The last 15 years have seen great improvements in the development of clinical practice guidelines. There are now rigorous methods for conducting systematic reviews of the relevant scientific evidence and for grading the strength of that evidence.1 However, it is in the next step of the process (generating and implementing recommendations for practice) that difficulties frequently arise. The grade of scientific evidence cannot simply dictate the priorities for clinical practice because of the crucial role of several other considerations. Judgements about the implementation of evidence will include judgements about patient needs, the size and value of treatment effects, and the most appropriate use of resources within a particular healthcare system (and society in general). It is for these reasons that clinical practice guidelines should be developed within the social and cultural context in which they will be applied. In guideline development, this priority setting process has usually reflected the assembled views of the guideline panel and has not been carried out in an explicit manner. Once guidelines come to be implemented in clinical practice, priorities often reflect the intuitive decision-making of clinicians and healthcare managers.

The article by Norrving et al2 outlines a novel approach to priority-setting during the development of the Swedish national stroke guidelines. They established a series of committees with a broad representation of many stakeholders including patient representatives. The approach is to be commended because it attempted to make transparent a series of decisions, which are frequently implicit.

Inevitably a number of questions arise. Despite the emphasis on transparency, it is not always clear exactly how some decisions are arrived on. The reliability of the methods used need to be tested in other settings. This is particularly important when rationing decisions may be taken based largely on economic considerations. Overall, the Swedish guideline development group have taken an important step in trying to establish a transparent and reliable approach to setting priorities. However, I suspect we are nearer the beginning of this journey than the end.

Disclosures
None.

References

Key Words: clinical guidelines ■ clinical trials ■ evidence-based practice ■ outcomes
Explicit Priority Setting in Clinical Guidelines: The Next Frontier?
Peter Langhorne

_Stroke_. 2007;38:2037; originally published online May 31, 2007;
doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.107.487231
_Stroke_ is published by the American Heart Association, 7272 Greenville Avenue, Dallas, TX 75231
Copyright © 2007 American Heart Association, Inc. All rights reserved.
Print ISSN: 0039-2499. Online ISSN: 1524-4628

The online version of this article, along with updated information and services, is located on the
World Wide Web at:
http://stroke.ahajournals.org/content/38/7/2037

Permissions: Requests for permissions to reproduce figures, tables, or portions of articles originally published in _Stroke_ can be obtained via RightsLink, a service of the Copyright Clearance Center, not the Editorial Office. Once the online version of the published article for which permission is being requested is located, click Request Permissions in the middle column of the Web page under Services. Further information about this process is available in the Permissions and Rights Question and Answer document.

Reprints: Information about reprints can be found online at:
http://www.lww.com/reprints

Subscriptions: Information about subscribing to _Stroke_ is online at:
http://stroke.ahajournals.org//subscriptions/