evidence base includes only observational studies, or very low if the evidence base consists only of descriptive studies (ie, uncontrolled studies) or expert opinion. The initial GRADE is then modified by 8 criteria. Criteria that can decrease the GRADE of an evidence base include poor quality of individual studies, inconsistent findings among studies, indirectness of study findings to the study question, imprecision of study estimates, and publication bias. Criteria that can increase the GRADE include a large magnitude of effect, a dose-response gradient, or inclusion of unmeasured confounders that would increase the effect size (Table 1). For questions regarding diagnostic measures (eg, sensitivity or predictive values) or descriptive measures (eg, prevalence or incidence), the initial GRADE of evidence can be high even if the evidence base only includes descriptive study designs, like cross-sectional studies.³⁰ The initial GRADE can then be modified by criteria similar to those used for therapy or harm questions. GRADE definitions are as follows^{27,28}:

1. High: further research is very unlikely to change confidence in the estimate of effect.
2. Moderate: further research is likely to affect confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
3. Low: further research is very likely to affect confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
4. Very low: any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

After determining the GRADE of the evidence base for each outcome of a given intervention or question, the overall GRADE of the evidence base for that intervention or question is calculated. The overall GRADE is based on the lowest GRADE for the outcomes deemed critical by the working group to making a recommendation.

Formulating recommendations

Narrative evidence summaries are then drafted by the working group using the evidence and GRADE tables. One summary is written for each theme that

Table 1. Rating the quality of evidence for therapy or harm studies using the GRADE approach

| Type of evidence | Initial grade | Criteria to decrease grade | Criteria to increase grade | Overall quality grade |
|---|---------------|--|---|-----------------------|
| RCT | High | Quality Serious (−1 grade) or very serious (−2 grades) limitation to study quality Consistency Important inconsistency (−1 grade) Directness Some (−1 grade) or major (−2 grades) uncertainty about directness Precision Imprecise or sparse data (−1 grade) Publication bias High risk of bias (−1 grade) | Strong association Strong (+1 grade) or very strong evidence of association (+2 grades) Dose response Evidence of a dose-response gradient (+1 grade) Unmeasured Confounders Inclusion of unmeasured confounders increases the effect size (+1 grade) | High |
| Observational study | Low | | | Moderate |
| Any other evidence (eg, expert opinion) | Very low | | | Low |

GRADE, Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation; RCT, randomized controlled trial.

Table 2. Formulating recommendations

| HICPAC recommendation | Weighing benefits and harms for critical outcomes | Quality of evidence |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Strong (category I) | Interventions with net benefits or net harms | Category IA: high to moderate Category IB: low to very low (established practice) Category IC: high to very low (regulatory) |
| Weak (category II) | Interventions with trade offs between benefits and harms | High to very low |
| No recommendation/unresolved Issue | Uncertain trade offs between benefits and harms | Low to very low |

emerges under each key question. The working group then uses the narrative evidence summaries to develop guideline recommendations. Factors determining the strength of a recommendation include the following²⁹: (1) the values and preferences of the working group when determining which study outcomes are critical,²⁸ (2) the risks and benefits that result from weighing the critical outcomes, and (3) the overall GRADE of the evidence base for the given intervention or question (Table 2). If weighing the critical outcomes for a given intervention or question results in a “net benefit” or a “net harm,” then a category I recommendation is formulated to strongly recommend for or against the given intervention respectively. If weighing the critical outcomes for a given intervention or question results in a “trade off” between benefits and harms, then a category II recommendation is formulated to recommend that providers or institutions consider the intervention when deemed appropriate. If weighing the critical outcomes for a given intervention or question results in an “uncertain trade off” between benefits and harms, then “No recommendation” is formulated to reflect this uncertainty.

For category I recommendations, levels A and B represent the quality of the evidence underlying the recommendation, with A representing high to moderate quality evidence and B representing low to very low quality evidence but established standards (eg, aseptic

technique, education, and training). For category IB recommendations, although there may be low to very low quality evidence directly supporting the benefits of the intervention, the theoretical benefits are clear, and the theoretical risks are marginal. Category IC represents practices required by state or federal regulation, regardless of the quality of evidence. It is important to note that the strength of a category IA recommendation is equivalent to that of a category IB or IC recommendation; it is only the quality of the evidence underlying the category IA recommendation that makes it different from a category IB.

In some instances, multiple recommendations may emerge from a single narrative evidence summary. The updated HICPAC categorization scheme for recommendations is provided in Table 3.

Category I recommendations are defined as strong recommendations with the following implications²⁹:

1. For patients: Most people in the patient’s situation would want the recommended course of action, and only a small proportion would not. Patients should request discussion if the intervention is not offered.
2. For clinicians: Most patients should receive the recommended course of action.
3. For policy makers: The recommendation may be considered for policy in many situations.

Table 3. Updated HICPAC categorization scheme for recommendations

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Category IA | A strong recommendation supported by high to moderate quality evidence suggesting net clinical benefits or harms |
| Category IB | A strong recommendation supported by low-quality evidence suggesting net clinical benefits or harms or an accepted practice (eg, aseptic technique) supported by low to very low quality evidence |
| Category IC | A strong recommendation required by state or federal regulation |
| Category II | A weak recommendation supported by any quality evidence suggesting a trade off between clinical benefits and harms |
| No recommendation | An unresolved issue for which there is low to very low quality evidence with uncertain trade offs between benefits and harms |

Category II recommendations are defined as weak recommendations with the following implications²⁹:

1. For patients: Most people in the patient's situation would want the recommended course of action, but some may not.
2. For clinicians: Different choices will be appropriate for different patients, and clinicians must help patients arrive at management decisions consistent with their values and preferences.
3. For policy makers: Policy making requires substantial debate and involvement of many stakeholders.

Our evidence-based recommendations are then cross-checked with those from guidelines identified in our original systematic search. In addition, recommendations from previous guidelines for topics not directly addressed by our systematic review of the evidence are included in a "Summary of Recommendations" if they are deemed critical to the target users of the guideline. Unlike recommendations informed by the literature search, these recommendations are not linked to a key question. Instead, these recommendations are agreed on by expert consensus and are generally designated either category IB if they represent a strong recommendation based on accepted practices (eg, aseptic technique) or category II if they are a suggestion based on a probable net benefit despite limited evidence.

We carefully select the wording of each recommendation to reflect the recommendation's strength.⁴⁰ We use the active voice when writing category I recommendations—the strong recommendations. Phrases including words such as "do" or "do not" and verbs without conditionals are used to convey certainty. A passive voice is used when writing category II recommendations—the weak recommendations. Words such as "consider" and phrases such as "is preferable," "is suggested," or "is not suggested" are used to reflect

the lesser certainty of the category II recommendations. Rather than a simple statement of fact, each recommendation is actionable, describing precisely a proposed action to take.⁴¹

The category "No recommendation/unresolved issue" is most commonly applied to situations in which either (1) the overall quality of the evidence base for a given intervention is low to very low, or (2) there is no published evidence on outcomes deemed critical to weighing the risks and benefits of a given intervention. If the latter is the case, those critical outcomes are noted at the end of the relevant evidence summary.

All recommendations are formulated to be consistent with policies from the United States Food and Drug Administration and Environmental Protection Agency. All recommendations are approved by HICPAC members and focus only on efficacy, effectiveness, and safety. However, the optimal use of these guidelines should include a consideration of the costs relevant to the local setting of guideline users.

Reviewing and finalizing the guideline

After a draft of the tables, narrative summaries, and recommendations is completed, the working group shares this draft with the content experts for review in depth. While the content experts are reviewing this draft, the working group completes the remaining sections of the guideline, including the executive summary; background; summary of recommendations; and recommendations for guideline implementation, audit, and further research. The working group then makes revisions to the draft based on feedback from the content experts and presents the entire draft guideline to the HICPAC for review. The CDC then submits the guideline for clearance and posts it on the *Federal Register* for public comment. After a period of public comment, the guideline is revised accordingly, and the final guideline is published and posted on the HICPAC Web site.

Updating the guideline

Guidelines will be reassessed periodically, and general or targeted revisions to guidelines will be dictated by new research and technologic advancements in the particular area of interest.⁴² Reassessments and updates will occur at the request of the HICPAC.

Guideline implementation

To improve the impact of guidelines on patient care quality and safety, multiple implementation initiatives are underway.⁵ In addition, future HICPAC guidelines will include an implementation and audit section. This section includes multimodal implementation of

specific recommendations or modules²⁵ that highlight the most critical recommendations in the guideline.²⁴ Besides being the focus of infection preventionists and health care epidemiologists, these recommendations may also be ripe for integration into computerized clinical decision support systems.⁴³ This section also includes performance indicators that can be used by health care facilities or regulators of such facilities to improve guideline adherence and ultimately patient care and may be the focus of pay for performance contracts either locally or nationally. These modules and performance indicators established by the HICPAC are based on the evidence review and recommendations.

LOOKING TO FUTURE CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

By integrating current advances in guideline development and implementation into future HICPAC guidelines, we believe that the HICPAC will be able to confront many of today's emerging challenges successfully. However, there are a number of methodologic challenges that are inadequately addressed by current advances. These challenges will likely be addressed by future advances, and the HICPAC will stand at the ready to integrate these future advances into its processes. Some such methodologic challenges include (1) questions for which there is little to no evidence on which to base a recommendation, there is little to no requirement for evidence given the high prior probability of a recommendation's success,^{44,45} or the evidence arises from basic science studies whose strength of evidence may not be accurately reflected in the current approaches to grading an evidence base (this last point is particularly relevant to the evidence addressing infection prevention and control questions); (2) those inherent to using systematic reviews in a systematic review, including how to judge the quality of studies included in the original systematic review³³; (3) how to use meta-analyses in guidelines effectively given the heterogeneity of populations, interventions, and outcomes often studied to address a single question; (4) the role of cost analyses in recommendations, particularly given the sometimes great differences in the costs of drugs and devices by state and by health care facility^{46,47}; and (5) the use of population-based patient preference evidence to inform individual patient decisions.⁴⁸⁻⁵¹

In addition, there are operational challenges that remain despite the HICPAC's new approach to guideline development. To maintain the success and efficiency of the HICPAC's new approach, the committee may want to rely on a small cadre of HICPAC members and CDC staff trained and experienced in the methods of guideline development; however, this methods

expertise must be balanced by content expertise, and this balance may result in a less efficient but more valid guideline development process. Second, guidelines must be developed efficiently and updated regularly if they are to provide the most valid, relevant, and up-to-date guidance, particularly in the context of emerging infections for which there may be a rapidly growing body of literature; however, this efficiency can conflict with the time often required for sufficient expert and public input. Third, guideline implementation could be markedly improved with the development of strategies to enable automatic integration of guidelines into computerized clinical decision support.⁴³ Fourth, as highlighted by a recent report by the US Government Accountability Office, the quantity of existing HICPAC recommendations is substantial, and there is a need to assist providers with translation and prioritization of these recommendations across the continuum of care.⁵² Last, the HICPAC will need to identify gaps in research to better prevent and control infections. In fact, one of the major strengths of performing a systematic review to develop a guideline is the ability to systematically uncover these critical evidence gaps. These gaps often represent only a handful of potential research studies, which, if performed, could provide much needed answers to our most critical questions.

CONCLUSION

The current update to the HICPAC's guideline methodology builds on past strengths and current advances in guideline development and implementation and enables the HICPAC to improve the validity and usability of its guidelines while also addressing emerging challenges in guideline development in the area of infection prevention and control. Despite the current update, methodologic and operational challenges persist, and the HICPAC is ready to integrate any future advances into its processes as appropriate.

The Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee thanks the following individuals for their critical input in the methodology update: Carolyn V. Gould, MD, MSCR; David A. Pegues, MD; Taranisa MacCannell, MSc, PhD; Ingi Lee, MD, MSCE; Kurt B. Stevenson, MD, MPH; Gretchen Kuntz, MSW, MSLIS; Michael R. Bell, MD.

References

1. Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee Web site. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Web site. Available from: <http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/dhqp/hicpac.html>. Accessed March 18, 2009.
2. Anonymous. Hospital Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee; establishment—CDC: notice of establishment. Federal Register 1991;56:5006.

3. O'Rourke EJ, O'Rourke EJ. The first HICPAC guideline: well done, CDC. Hospital Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee. *Am J Infect Control* 1995;23:50-2.
4. Olmsted RN, Kowalski CP, Krein SL, Saint S. Reading habits of infection control coordinators in the United States: peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed evidence? *Am J Infect Control* 2006;34:616-20.
5. Yokoe DS, Mermel LA, Anderson DJ, et al. Executive summary: a compendium of strategies to prevent health care associated infections in acute care hospitals. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2008;29:S12-21.
6. Burton DC, Edwards JR, Horan TC, Jernigan JA, Fridkin SK. Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* central line-associated bloodstream infections in US intensive care units, 1997-2007. *JAMA* 2009;301:727-36.
7. Larson EL, Quiros D, Lin SX. Dissemination of the CDC's hand hygiene guideline and impact on infection rates. *Am J Infect Control* 2007;35:666-75.
8. Pronovost P, Needham D, Berenholtz S, Sinopoli D, Chu H, Cosgrove S, et al. An intervention to decrease catheter-related bloodstream infections in the ICU. *N Engl J Med* 2006;355:2725-32.
9. CDC. Reduction in central line-associated bloodstream infections among patients in intensive care units—Pennsylvania, April 2001-March 2005. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2005;54:1013-6.
10. Manangan LP, Banerjee SN, Jarvis WR. Association between implementation of CDC recommendations and ventilator-associated pneumonia at selected US hospitals. *Am J Infect Control* 2000;28:222-7.
11. Schunemann HJ, Cook D, Guyatt G. Methodology for antithrombotic and thrombolytic therapy guideline development: American College of Chest Physicians evidence-based clinical practice guidelines 8th Ed.. *Chest* 2008;133(Suppl 6):S113-22.
12. Sawaya GF, Guirguis-Blake J, LeFevre M, Harris R, Petitti D. Update on the methods of the US Preventive Services Task Force: estimating certainty and magnitude of net benefit. *Ann Intern Med* 2007;147:871-5.
13. Barton MB, Miller T, Wolff T, Petitti D, LeFevre M, Sawaya G, et al. How to read the new recommendation statement: methods update from the US Preventive Services Task Force. *Ann Intern Med* 2007;147:123-7.
14. Schunemann HJ, Jaeschke R, Cook DJ, Bria WF, El-Solh AA, Ernst A, et al. An official ATS statement: grading the quality of evidence and strength of recommendations in ATS guidelines and recommendations. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2006;174:605-14.
15. Methodology manual for ACCF/AHA Guideline Writing Committee. American Health Association Web site. Available from: <http://www.americanheart.org/presenter.jhtml?identifier=3039684>. Accessed October 28, 2009.
16. Fleisher LA, Bass EB, McKeown P. American College of Chest P. Methodological approach: American College of Chest Physicians guidelines for the prevention and management of postoperative atrial fibrillation after cardiac surgery. *Chest* 2005;128(Suppl 2):S17-23.
17. AGREE Collaboration Web site. Available from: <http://www.agreecollaboration.org/>. Accessed March 18, 2009.
18. Shiffman RN, Shekelle P, Overhage JM, Slutsky J, Grimshaw J, Deshpande AM. Standardized reporting of clinical practice guidelines: a proposal from the Conference on Guideline Standardization. *Ann Intern Med* 2003;139:493-8.
19. Shaneyfelt TM, Mayo-Smith MF, Rothwangl J. Are guidelines following guidelines? The methodological quality of clinical practice guidelines in the peer-reviewed medical literature. *JAMA* 1999;281:1900-5.
20. Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines, Institute of Medicine. In: Field MJ, Lohr KN, editors. Guidelines for clinical practice: from development to use. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 1992.
21. Sniderman AD, Furlberg CD. Why guideline making requires reform. *JAMA* 2009;301:429-31.
22. Pronovost PJ, Goeschel CA, Wachter RM. The wisdom and justice of not paying for "preventable complications.". *JAMA* 2008;299:2197-9.
23. Wald HL, Kramer AM. Nonpayment for harms resulting from medical care: catheter-associated urinary tract infections. *JAMA* 2007;298:2782-4.
24. O'Connor PJ. Adding value to evidence-based clinical guidelines. *JAMA* 2005;294:741-3.
25. Institute for Healthcare Improvement Web site. Raising the bar with bundles: treating patients with an all-or-nothing standard. Available from: <http://www.ihl.org/IHI/Topics/CriticalCare/Sepsis/Literature/RaisingtheBarwithBundles>. Accessed March 18, 2009.
26. Eichacker PQ, Natanson C, Danner RL. Surviving sepsis—practice guidelines, marketing campaigns, and Eli Lilly. *N Eng J Med* 2006;355:1640-2.
27. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;336(7650):924-6.
28. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Vist GE, Falck-Ytter Y, Schunemann HJ. What is "quality of evidence" and why is it important to clinicians? *BMJ* 2008;336:995-8.
29. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Vist GE, Liberati A, et al. Going from evidence to recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;336:1049-51.
30. Schunemann HJ, Oxman AD, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Jaeschke R, Vist GE, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations for diagnostic tests and strategies. *BMJ* 2008;336:1106-10.
31. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence Web site. Available from: <http://www.nice.org.uk/>. Accessed March 18, 2009.
32. BlueCross BlueShield Association Technology Evaluation Center Web site. Available from: <http://www.bcbs.com/blueresources/tec/>. Accessed March 18, 2009.
33. Whitlock EP, Lin JS, Chou R, Shekelle P, Robinson KA. Using existing systematic reviews in complex systematic reviews. *Ann Intern Med* 2008;148:776-82.
34. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Ann Intern Med* 2007;147:573-7.
35. Shea BJ, Grimshaw JM, Wells GA, Boers M, Andersson N, Hamel C, et al. Development of AMSTAR: a measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2007;7:10.
36. Sanderson S, Tatt ID, Higgins JP. Tools for assessing quality and susceptibility to bias in observational studies in epidemiology: a systematic review and annotated bibliography. *Int J Epidemiol* 2007;36:666-76.
37. Moher D, Schulz KF, Altman D. The CONSORT statement: revised recommendations for improving the quality of reports of parallel-group randomized trials. *JAMA* 2001;285:1987-91.
38. Jadad AR, Moore RA, Carroll D, Jenkinson C, Reynolds DJ, Gavaghan DJ, et al. Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: is blinding necessary? *Control Clin Trials* 1996;17:1-12.
39. GRADE Working Group Web site. Available from: <http://www.grade-workinggroup.org/>. Accessed March 18, 2009.
40. Yale Center for Medical Informatics Web site. Available from: <http://ycmi.med.yale.edu/>. Accessed March 18, 2009.
41. Hussain T, Michel G, Shiffman RN. The Yale guideline recommendation corpus: a representative sample of the knowledge content of guidelines. *Int J Med Inform* 2009;78:354-63.
42. Shekelle PG, Ortiz E, Rhodes S, Morton SC, Eccles MP, Grimshaw JM, et al. Validity of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality clinical practice guidelines: how quickly do guidelines become outdated? *JAMA* 2001;286:1461-7.
43. Shiffman RN, Karras BT, Agrawal A, Chen R, Marenco L, Nath SGEM. A proposal for a more comprehensive guideline document model using XML. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2000;7:488-98.
44. Smith GC, Pell JP. Parachute use to prevent death and major trauma related to gravitational challenge: systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 2003;327:1459-61.
45. Pauker SG, Kassirer JP. The threshold approach to clinical decision making. *N Engl J Med* 1980;302:1109-17.

46. Matchar DB, Mark DB. Strategies for incorporating resource allocation and economic considerations: American College of Chest Physicians evidence-based clinical practice guidelines 8th Ed.. Chest 2008; 133(Suppl 6):S132-40.
47. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Jaeschke R, Helfand M, Liberati A, et al. Incorporating considerations of resources use into grading recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;336:1170-3.
48. Strech D, Tilburt J. Value judgments in the analysis and synthesis of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61:521-4.
49. Murad MH, Montori VM, Guyatt GH. Incorporating patient preferences in evidence-based medicine. *JAMA* 2008;300:2483-4.
50. Krahn M, Naglie G. The next step in guideline development: incorporating patient preferences. *JAMA* 2008;300:436-8.
51. Umscheid CA. Should guidelines incorporate evidence on patient preferences? *J Gen Intern Med* 2009;24:988-90.
52. United States Government Accountability Office. Health care-associated infections in hospitals. GAO-08-283. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office; March 2008.

APPENDIX 1: HEALTHCARE INFECTION CONTROL PRACTICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Chair: Brennan, Patrick J., MD, Chief Medical Officer, University of Pennsylvania Health System. Executive Secretary: Bell, Michael R., MD, Associate Director for Infection Control, Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion, National Center for Infectious Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Members: Burns, Lillian A., MPH, Infection Control Coordinator, Infectious Diseases Department, Greenwich Hospital; Elward, Alexis, MD, MPH, Medical Director of Infection Control, Assistant Professor, Pediatric Infectious Diseases, Washington University School of Medicine; Engel, Jeffrey, MD, Chief of Epidemiology Section, North Carolina Division of Public Health, North Carolina State Epidemiologist; Lundstrom, Tammy, MD, JD, Chief Medical Officer, Providence Hospital; Gordon, Steven M., MD, Chairman, Department of Infectious Diseases, Hospital Epidemiologist, Cleveland Clinic Foundation; McCarter, Yvette S., PhD, Director, Clinical Microbiology Laboratory, Department of Pathology, University of Florida Health Science Center-Jacksonville; Murphy, Denise M., MPH, RN, CIC, Vice President, Safety and Quality, Barnes-Jewish Hospital at Washington University Medical Center; Olmsted, Russell N., MPH, Epidemiologist, Infection Control Services, St. Joseph Mercy Health System; Pegues, David Alexander, MD, Professor of Medicine, Hospital Epidemiologist, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA; Ramsey, Keith M., MD, Professor of Medicine; Medical Director of Infection Control; Pitt County Memorial; Singh, Nalini, MD, MPH, Professor of Pediatrics Epidemiology, and International Health, George Washington University, Children's National Medical Center; Soule, Barbara M., RN, MPA, CIC, Practice Leader, Infection Prevention

Services, Joint Commission Resources/Joint Commission International; Schecter, William P., MD, Department of Surgery, Ward 3A 17, San Francisco General Hospital; Stevenson, Kurt Brown, MD, MPH, Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Internal Medicine, The Ohio State University Medical Center. Ex-Officio Members: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality: Baine, William B., MD, Senior Medical Advisor, Center for Outcomes and Evidence, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services: Miller, Jeannie, RN, MPH, Deputy Director, Office of Clinical Standards and Quality/Clinical Standards Group. National Institutes of Health: Henderson, David, MD, Deputy Director for Clinical Care, National Institutes of Health. Health Resources and Services Administration: Jay, Lorine J., MPH, RN, CPHQ, Regional Coordinator. Food and Drug Administration: Murphey, Sheila A., MD, Branch Chief, Infection Control Devices Branch, Division of Anesthesiology, General Hospital Infection Control and Dental Devices, Center for Devices and Radiology Health, Food and Drug Administration. Department of Veterans Affairs: Roselle, Gary A., MD, National Program Director, Infectious Diseases, VA Central Office, Cincinnati VA Medical Center. Liaisons: Association for Professionals of Infection Control and Epidemiology, Inc: Bjerke, Nancy, BSN, RN, MPH, CIC, Infection Control Consultant, Infection Control Associates. American Health Care Association: Fitzler, Sandra L., RN, Senior Director of Clinical Services, American Health Care Association. American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine: Russi, Mark, MD, MPH, American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine. Advisory Council for the Elimination of Tuberculosis: Stricof, Rachel L., MPH, New York State Department of Health. American Hospital Association: Schulman, Roslyne, MHA, MBA, Senior Associate Director, Policy Development. Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America: Maragakis, Lisa, MD, Assistant Professor of Medicine, Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions. Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations: Wise, Robert A., MD, Division of Standards & Survey Methods, Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations. Consumers Union: McGiffert, Lisa, Senior Policy Analyst on Health Issues, Project Director of Stop Hospital Infections Organization. Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists: Kainer, Marion MD, MPH, Medical Epidemiologist/Infections Diseases Physician Director, Hospital Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance Program, Tennessee Department of Health. Association of periOperative Registered Nurses: Blanchard, Joan C., RN, BSN, MSS, CNOR, CIC, Association of periOperative Registered Nurses.