checks in our new structure, we will meet the high challenges we are facing, and that professional societies can still play a role in producing trustworthy and useful clinical guidance documents.

4 TAKING ACCOUNT OF TUMOUR HETEROGENEITY IN SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

Shona Lang, Stephanie Swift, Steve Duffy, Jos Kleijnen. *Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, York, UK*

10.1136/bmjebm-2019-EBMLive.85

Objectives Precision medicine requires an in-depth understanding of cancer genomics and a rigorous approach to tumour tissue evaluation. Accounting for tumour heterogeneity, which is a feature of most cancers, is essential when assessing somatic mutations. Genomic instability produces multiple tumour clones within a given tumour tissue. Each clone has different characteristics (e.g. histology, growth, genetic mutations) and ultimately, can have different clinical outcomes. The challenge in oncology is to work out which clone is the greatest threat to life and target treatment appropriately. Current approaches to biomarker testing focus on interpatient heterogeneity but not intra-tumour heterogeneity.

We aim to evaluate how somatic mutation studies report and validate tumour tissue samples and whether they consider tumour heterogeneity. Secondly, we aim to search the literature to identify existing guidance on tumour heterogeneity.

Method We used a set of nine studies (12 datasets) taken from a recent systematic review on the prevalence of somatic gene mutations in cancer. We assessed whether the authors of the studies reported on:

1. Tissue sampling:
 - i. the clarity of reporting for sampling and pathology methods
 - ii. whether the pathology of the sample or the patient is presented.
2. Tumour heterogeneity or clonality:
 - i. the use of multiple samples from the same patient;
 - ii. the investigation of clonality or heterogeneity.
3. Tumour content (purity):
 - i. the use of microdissection;
 - ii. the reporting of the tumour content of the sample.

We searched MEDLINE, Pubmed and Embase and seven guideline- and systematic review-specific databases from inception to January 2019 to identify guidelines reporting on tumour heterogeneity.

Results Seven (58%) datasets did not report sufficient information with regards to tumour sampling and pathology to confirm that the tumour sample represented the patient's pathology. The use of this information in a systematic review would introduce uncertainty.

None of the datasets reported multiple prevalence results per sample. The use of this finding in a review would illustrate an evidence gap that tumour heterogeneity was not investigated only patient heterogeneity.

Ten datasets (83%) reported measuring the tumour content of the sample; seven (58%) reported that the tumour content could be as low as 10%. The use of this finding in a review would illustrate that the samples are at risk of contamination and the results cannot be considered reliable.

Results for searching of guidelines will be presented at the conference.

Conclusions Systematic reviewers need to be much more cautious about the use of patient derived tissue samples. It cannot be assumed that a tumour sample replicates the pathology of the patient, or that somatic tumour samples are homogeneous for a given biomarker or mutation. Systematic reviewers need to assess whether a) the study reports sufficient information to confirm that the sample reflects the pathology of interest b) the sample is free of normal, benign or other contaminant cells c) tumour heterogeneity has been considered. The assessment of tumour samples and tumour heterogeneity is important for systematic reviews of epidemiology, diagnostic and prognostic studies.

5 HOW DO WE KNOW THAT WE KNOW SOMETHING?

^{1,2}Carlos José Fajardo Flores, ³Jackeline Alger. ¹Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, Tegucigalpa, Honduras; ²Centro de Cáncer Emma Romero de Callejas, Tegucigalpa, Honduras; ³Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, Tegucigalpa, Honduras

10.1136/bmjebm-2019-EBMLive.86

In high income countries, this question may be substituted by another one that it's easier to answer: How many randomized controlled trials have been done over this topic? In Honduras, Central America, this question is answered very differently. Medical practice in LMIC continues to be empirical and anecdotic and in the best-case scenario, decisions are taken based on research made abroad under distinct settings. Dealing with endless challenges, our health system fails to inform operational, implementation and health system research decisions. Barriers that limit quality research go from untrained health workers to lack of funding to come up with more complex research designs. Descriptive studies represent an overwhelming majority of published studies but due to their nature, their impact falls short to inform health decisions that benefit those that need it the most. So, are we posing quality research studies that answer our most important clinical questions? The EBM manifesto enlists the most important challenges that need to be addressed. Increase the systematic use of evidence is one of them. An estimated 97% of research in the world seeks to produce new knowledge, only the remaining 3% seeks to implement existing knowledge. Implementation Research (IR) is a discipline that aims to uptake interventions that have been proven effective under controlled settings and turn them into routine practices that benefit a wider population. Let's consider EBM as an effective intervention to enhance quality research practice, then why in LMIC an EBM culture has not been implemented? What factors have diminished its impact? IR might be an important tool to uptake the implementation of EBM in a poor developed research context. Pose research questions that arise in the communities, in real not controlled settings, that try to solve day-to-day problems can make the research process a less cumbersome enterprise. In other words, more practical questions that are closer to reality can boost a research practice that motivates a scientific community that watches research more as a luxury than as a necessity. A powerful way to motivate a scientific community to uptake