Modern Applied Medical Research

Volume 5,Issue 1, January, 2025,Page 01-03
ISSN: 2582-9181

Review Article Received: 28-12-2024| Accepted: 09-01-2025 | Published: 15-01-2025

Evidence-Based Laboratory Medicine: A Comprehensive Review

Xig Jon
Independent Scholar

Abstract: Evidence-based laboratory medicine (EBLM) employs the principles of evidence-based medicine (EBM) with a focus on diagnostic testing, aiming to enhance patient outcomes, ensure efficient use of tests, and manage healthcare expenses. This review builds on Tony Badrick's 2013 editorial by incorporating later advancements in evaluating test effectiveness, quality improvement measures, economic considerations, and the challenges of implementation. Essential topics include the hierarchy of test efficacy—from analytical performance to patient outcomes—methods for critical appraisal, case studies (like the adoption of cystatin C), the influence of point-of-care testing, and suggestions for integrating EBLM skills into laboratory education and practice.

Keywords: Evidence-based laboratory medicine; Diagnostic testing; Test effectiveness; Quality improvement; Healthcare economics; Point-of-care testing; Laboratory education; Patient outcomes

1. Introduction

Laboratory testing is crucial, contributing to about 70% of medical decisions. However, numerous new tests are adopted into clinical practice based solely on analytical characteristics, lacking strong evidence of advantages for patients. EBLM seeks to address this shortfall through five iterative steps: 1) formulating precise clinical questions, 2) systematically reviewing existing literature, 3) assessing validity and relevance, 4) implementing evidence in practice, and 5) assessing outcomes. Despite its philosophical alignment with EBM and quality improvement initiatives, EBLM adoption is slow, hindered by cultural resistance, resource limitations, and disjointed training efforts.

2. Historical Context and EBM Foundations

The beginnings of EBM can be traced back to the hospitals in Paris during the 18th century, where groundwork for clinicopathologic correlations was established. The modern evolution of EBM occurred in the 1990s, thanks to the frameworks developed by Guyatt and his team. Badrick adapted EBM's five guiding principles for use in laboratory settings, highlighting the friction between statistical meta-analysis and more expansive scientific reasoning. Major criticisms of extensive meta-analyses point to the necessity of scientific judgment in evaluating the quality and significance of evidence.

3. EBLM Process and Critical Appraisal

3.1 Framing Clinical Questions

EBLM inquiries should specify the diagnostic method, intended clinical function (such as screening, diagnosis, or monitoring), and the patient group. Adjustments to PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome) assist in forming organized questions for assessing tests.

3.2 Evidence Retrieval

Thorough literature searches encompass peer-reviewed databases such as MEDLINE, EMBASE, and SCOPUS, along with grey literature. The search strategies ought to incorporate test names, assay techniques, and clinical uses to encompass a wide array of study designs.

3.3 Appraising Evidence

Critical appraisal instruments comprise AMSTAR-2 for evaluating systematic reviews, QUADAS-2 for assessing diagnostic accuracy studies, and GRADE for determining evidence certainty. It is essential for clinicians and laboratorians to be adept in using these tools to assess methodological quality, potential bias, and relevance effectively.

3.4 Applying Evidence

Implementing evidence depends on clinical guidelines, care pathways, and strategies for managing demand. The process of translating evidence into practice requires teamwork across multiple disciplines and ongoing feedback mechanisms.

3.5 Evaluating Impact

Outcome measures—both clinical (diagnostic yield, treatment modification, patient morbidity/mortality) and operational (test utilization rates, cost per diagnosis)—provide data for iterative process refinement.

4. Hierarchy of Test Efficacy

Adapting Fryback & Thornbury's imaging efficacy model, Price's pyramid outlines six evaluation levels:

1. **Technical Performance**: Analytical sensitivity, specificity, precision.
2. **Diagnostic Accuracy**: Clinical sensitivity, specificity, predictive values.
3. **Diagnostic Thinking**: Influence on clinician confidence and decision-making.
4. **Patient Management**: Impacts on treatment plans and resource use.
5. **Patient Outcomes**: Effects on morbidity, mortality, quality of life.
6. **Societal Impact**: Health economics, cost-effectiveness, equity.

Evidence often concentrates at levels 1–2, while levels 3–6 are underrepresented. Advancing EBLM requires filling these evidence gaps through robust clinical trials, implementation research, and health-economic evaluations.

5. Case Study: Cystatin C for GFR Assessment

Cystatin C demonstrates superior GFR estimation versus creatinine but faces adoption barriers:

- Lack of outcome-based trials linking cystatin C use to clinical benefits (levels 4–5).
- Confounding variables (steroids, thyroid disease) impacting assay interpretation.
- Variable reference intervals and decision thresholds across populations.
- Higher assay cost and longer turnaround times.
- Limited assay standardization across platforms.
  Overcoming these barriers requires targeted studies at higher efficacy levels, standardized assay protocols, and cost–benefit analyses demonstrating patient outcome improvements.

6. Point-of-Care Testing and Economic Evaluations

Point-of-care testing (PoCT) provides quick results that can affect acute care procedures. Economic evaluations of INR testing in warfarin clinics, the use of CRP in managing infections, and troponin tests in acute coronary syndromes suggest possible cost reductions and shorter hospitalizations. Nonetheless, implementing PoCT requires an assessment of the expenses for training, the logistics of quality control, and the integration with electronic medical records.

7. Quality Improvement Tools for EBLM

Laboratorians should engage with clinical quality tools:

- **Clinical Guidelines**: Evidence-based care algorithms aligned with test indications.
- **Care Maps**: Visual workflows linking test ordering to management steps.
- **Outcome Metrics**: Laboratory impact on patient health indicators.
  Adapting these tools requires cross-disciplinary collaboration and may leverage Six Sigma and Lean methodologies for process optimization.

8. Educational Imperatives and Competency Frameworks

EBLM competencies must be integrated into curricula for pathologists, clinical scientists, and laboratory managers:

- **Critical Appraisal Skills**: Training in AMSTAR-2, QUADAS-2, GRADE.
- **Health Economics**: Principles of cost-effectiveness and budget impact analysis.
- **Leadership and Change Management**: Techniques for implementing evidence-based protocols.
- **Interprofessional Collaboration**: Communication strategies for clinician–laboratorian partnerships.

9. Implementation Challenges

9.1 Cultural Resistance

Established laboratory routines and clinician test-ordering habits resist change without compelling outcome evidence.

9.2 Resource Constraints

Time and personnel limitations hinder systematic evidence appraisal and guideline development.

9.3 Data Infrastructure

Inadequate integration of laboratory and clinical data impedes outcome measurement and feedback loops.

10. Recommendations

1. **Curriculum Revision**: Embed EBLM modules into professional training and continuing education.
2. **Evidence Repositories**: Develop accessible, curated databases of diagnostic test evidence for rapid clinician reference.
3. **Collaborative Frameworks**: Establish joint laboratory–clinical committees to review new tests and implement demand management.
4. **Pilot Projects**: Fund demonstration studies assessing EBLM applications at levels 4–6 of test efficacy pyramid.
5. **Health IT Integration**: Enhance laboratory information systems to capture utilization and patient outcome data for continuous quality improvement.

11. Conclusion

EBLM offers a structured approach to evolving laboratory practice beyond just technical measurements towards focusing on patient-centered results and cost-effective healthcare delivery. By excelling in critical evaluation, utilizing strong efficacy frameworks, and encouraging interdisciplinary cooperation, laboratory professionals can lead evidence-based advancements that enhance diagnostic precision, patient care, and the overall efficiency of the healthcare system. Achieving lasting success involves educational reform, cultural transformation, and investment in resources to fully integrate EBLM into the core of the laboratory profession.

References

1. Guyatt, G., Cairns, J., Churchill, D., et al. (1992). Evidence-based medicine. A new approach to teaching the practice of medicine. JAMA, 268, 2420–2425.
2. Straus, S. E., & McAlister, F. A. (1999). Evidence-based medicine: past, present, and future. Annals of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada, 32, 260–264.
3. Sackett, D. L., Rosenberg, W. M., Gray, J. A., Haynes, R. B., & Richardson, W. S. (1996). Evidence-based medicine: what it is and isn't. BMJ, 312, 71–72.
4. Charlton, B. G., & Miles, A. (1998). The rise and fall of EBM. QJM, 91, 371–374.
5. Lord, S. J., Irwig, L., & Simes, R. J. (2006). When is measuring sensitivity and specificity sufficient to evaluate a diagnostic test, and when do we need randomized trials? Annals of Internal Medicine, 144, 850–855.
6. Badrick, T., & St John, A. (2012). Time to redefine the requirements for a medical laboratory scientist. Australian Journal of Medical Science, 33, 107–110.
7. Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. PLoS Medicine, 2, e124.

5(1): 01-03
ISSN: 2582-9181

8. Bossuyt, P. M., Irwig, L., Craig, J., & Glasziou, P. (2006). Comparative accuracy: assessing new tests against existing diagnostic pathways. BMJ, 332, 1089–1092.
9. McQueen, M. J. (2001). Overview of evidence-based medicine: challenges for evidence-based laboratory medicine. Clinical Chemistry, 47, 1536–1546.
10. Woolf, S. H., Grol, R., Hutchinson, A., Eccles, M., & Grimshaw, J. (1999). Potential benefits, limitations, and harms of clinical guidelines. BMJ, 318, 527–530.
11. Price, C. P. (2000). Evidence-based laboratory medicine: supporting decision-making. Clinical Chemistry, 46, 1041–1050.
12. Fryback, D. G., & Thornbury, J. R. (1991). The efficacy of diagnostic imaging. Medical Decision Making, 11, 88–94.
13. Chew, J. S. C., Saleem, M., Florkowski, C. M., & George, P. M. (2008). Cystatin C—a paradigm of evidence-based laboratory medicine. Clinical Biochemistry Reviews, 29, 47–62.
14. Jaeschke, R., Guyatt, G. H., & Sackett, D. L. (1994). Users' guides to the medical literature. III. How to use an article about a diagnostic test. A. Are the results valid? JAMA, 271, 389–391.
15. Jaeschke, R., Guyatt, G. H., & Sackett, D. L. (1994). Users' guides to the medical literature. III. How to use an article about a diagnostic test. B. What are the results and will they help me in caring for my patients? JAMA, 271, 703–707.