Paper Summary

<!--META_START-->

Title: Actionable Recommendations in the Bright Futures Child Health Supervision Guidelines

Authors: S.M.E. Finnell, J.L. Stanton, S.M. Downs

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4338/ACI-2014-02-RA-0012

Year: 2014

Publication Type: Journal Article

Discipline/Domain: Clinical Informatics / Pediatrics

Subdomain/Topic: Pediatric preventive care guidelines, clinical decision support, guideline implementabil

Eligibility: Eligible

Overall Relevance Score: 88

Operationalization Score: 80

Contains Definition of Actionability: Yes (explicit via GLIA criteria)

Contains Systematic Features/Dimensions: Yes (decidability, executability)

Contains Explainability: Partial

Contains Interpretability: No

Contains Framework/Model: Yes (Service Interval Diagram, GLIA)

Operationalization Present: Yes

Primary Methodology: Qualitative (guideline content analysis)

Study Context: Evaluation of Bright Futures pediatric preventive care guideline for computer implementat

Geographic/Institutional Context: United States; Indiana University School of Medicine / Regenstrief Institutional Context: United States; Indiana University School of Medicine / Regenstrief Institutional Context: United States; Indiana University School of Medicine / Regenstrief Institutional Context: United States; Indiana University School of Medicine / Regenstrief Institutional Context: United States; Indiana University School of Medicine / Regenstrief Institutional Context: United States; Indiana University School of Medicine / Regenstrief Institutional Context: United States; Indiana University School of Medicine / Regenstrief Institutional Context: United States; Indiana University School of Medicine / Regenstrief Institutional Context: United States; Indiana University School of Medicine / Regenstrief Institutional Context: United States; Indiana University School of Medicine / Regenstrief Institutional Context: United States; Indiana University School of Medicine / Regenstrief Institutional Context: United States (Institutional Context) (Institutional Context)

Target Users/Stakeholders: Pediatricians, clinical decision support developers, public health agencies

Primary Contribution Type: Conceptual and methodological assessment

CL: Yes

CR: Yes

FE: Partial

TI: No

EX: Partial

GA: Partial

Reason if Not Eligible: n/a

<!--META_END-->

Title:

Actionable Recommendations in the Bright Futures Child Health Supervision Guidelines **Authors:** S.M.E. Finnell, J.L. Stanton, S.M. Downs **DOI:** http://dx.doi.org/10.4338/ACI-2014-02-RA-0012 **Year:** 2014 **Publication Type:** Journal Article **Discipline/Domain:** Clinical Informatics / Pediatrics **Subdomain/Topic:** Pediatric preventive care guidelines, clinical decision support, guideline implementability **Contextual Background:** Bright Futures is the most widely accepted pediatric preventive health care guideline in the U.S., organize **Geographic/Institutional Context:** United States; Indiana University School of Medicine / Regenstrief Institute **Target Users/Stakeholders:** Pediatricians, clinical decision support developers, public health agencies **Primary Methodology:** Qualitative (guideline content analysis) **Primary Contribution Type:**

Conceptual and methodological assessment

General Summary of the Paper

This study evaluates the Bright Futures pediatric preventive care guidelines to determine their suitability f

Eligibility

Eligible for inclusion: **Yes**

How Actionability is Understood

Actionability is explicitly defined through GLIA as requiring:

- **Decidability**: Clear specification of the conditions under which to apply a recommendation.
- **Executability**: Specific, unambiguous, detailed description of what action to take.
- > "Actionable recommendation statements are both decidable (...clinical circumstances... clearly enough

- > "It is impossible to create computer implementable decision rules if the guideline statements are vague ## What Makes Something Actionable
- Precise conditions for applicability (decidability)
- Specific, detailed, unambiguous action steps (executability)
- Consistency in recommendation wording
- Potential adaptation to continuous age-based intervals for missed or delayed visits
- ## **How Actionability is Achieved / Operationalized**
- **Framework/Approach Name(s):** GuideLine Implementability Appraisal (GLIA) v2.0; Service Interval I
- **Methods/Levers:** Consolidation of action statements, GLIA-based assessment, representation of rec
- **Operational Steps / Workflow:**
 - Consolidate duplicate and fragmented actions into discrete recommendations
- 2. Apply decidability criterion first; if met, apply executability
- 3. Develop SID to map recommendations across ages
- **Data & Measures:** 2,161 Bright Futures actions; reduced to 245 recommendations; 52 actionable
- **Implementation Context:** Pediatric preventive care; EHR-based clinical decision support
- > "The SID spans... from birth to 21 years... represents the appropriate time for delivering services as a "## Dimensions and Attributes of Actionability (Authors' Perspective)
- **CL (Clarity):** Yes clarity in conditions and actions is essential.
- **CR (Contextual Relevance):** Yes recommendations should be relevant to specific ages and conte
- **FE (Feasibility):** Partial feasibility implied but not systematically assessed.
- **TI (Timeliness):** No explicit link to actionability.
- **EX (Explainability):** Partial some detail provided, but not uniformly.
- **GA (Goal Alignment):** Partial linked indirectly via alignment with preventive care objectives.
- **Other Dimensions Named by Authors:** None beyond GLIA's standard eight dimensions.
- ## Theoretical or Conceptual Foundations
- GLIA v2.0 (Shiffman et al., 2005) for implementability assessment
- CDC immunization schedule concept for SID format analogy
- ## Indicators or Metrics for Actionability
- Meets GLIA decidability and executability criteria
- Count and proportion of recommendations deemed actionable
- ## Barriers and Enablers to Actionability
- **Barriers:**

- Vague recommendations lacking specificity
- Organization by visit rather than age interval
- Inconsistent wording across visits
- Lack of detail for sensitive topics (e.g., mental health)
- **Enablers:**
 - Clear, specific age-based criteria
 - Standardized, detailed action descriptions
 - Consolidation of redundant actions

Relation to Existing Literature

Authors build on prior GLIA applications in multiple clinical domains and extend the method to pediatric p ## Summary

The paper provides a rigorous, criteria-based evaluation of Bright Futures guidelines' actionability, focusing ## Scores

- **Overall Relevance Score:** 88 Explicit definition of actionability via GLIA; comprehensive application
- **Operationalization Score:** 80 Clear process for assessing and representing actionability; SID offer ## Supporting Quotes from the Paper
- "Actionable recommendation statements are both decidable... and executable..." (p. 652)
- "It is impossible to create computer implementable decision rules if the guideline statements are vague
- "The SID spans... from birth to 21 years... represents the appropriate time for delivering services as a continuous con
- "Only 52 (21%) meet criteria for actionability..." (p. 657)

Actionability References to Other Papers

- Shiffman RN et al. (2005) on GLIA
- CDC immunization schedules as a model for SID
- Multiple GLIA applications in other specialties (Hill et al., Peleg & Garber, Nagler et al., van Dijk et al.)