

This is a repository copy of *Towards evidence-based medicine for paediatricians*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/202677/>

Version: Published Version

Article:

Phillips, Bob orcid.org/0000-0002-4938-9673 (2023) *Towards evidence-based medicine for paediatricians*. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. p. 775. ISSN 1468-2044

<https://doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2023-326113>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC) licence. This licence allows you to remix, tweak, and build upon this work non-commercially, and any new works must also acknowledge the authors and be non-commercial. You don't have to license any derivative works on the same terms. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Towards evidence-based medicine for paediatricians

Edited by Bob Phillips

Slippage

We have gone on (at length) about the need to think carefully about populations where a diagnostic test is under investigation, and using those assessments in different clinical situations.¹ We have also banged home the difference between 'particularising' and 'generalising' from clinical trials—basically, do not ask 'would this patient be allowed to go into the study' and do ask 'what is so different about my patient that I think this treatment could act differently'.² What we have not spoken to too much is the way things change over time ...

Back in the good old days, your average biochemistry laboratory could reliably measure methotrexate levels down to about 0.2 µmol/L. Lots of the paediatric oncology protocols using high-dose methotrexate kept rescuing the normal cells with folinic acid until levels of active drug could not be measured. With modern analysers, we can reliably go down to 0.1 µmol/L now, and potentially lower. Should we keep our old instruction—'until below the limit of detection'—or change what we do or say? (This is pretty easy—we just turned it to 'less than 0.2 µmol/L'—but not all are so obvious.)

What if the thing that has slipped is not the measurement of a drug level, but the ease of detection of a genetic change? Or the diagnostic criteria for a condition? How do we then know if a treatment which holds more good than harm for the 'old' diagnosis with significant symptoms will do the same in the broader definition? What is the prognosis in those who have an incidentally detected change, given the data were derived from an older setting?

We can hope for new studies, and those may come along. And while they do, we need to apply the same frameworks for thinking how to extrapolate from all the other studies we look at. How much does my patient differ? What are the important things for them? Where does the benefit seem to come from? And make sure we discuss the limits of our uncertainties with families.

Bob Phillips

Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York Alcuin College, York, UK

Correspondence to Dr Bob Phillips, Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York Alcuin College, York, YO10 5NB, UK; bob.phillips@doctors.org.uk

Twitter Bob Phillips @drbobphillips

Competing interests None declared.

Provenance and peer review Commissioned; internally peer reviewed.

© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2023. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

Received 20 July 2023

Accepted 21 July 2023



▶ <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2023-325726>



Listen to Podcast
adc.bmj.com



Arch Dis Child 2023;**108**:775. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2023-326113

ORCID iD

Bob Phillips <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4938-9673>

REFERENCES

- 1 Phillips B. Towards evidence-based medicine for Paediatricians. *Arch Dis Child* 2023;108:411.
- 2 Phillips B. Towards evidence based medicine for Paediatricians. *Arch Dis Child* 2004;89:286–7.