

부록 6: 선택지침

선택 지침 1.

지침 제목	2017 American College of Rheumatology Guideline for the Prevention and Treatment of Glucocorticoid-Induced Osteoporosis
발표일	2017, September
Adaptation	자체 개발, revision of American College of Rheumatology Guideline in 2002
지침 개발자	American College of Rheumatology
재원	American College of Rheumatology
저자구성	Rhumatologists
COI	공시
해당질병	Glucocorticoid-Induced Osteoporosis (GIOP)
지침범주	진단, 평가, 관리, 예방, 치료, 치료 반응 평가, 추적 관찰
Clinical Speciality	내과학, 내분비학, 류마티스학, 정형외과학
지침 목적	To develop recommendations for prevention and treatment of GIOP.
사용자	patients with or at risk for GIOP and their clinicians
대상 모집단	average or typical glucocorticoid(GC)-treated patients
주요 결과	the assessment, prevention and treatment of OP and fractures in children and adults taking glucocorticoids (prednisone dose of > 2.5 mg of prednisone for \geq 3 months), including patients with organ transplant who are treated with GCs.
비용분석	예
근거확보방법	수기검색(이차), 전자 DB 검색
질평가방법	Cochrane risk of bias tool (http://handbook.cochrane.org/)

지침 제목	2017 American College of Rheumatology Guideline for the Prevention and Treatment of Glucocorticoid-Induced Osteoporosis											
근거수준	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Type of Evidence</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>High quality</td> <td>Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moderate quality</td> <td>Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Low quality</td> <td>Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Very low quality</td> <td>We are very uncertain about the estimate.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Level	Type of Evidence	High quality	Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.	Moderate quality	Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate	Low quality	Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.	Very low quality	We are very uncertain about the estimate.
Level	Type of Evidence											
High quality	Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.											
Moderate quality	Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate											
Low quality	Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.											
Very low quality	We are very uncertain about the estimate.											
근거분석방법	systematic review											
권고안 도출	전문가 합의, voting process using Poll Everywhere software (http://www.polleverywhere.com/)											
권고등급	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>Type of Evidence - Nature of Recommendations</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A strong recommendation</td> <td>The Panel was confident that the desirable effects of following the recommendation outweigh the undesirable effects (or vice versa), so the course of action would apply to all or almost all patients, and only a small proportion would not want to follow the recommendation.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A conditional recommendation</td> <td>The Panel believed the desirable effects of following the recommendation probably outweigh the undesirable effects, so the course of action would apply to the majority of the patients, but some may not want to follow the recommendation. Because of this, conditional recommendations are preference sensitive and always warrant a shared decision-making approach.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Grade	Type of Evidence - Nature of Recommendations	A strong recommendation	The Panel was confident that the desirable effects of following the recommendation outweigh the undesirable effects (or vice versa), so the course of action would apply to all or almost all patients, and only a small proportion would not want to follow the recommendation.	A conditional recommendation	The Panel believed the desirable effects of following the recommendation probably outweigh the undesirable effects, so the course of action would apply to the majority of the patients, but some may not want to follow the recommendation. Because of this, conditional recommendations are preference sensitive and always warrant a shared decision-making approach.				
Grade	Type of Evidence - Nature of Recommendations											
A strong recommendation	The Panel was confident that the desirable effects of following the recommendation outweigh the undesirable effects (or vice versa), so the course of action would apply to all or almost all patients, and only a small proportion would not want to follow the recommendation.											
A conditional recommendation	The Panel believed the desirable effects of following the recommendation probably outweigh the undesirable effects, so the course of action would apply to the majority of the patients, but some may not want to follow the recommendation. Because of this, conditional recommendations are preference sensitive and always warrant a shared decision-making approach.											

지침 제목	2017 American College of Rheumatology Guideline for the Prevention and Treatment of Glucocorticoid-Induced Osteoporosis	
	A good practice recommendation	Although the Panel believed the benefits of proceeding according to the guidance far outweigh the harms, the supporting evidence is indirect, and the Panel did not formally assess the relevant evidence.

타당도평가	내외부 동료검토
알고리즘	예
실행계획	예
원문사용	예

선택지침 2

지침 제목	A framework for the development of guidelines for the management of glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis
발표일	2012. February
Adaptation	자체개발
지침 개발자	the International Osteoporosis Foundation(IOF) and the European Calcified Tissue Society
재원	the International Osteoporosis Foundation(IOF) and the European Calcified Tissue Society
저자구성	endocrinologist, rheumatologist, physician, orthopedist
COI	공시
해당질병	Glucocorticoid-Induced Osteoporosis (GIO)
지침범주	역학, 병태생리, 진단, 평가, 관리, 예방, 치료, 치료 반응 평가, 추적 관찰
Clinical Speciality	내과학, 내분비학, 류마티스학, 정형외과학
지침 목적	the management of glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis
사용자	physicians in primary and secondary care
대상 모집단	men and women aged 18 years and over in whom oral glucocorticoid therapy is considered for 3 months or longer
주요 결과	Epidemiology of GIO, Pathophysiology of GIO, Assessment of fracture risk, Management of glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis, Intervention thresholds, Cost-effectiveness of the treatment of GIO, Safety of treatments in GIO, Monitoring
비용분석	예
근거확보방법	수기검색(이차), 전자 DB 검색
질평가방법	Jadad score

지침 제목	A framework for the development of guidelines for the management of glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis	
근거수준/권고등급	Level of grade of evidence/type of evidence recommendation	studies
	Ia/A	Meta-analysis of RCTs
	Ib/A	At least one RCT
	IIa/B	At least one well-designed, controlled study but without randomization
	IIb/B	At least one well-designed, quasi-experimental study
	III/B	At least one well-designed, non-experimental descriptive study (e.g. comparative studies, correlation studies, case studies)
	IV/C	Expert committee reports, opinions and/or experience of respected
근거분석방법	systematic review	
권고안 도출	전문가 합의	
타당도평가	내외부 동료검토	
알고리즘	예	
수행계획	예	
원문사용	예	

선택지침 3

지침 제목	2014 update of recommendations on the prevention and treatment of glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis
발표일	2014 July
Adaptation	자체개발, update the recommendations on the prevention and treatment of glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis issued in 2003 by the French National Authority for Health (HAS).
지침 개발자	the Bone Section of the French Society for Rheumatology (SFR) and Osteoporosis Research and Information Group (GRIO)
재원	the Bone Section of the French Society for Rheumatology (SFR) and Osteoporosis Research and Information Group (GRIO)
저자구성	National Organization of Teaching Primary-Care Physicians, Osteoporosis Research and Information Group, French National Society for Gastroenterology, French National Society for Internal Medicine, Nephrology Society and French Society for Rheumatology
COI	공시
해당질병	Glucocorticoid-Induced Osteoporosis
지침범주	pathophysiology, risk factors, prevention and treatment, patient follow-up, safety of osteoporosis drugs
Clinical Speciality	내과학, 내분비학, 류마티스학, 소화기학, 신장학, 정형외과학
지침 목적	to improve the quality of care delivered to patients on long-term glucocorticoid therapy, in order to decrease the risk of fracture
사용자	all physicians involved in the management of patients who are scheduled to start, or are taking, long-term glucocorticoid therapy (≥ 3 months) in any dose and for any reason
대상 모집단	
주요 결과	pathophysiology, risk factors, prevention and treatment, patient follow-up, safety of osteoporosis drugs

지침 제목	2014 update of recommendations on the prevention and treatment of glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis
비용분석	아니오.
근거확보방법	method developed by the HAS, 구체적인 기술 없음.
질평가방법	method developed by the HAS, 구체적인 기술 없음.
근거수준	구체적인 기술 없음
근거분석방법	SR
권고안 도출	전문가 합의
권고등급	구체적인 기술 없음
타당도평가	내외부 동료검토
알고리즘	예
수행계획	아니오
원문사용	예

선택지침 4

지침 제목	2010 clinical practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of osteoporosis in Canada: summary							
발표일	2010, November							
Adaptation	자체개발, revision of the Osteoporosis Canada guidelines in 2002							
지침 개발자	the Scientific Advisory Council of Osteoporosis Canada							
재원	the Scientific Advisory Council of Osteoporosis Canada							
저자구성	소아과 의사, 내과 의사, 가정의학과 의사, 내분비내과 의사, 영상의학과 의사							
COI	공시							
해당질병	osteoporosis							
지침범주	risk assessment, treatment, monitoring							
Clinical Speciality	내과, 가정의학과, primary care physician							
지침 목적	management of osteoporosis							
사용자	primary care physicians, patients, osteoporosis specialists from various disciplines, radiologists, allied health professionals and health policy-makers to identify priorities							
대상 모집단	women and men over age 50, because of the overall burden of illness in that age group. children and young adults, as well as high-risk groups such as transplant recipients							
주요 결과	assessment for osteoporosis and fracture risk, treatment, adverse events, management in special group, monitoring, stop or use combination therapy							
비용분석	아니오							
근거확보방법	수기검색(이차), 전자 DB 검색							
질평가방법	구체적인 기술 없음							
근거수준	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">Level</td> <td>criteria</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Studies of diagnosis</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td> I. Independent interpretation of test results ii. Independent interpretation of the diagnostic standard </td> </tr> </table>		Level	criteria	Studies of diagnosis		1	I. Independent interpretation of test results ii. Independent interpretation of the diagnostic standard
Level	criteria							
Studies of diagnosis								
1	I. Independent interpretation of test results ii. Independent interpretation of the diagnostic standard							

지침 제목	2010 clinical practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of osteoporosis in Canada: summary	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Selection of people suspected, but not known to have the disorder iv. Reproducible description of the test and diagnostic standard v. At least 50 people with and 50 people without the disorder
	2	Meets 4 of the Level 1 criteria
	3	Meets 2 of the Level 1 criteria
	4	Meets 1 or 2 of the Level 1 criteria
	Studies of treatment and intervention	
	1+	Systematic overview of meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials
	1	1 randomized controlled trial with adequate power
	2+	Systematic overview or meta--analysis of Level 2 randomized controlled trials
	2	Randomized controlled trial that does not meet Level 1 criteria
	3	Non-randomized controlled trial or cohort study
	4	Before-after study, cohort study with non-contemporaneous controls, case-control study
	5	Case series without controls
	6	Case report or case series of < 10 patients
	Studies of prognosis	
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Inception cohort of patients with the condition of interest, but free of the outcome of interest ii. Reproducible inclusion and exclusion criteria iii. Follow-up of at least 80% of participants iv. Statistical adjustment for confounders v. Reproducible description of the outcome measures
	2	Meets criterion I and 3 of the 4 of the Level 1 criteria
	3	Meets criterion I and 2 of the 4 of the Level 1 criteria

지침 제목	2010 clinical practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of osteoporosis in Canada: summary

근거분석방법	systematic review										
권고안 도출	a modified RAND/University of California, Los Angeles Delphi method										
권고등급	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>grade</th> <th>criteria</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>Need supportive level 1 or 1+ evidence plus consensus*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>Need supportive level 2 or 2+ evidence plus consensus*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>Need supportive level 3 evidence plus consensus</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>Any lower level of evidence supported by consensus</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*As appropriate level of evidence was necessary, but not sufficient to assign a grade in recommendation; consensus was required in addition.</p>	grade	criteria	A	Need supportive level 1 or 1+ evidence plus consensus*	B	Need supportive level 2 or 2+ evidence plus consensus*	C	Need supportive level 3 evidence plus consensus	D	Any lower level of evidence supported by consensus
grade	criteria										
A	Need supportive level 1 or 1+ evidence plus consensus*										
B	Need supportive level 2 or 2+ evidence plus consensus*										
C	Need supportive level 3 evidence plus consensus										
D	Any lower level of evidence supported by consensus										
타당도평가	전문가 검토										
알고리즘	예										
수행계획	아니오										
원문사용	예										

선택지침 5

지침 제목	National Osteoporosis Guideline Group 2017 Clinical guideline for the prevention and treatment of osteoporosis
발표일	2017, March
Adaptation	자체개발, updates those previously developed by the Royal College of Physicians [RCP 1999, 2000] and the National Osteoporosis Guideline Group [Compston et al 2009, Compston et al 2013].
지침 개발자	National Osteoporosis Guideline Group
재원	No funding source/body was involved in the development of this guideline.
저자구성	bone specialist, Primary Care Physician, endocrinologist, rheumatologist
COI	공시
해당질병	osteoporosis
지침범주	the assessment and diagnosis of osteoporosis, the therapeutic interventions available and the manner in which these can be used to develop management strategies for the prevention of osteoporotic fracture in postmenopausal women and in men age 50 years or over
Clinical Speciality	내과학, 내분비학, 류마티스학, 소화기학, 신장학, 정형외과학
지침 목적	the management of glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis
사용자	all healthcare professionals involved in the management of osteoporosis
대상 모집단	postmenopausal women and in men age 50 years or over
주요 결과	definition and diagnosis of osteoporosis, fracture risk assessment, lifestyle measures in the management of osteoporosis, pharmacological interventions, duration and monitoring of bisphosphonate therapy, glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis, osteoporosis in men, post-fracture care and Fracture Liaison Services, Case finding and intervention thresholds, recommendations for training, recommendations for commissioners of healthcare and the Department of Health, Review criteria for audit
비용분석	아니오
근거확보방법	수기검색(이차), 전자 DB 검색
질평가방법	AMSTAR

지침 제목	National Osteoporosis Guideline Group 2017 Clinical guideline for the prevention and treatment of osteoporosis																																
근거수준	<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="2">Levels of evidence for studies of intervention are defined as follows:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ia</td> <td>from meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials (RCTs)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ib</td> <td>from at least one RCT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IIa</td> <td>from at least one well designed controlled study without randomisation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IIb.</td> <td>from at least one other type of well-designed quasi-experimental study</td> </tr> <tr> <td>III.</td> <td>from well-designed non-experimental descriptive studies, e.g. comparative studies, correlation studies, case-control studies</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IV.</td> <td>from expert committee reports or opinions and/or clinical experience of authorities</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">The validity of candidate risk factors is also assessed by an evidence-based approach:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ia</td> <td>Systematic reviews or meta-analysis of level I studies with a high degree of homogeneity</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ib</td> <td>Systematic reviews or meta-analysis with moderate or poor homogeneity</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ic</td> <td>Level I studies (with appropriate populations and internal controls)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IIa</td> <td>Systematic reviews or meta-analysis of level II studies</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IIb</td> <td>Level II studies (inappropriate population or lacking an internal control)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IIIa</td> <td>Systematic reviews or meta-analysis of level III studies</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IIIb</td> <td>Case-control studies</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IV</td> <td>Evidence from expert committees without explicit critical scientific analysis or that based on physiology, basic research or first principles</td> </tr> </table>	Levels of evidence for studies of intervention are defined as follows:		Ia	from meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials (RCTs)	Ib	from at least one RCT	IIa	from at least one well designed controlled study without randomisation	IIb.	from at least one other type of well-designed quasi-experimental study	III.	from well-designed non-experimental descriptive studies, e.g. comparative studies, correlation studies, case-control studies	IV.	from expert committee reports or opinions and/or clinical experience of authorities	The validity of candidate risk factors is also assessed by an evidence-based approach:		Ia	Systematic reviews or meta-analysis of level I studies with a high degree of homogeneity	Ib	Systematic reviews or meta-analysis with moderate or poor homogeneity	Ic	Level I studies (with appropriate populations and internal controls)	IIa	Systematic reviews or meta-analysis of level II studies	IIb	Level II studies (inappropriate population or lacking an internal control)	IIIa	Systematic reviews or meta-analysis of level III studies	IIIb	Case-control studies	IV	Evidence from expert committees without explicit critical scientific analysis or that based on physiology, basic research or first principles
Levels of evidence for studies of intervention are defined as follows:																																	
Ia	from meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials (RCTs)																																
Ib	from at least one RCT																																
IIa	from at least one well designed controlled study without randomisation																																
IIb.	from at least one other type of well-designed quasi-experimental study																																
III.	from well-designed non-experimental descriptive studies, e.g. comparative studies, correlation studies, case-control studies																																
IV.	from expert committee reports or opinions and/or clinical experience of authorities																																
The validity of candidate risk factors is also assessed by an evidence-based approach:																																	
Ia	Systematic reviews or meta-analysis of level I studies with a high degree of homogeneity																																
Ib	Systematic reviews or meta-analysis with moderate or poor homogeneity																																
Ic	Level I studies (with appropriate populations and internal controls)																																
IIa	Systematic reviews or meta-analysis of level II studies																																
IIb	Level II studies (inappropriate population or lacking an internal control)																																
IIIa	Systematic reviews or meta-analysis of level III studies																																
IIIb	Case-control studies																																
IV	Evidence from expert committees without explicit critical scientific analysis or that based on physiology, basic research or first principles																																
근거분석방법	SR																																
권고안 도출	전문가 합의																																

권고등급	The quality of the guideline recommendations is similarly graded to indicate the levels of evidence on which they are based:	
	GRADE A	evidence levels Ia and Ib
	GRADE B	evidence levels IIa, IIb and III
	GRADE C	evidence level IV
	Risk factors can also be categorised according to evidence for reversible risk:	
	GRADE A	Validated by use as inclusion criteria in randomized controlled trials
	GRADE B	Do not adversely affect fracture outcomes in randomized controlled trials
	GRADE C	Untested or adversely affect intervention outcomes
	타당도평가	내외부 동료검토
알고리즘	예	
수행계획	예	
원문사용	예	