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The current state of EBP

- Many studies avoid the important questions or measure the right outcomes
- Bias
- Discovery favoured over replication
- Negative findings don’t get published
- Confusion: Lots of opposing studies and dubious practices
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How do we evaluate effectiveness?

• Subjective outcome/end point: based on feeling better
  – Can be misleading: is the effect real and lasting?
  – Harms associated with placebo

• Objective outcome/end point: surrogate versus clinical end points
Types of objective outcomes

**Surrogate end points**
- Defined and measured
- Invisible to the patient
- Easier and cheaper to study
- Research dozens of patients, months-years
- Often make intuitive sense
  e.g. drug lowers blood pressure

**Clinical end points**
- Defined and measured
- Meaningful to patients (what they’re really interested in)
- Complex and expensive to study
- Research hundreds of patients, years-decades
  e.g. drug improves survival
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Objective outcomes in dysphagia studies

Surrogate end points

- OTT, PTT
- UES opening
- Laryngeal penetration
- Aspiration (amount, frequency)
- Coughing
e.g. thickeners reduce OTT

Clinical end points

- Physical health and well-being
- Emotional health and well-being
- Hunger, thirst
- Perceived quality of life
- Survival rates
e.g. oral care lowers pneumonia risk
The problem with surrogate end points

- Don’t always correlate with the clinical end point, i.e. the outcome that matters to patients:
  - cough reflex testing \( \not \Rightarrow \) pneumonia rates (Miles et al, 2013)
  - aspiration \( \not \Rightarrow \) long-term survival (Chen et al, 2004)
  - thickener \( \not \Rightarrow \) pneumonia rates (Robbins et al, 2008)
Reflecting on potential barriers

- Heuristics
- Biases
- Cognitive dissonance
- We see dysphagia, we reflexively try to fix dysphagia
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Moving the stones in the road

- Approaching EBP with caution
- Reflecting on heuristics and biases that affect our decision-making
- Clinical outcomes rather than surrogate outcomes
- QI methodology