

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Re “Methodological Assessment of Diabetic Foot Syndrome Clinical Practice Guidelines”

We commend Tan *et al.* on their assessment of diabetic foot guidelines.¹ They provide a thorough analysis of most of the available guidelines, and thoughts on how to improve future guidelines.

As the International Working Group on the Diabetic Foot (IWGDF) editorial board, we were particularly interested in this independent analysis of our five guidelines on key aspects of diabetic foot disease. Our first guidelines were published in 1999, and we have updated and expanded them every four years since. With each update, we aim to improve the content and methodological rigour. We were pleased to see our efforts rewarded with high overall scores.¹

Unfortunately, Tan *et al.* did not assess our most recent guidelines. They searched the literature, including institutional websites, up to 31 May 2019, but apparently missed our 2019 updates, which were published online (www.iwgdfguidelines.org) and presented (at the International Symposium on the Diabetic Foot) on 25 May 2019.

In these updated guidelines,² we specifically aimed to improve on Appraisal of Guidelines for Research & Evaluation (AGREE) domains 3 (rigour of development) and 6 (editorial independence). This included being more explicit in considerations underlying recommendations, clarifying and broadening external reviews, and posting extensive conflict of interest statements on our public website. Indeed, independent assessment by the ECRI Guidelines Trust (<https://guidelines.ecri.org/>) shows higher scores on these items than in our previous guidelines. We think readers would be interested to know of this update to the IWGDF guidelines.

The process of developing our 2023 updates is already underway. To continue improving our guidelines, we will take on board the assessments by Tan *et al.*¹

REFERENCES

- 1 Tan MKH, Goodall R, Hughes W, Langridge B, Shalhoub J, Davies AH. A methodological assessment of diabetic foot syndrome clinical practice guidelines. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg* 2020;60:274–81.
- 2 Bus SA, Van Netten JJ, Hinchliffe RJ, Apelqvist J, Lipsky BA, Schaper NC, IWGDF Editorial Board. Standards for the development and methodology of the 2019 international working Group on the diabetic foot guidelines. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* 2020;36:e3267.

Jaap J. van Netten*

Amsterdam UMC, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Academic Medical Centre, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam Movement Sciences, Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Nicolaas C. Schaper

Div. Endocrinology, MUMC+, CARIM and CAPHRI Institute, Maastricht, the Netherlands

Jan Apelqvist

Department of Endocrinology, University Hospital of Malmö, Malmö, Sweden

Sicco A. Bus

Amsterdam UMC, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Academic Medical Centre, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam Movement Sciences, Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Robert J. Hinchliffe

Bristol Centre for Surgical Research, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

Benjamin A. Lipsky

Department of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

*Corresponding author.

Email-address: j.j.vannetten@amsterdamumc.nl (Jaap J. van Netten)

Available online 20 September 2020

© 2020 European Society for Vascular Surgery. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejvs.2020.08.035>

DOI of original article: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejvs.2020.04.028>

Comment and Questions on “European Society for Vascular Surgery (ESVS) 2020 Clinical Practice Guidelines on the Management of Vascular Graft and Endograft Infections”*

We read with great interest the Clinical Practice Guidelines written by the European Society for Vascular Surgery on the management of vascular graft and endograft infections (VGEI).¹ The authors developed guidelines to assist physicians involved in the diagnosis and treatment of patient with VGEI.

Independent patient related risk factors for surgical site infections of the lower limbs are summarised in Table 12 in the paper. We noticed that some results reported in the Guidelines

Table 1. Patient related independent risk factors for surgical site infections of the lower limbs: differences compared with Table 12 of the Guidelines¹ are highlighted

Risk factor	Adjusted risk estimation – OR (95% CI)	Reference
Female sex	1.44 (1.28–1.63)	Greenblatt <i>et al.</i> ²
Obesity	2.08 (1.78–2.43)	Greenblatt <i>et al.</i> ²
BMI ≥ 25 kg/m ²	1.78 (1.23–2.57)	Davis <i>et al.</i> ³
	1.28 (1.10–1.49)	Greenblatt <i>et al.</i> ²
COPD	4.29 (2.74–6.72)	Davis <i>et al.</i> ³
	2.10 (1.07–4.09)	Leekha <i>et al.</i> ⁴
	1.23 (1.03–1.43)	Greenblatt <i>et al.</i> ²
Dialysis	4.35 (3.45–5.47)	Davis <i>et al.</i> ³
	1.51 (1.08–2.11)	Greenblatt <i>et al.</i> ²
CLI	4.35 (3.45–5.47)	Davis <i>et al.</i> ³
	2.91 (1.61–5.27)	Leekha <i>et al.</i> ⁴
Re-intervention	2.91 (1.61–5.27)	Leekha <i>et al.</i> ⁴
	11 (1.9–63)	Brothers <i>et al.</i> ⁵