

Evidence check

7 October 2020

Rapid evidence checks are based on a simplified review method and may not be entirely exhaustive, but aim to provide a balanced assessment of what is already known about a specific problem or issue. This brief has not been peer-reviewed and should not be a substitute for individual clinical judgement, nor is it an endorsed position of NSW Health.

Elective surgical procedures, non-surgical alternatives and shared decision-making

Evidence check question

- 1) What non-surgical alternatives to elective surgery have been reported in literature?
- 2) What evidence is available on the impact of shared decision-making interventions and tools on decisions regarding elective surgical procedures?

In brief

Question 1: Non-surgical alternatives to elective surgery management of patients

- Non-surgical alternatives management refers to treatments that avoid surgery and other invasive procedures.
- This review identified 151 surgical procedures for which non-surgical alternatives have been reported in recent systematic reviews (2015-present).
- The most common types of conditions reporting non-surgical alternatives to elective surgery were orthopaedic injuries and degenerative conditions, cardiovascular conditions, and cancers.
- Non-surgical options include active surveillance (or 'watchful waiting'), delayed surgery, and (non-operative) medical treatment.

Question 2: The impact of shared decision-making

- This review is about shared decision-making between clinicians and patients for management of patients by surgical treatment or non-surgical alternatives.
- Interventions to promote or integrate shared decision-making for elective surgical treatments and procedures included:
 - a decision-making checklist, which led to an informed decision to defer urogenital sinus surgery(1)
 - patient education provided by a multidisciplinary team, which led to more informed and confident decision-making in patients considering treatment options for prostate cancer (2)

- counselling based on the individual's risks and benefits, which led to non-surgical decisions in those considering nerve sparing procedures during radical prostatectomy (3)
- pre-consultation interactive multimedia interventions and written and/or verbal communication provided before and during consultations, leading to less patients opting for surgical procedures(4)
- individualised decision surveys using adaptive conjoint analysis, which led to more respondents expressing informed preferences for operative treatment after first-time anterior shoulder dislocation(5)
- an interactive voice recognition application connecting patients to a health coach, which led to greater preference-sensitive surgery rate than in the control group.(6)
- Patient decision aids are the most frequently reported shared decision-making tool.(4, 7-9)
- A 2020 systematic review found that the impact on patients' treatment decisions varied by shared decision-making intervention types; for example, the use of interactive multimedia interventions resulted in less patients opting for elective surgery as compared to the provision of written materials only.(4)
- In seven studies, shared decision-making interventions led to the decision to choose non-surgical treatment or management options over elective surgery.(1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10) A 2017 Cochrane review of 105 randomised controlled trials found that the use of decision aids reduced the number of people choosing major elective surgery in favour of less invasive options (RR 0.84; 95% CI: 0.73-0.97; 17 studies; N = 3,108).(8)
- Short and long-term implications of using a decision aids may differ.(9) For example, while some patients may choose medication over surgery, this may simply delay surgery until a later point. This delay may lead to short-term cost savings, but it may also possibly lead to a more complicated or expensive surgery at a later date, increasing the total lifetime costs.
- Compared to usual care, shared decision-making interventions increased patient or parental knowledge about treatment options and certainty about their decisions.(2, 11) Authors of a Cochrane review evaluated 50 decision aids for various surgical procedures, screening (e.g. prostate cancer, colon cancer, prenatal), genetic testing, and medication treatments (e.g. diabetes, atrial fibrillation), and found that they increased participants' knowledge, accuracy of risk perceptions, and congruency between informed values and care choices.(8) In this study, decision aids were also found to reduce the number of people choosing major elective surgery in favour of less invasive options.

Limitations

Evidence on this topic is likely context-specific and dependent on various factors, including surgery or treatment type, patient population (including type and severity of condition), care settings, and the nature and frequency of the intervention.

The literature search for question 1 was limited to systematic reviews published in English from 2015 to present. Thus, the studies included in this review do not comprise an exhaustive list of surgical procedures and their alternatives.

While the PubMed search string used to capture 'shared decision-making' literature was comprehensive and adapted from an existing Cochrane review, certain shared decision-making interventions may still have been unintentionally excluded.(12)

Background

It has been reported that 25% of elective surgery may be unnecessary or inappropriate, and that in surgical specialties such as orthopaedic surgery, a large proportion of procedures may not be based on high-quality evidence.(13, 14)

Decisions on elective surgery often involves careful evaluation of risks and benefits, which can vary widely between individuals. Actively engaging patients in this decision-making process can lead to better health outcomes and patient satisfaction after elective surgery.(15)

Patient and surgeon attitudes support shared decision-making.(16) Barriers to shared decision-making in elective surgery include knowledge deficits, including not knowing the procedures performed and the existence of alternatives to elective surgery.(17)

Methods (Appendix 1)

A PubMed search was conducted on 3 and 12-13 August 2020, and Google and Google Scholar searches were conducted on 10 and 21 August 2020. A search of systematic reviews was conducted on 17 September 2020 to support question 1.

Question 1 inclusion: systematic reviews on comparisons of elective surgical procedures and one or more non-surgical alternative.

Question 2 inclusion: evaluations of shared decision-making intervention evaluated shared decision-making interventions leading to a decision on treatment options.

Similar criteria were applied to grey literature search. Google was searched for 'non-surgical alternatives to elective surgery' and similar search terms (Appendix 1). Documents which provided relevant resources for patient decision making for surgical treatments were also searched for and included.

Results

Table 1: Examples of surgical procedures with non-surgical alternatives in literature

Adrenalectomy (in Cushing’s syndrome) (18, 19)	
Appendectomy (20-25)	
Brain, spinal cord	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invasive arteriovenous malformation (AVM) therapy in epilepsy (26) Revascularisation procedures to treat Moyamoya Syndrome (27) Repeated cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) removal for intraventricular haemorrhage (28) 	
Cancers, masses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oesophageal cancer and esophagectomy (35) Oral, face cancer and elective neck dissection or irradiation (36-38) Pancreatic neoplasms and surgical management (39) Prostate cancer and radical prostatectomy and other primary treatments (40-46) Schwannoma and microsurgery (47-49)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Histologically dysplastic naevi and surgical re-excision (29) Kidney masses and surgery, including nephron-saving procedures (30, 31) Liver cancer and resection (32) Melanoma and lymph node dissection (33, 34) 	
Cardiovascular conditions	Abdominal arterial diseases
Coronary conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Isolated abdominal aortic/mesenteric artery dissection (60-62) Surgery for small asymptomatic abdominal aortic aneurysms (63) Treatment for Endoleak after endovascular abdominal aneurysm repair (64, 65) Pre-emptive correction of arteriovenous access stenosis (66)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Iatrogenic left atrial dissection (50) Spontaneous coronary artery dissection with revascularisation (51) Invasive strategy for non-ST elevation acute coronary syndrome (52, 53) Catheter ablation in atrial fibrillation (54) MitraClip for mitral regurgitation (55, 56) Management of aortic stent-graft infection (57) Revascularisation for spontaneous coronary artery dissection (58) Endovascular management for acute stroke (59) 	Endovascular therapies in limbs
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endovascular revascularisation for intermittent claudication (67) Surgical repair for short saphenous varicose veins (68) Superficial venous surgery for venous leg ulcers (69)

Cholecystectomy (70-72)**Foot (non-injury)**

- Surgery to treat plantar fibromatosis (73)
- Surgery to treat hallux valgus deformity (74)

Gastrointestinal (non-cancer)

- Band ligation for prevention of upper gastrointestinal bleeding (75)
- Surgical intervention for rectal ulcer syndrome (76)
- Endoscopic gastroplasty for obesity treatment (77)
- Surgical management of abdominal injury (78)

Gynaecological conditions

- Invasive treatment of vesicovaginal fistulas (79)
- Surgical treatment of paediatric and adolescent hydrosalpinges (80)

Head and face (non-cancer)

- Haematoma evacuation in cerebellar intracerebral haemorrhage (81)
- Surgical intervention for intermittent exotropia (82)
- Laser surgery for osteonecrosis of the jaws (83)
- Surgery for unilateral mandibular condyle fracture (84)
- Surgery for paediatric acute mastoiditis (85)
- Inferior turbinate hypertrophy in rhinoplasty (86)

Hernia (inguinal) repair (87, 88)**Laryngoplasty (89)**

<p>Orthopaedic injuries and degenerative conditions</p>	<p>Hand, wrist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Surgery for closed mallet thumb injury (107) ○ Surgical treatment for carpal tunnel syndrome (108) ○ Surgical treatment of distal radius fracture (109) 	<p>Ribs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fixation of flail chest or multiple rib fractures (124-126)
<p>Clavicles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Surgical interventions for treating clavicular fractures or displacement (90-93) 	<p>Hip, pelvis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Operative treatment of apophyseal avulsion fractures of the pelvis (110) ○ Treatments for undisplaced femoral neck fracture (111) ○ Iliopsoas tenotomy and revision arthroplasty for iliopsoas impingement after hip replacement (112) 	<p>Shoulder</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Surgical management of floating shoulder injuries (127, 128) ○ Surgical repair of rotator cuff tears (129-131) ○ Arthroscopic Bankart repair for acute anterior shoulder dislocation (132) ○ Surgical treatment for shoulder stiffness (133) ○ Surgery for proximal humerus fractures in children and adolescents (134) ○ Operative treatment of first-time patellar dislocations (135) ○ Surgery to treat multidirectional instability of the shoulder (136) ○ Surgical treatment for shoulder impingement (137)
<p>Elbow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Surgical management of elbow medial ulnar collateral ligament injury (94) ○ Surgical interventions for elbow flexion contractures (95) ○ Surgical management of the paediatric pulseless supracondylar humeral fracture (96) ○ Treatment for ulnar neuropathy at the elbow (97) 	<p>Knee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Surgical repair of medial meniscus posterior root tear (113) ○ Arthroscopic partial meniscectomy for degenerative tears in knees (114-116) ○ Invasive radiofrequency treatment for knee pain (117) ○ Surgical treatment of primary acute patellar dislocation (118, 119) ○ Surgical reconstruction in isolated posterior cruciate ligament (PCL) injuries (120) ○ Surgical intervention for anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injuries (121) 	<p>Various, Total joint arthroplasty (138)</p>
<p>Foot and ankle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Operative management of Weber C ankle fractures (98) ○ Surgical management of unstable ankle fractures (99, 100) ○ Surgical therapy of injury of lateral ankle ligament (101) ○ Surgery for isolated medial malleolar fracture (102) ○ Surgical treatment for acute Achilles tendon rupture (103) ○ Surgical management of acute isolated syndesmotom injuries (104) ○ Surgery for posterior malleolar fracture (105) ○ Operative intervention for Jones fracture of the fifth metatarsal (106) 	<p>Leg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Surgery for isolated anterior tibial tendon rupture (122) ○ Surgery for distal tibial metaphyseal fractures (123) 	<p>Vertebrae</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Treatments for lumbar disc herniation or degenerative disease (139-142) ○ Surgical treatment for spondylolysis or spondylolisthesis (143, 144) ○ Vertebral fractures and surgical treatment (145-150) ○ Degenerative spine stenosis and surgery (151-153) ○ Interspinous dynamic stabilisation and surgery (154)

Pain

- Treatment of longstanding groin pain (155)
- Exercise-induced leg pain in athletes (156)

Pancreatitis

- Open surgical debridement in acute pancreatitis (157)
- Early endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in acute biliary pancreatitis (158)
- Surgical intervention for painful obstructive chronic pancreatitis (159)

Parathyroidectomy (160)**Pulmonary conditions**

- Intra-pleural fibrinolytic therapy in parapneumonic effusions and empyema (161)
- Surgical management of congenital pulmonary airway malformation in children (162)

Splenectomy (163)**Thoracic duct and prophylactic ligation in esophagectomy patients (164)****Thymectomy (165)****Tonsillectomy (166-168)**

Table 2: Shared decision-making interventions influencing surgical treatment decision

Source	Summary
Peer reviewed sources	
<p>Shared decision-making and choice for elective surgical care: A systematic review Boss, et al. 2016 (10)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This systematic review synthesised findings of 24 studies evaluating use and outcomes of shared decision-making in elective surgery. • The most common area studied was spine (7/24) followed by joint (5/24) and gynaecological surgery (4/24). • Twenty studies used decision aids and support tools, including modalities that were multimedia or video (13/20), written (3/20), or personal coaching (4/20). • Effect of shared decision-making on preference for surgery were mixed across studies, showing a decrease in surgery (9/24), no difference (8/24), or increase (1/24). • Shared decision-making tended to improve decision quality (3/3) as well as knowledge and preparation (4/6), while decreasing decision conflict (4/6). • While net findings show that shared decision-making may influence patients to choose surgery less often, the impact of shared decision-making on surgical utilisation cannot be clearly ascertained.
<p>Utilization of a shared decision-making tool in a female infant with congenital adrenal hyperplasia and genital ambiguity Chawla, et al. 2019 (1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This case study of a 2.5-year-old female with congenital adrenal hyperplasia and genital atypia describes the application of a newly developed shared decision-making tool for parents and female patients with congenital adrenal hyperplasia and associated genital atypia. Elective genital surgery in congenital adrenal hyperplasia is considered controversial. • The intervention was a formal, shared decision-making tool (Figure 1), a checklist which allowed providers of the team to explain goals of care and to create an individualised treatment plan. • Initially, the patient’s parents had intended to proceed with surgery; however, after utilising the shared decision-making checklist, they made an informed decision to defer urogenital sinus surgery for their daughter.

Source	Summary
<p>A prospective cohort study of treatment decision-making for prostate cancer following participation in a multidisciplinary clinic</p> <p>Hurwitz, et al. 2016 (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This prospective cohort study examined treatment decision-making in a racially diverse, equal-access, contemporary cohort of patients with prostate cancer (n=925) counselled on treatment options at a multidisciplinary clinic. • Newly diagnosed patients with prostate cancer were enrolled in a multidisciplinary clinic to discuss their treatment options. At this clinic, patients met individually with a urologic oncologist, radiation oncologist, andrologist, psychologist, and nurse educator. Patients completed preclinic and postclinic surveys to assess treatment preferences, reasons for treatment choice, and decisional regret. • Surgery (54%), external radiation (20%), and active surveillance (12%) were the most common primary treatments for patients with low- and intermediate-risk prostate cancer, whereas patients with high-risk prostate cancer chose surgery (34%) or external radiation with neoadjuvant hormones (57%). • Patients' thoughts on each treatment changed over the course of the clinic, with fewer patients reporting uncertainty and more leaning toward or against each treatment postclinic. 62% of patients reported a preference for a particular treatment before clinic, and 64% of patients had decided on a treatment by the end of the clinic. • Patients preferred to play an active role in the decision-making process and cited doctors at the clinic as the most helpful source of treatment-related information. Almost all patients reported satisfaction with their decision.
<p>Reduced Elective Operation Rates and High Patient Satisfaction After the Implementation of Decision Aids in Patients with Gallstones or an Inguinal Hernia</p> <p>Latenstein, et al. 2019 (7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single-centred retrospective study of non-acute patients with gallstones (n=1,625) and inguinal hernia (n=1,798) in a surgical outpatient clinic in the Netherlands. • The aim was to evaluate operation rates before and after implementation of decision aids, and to assess patient compliance with the use of decision aids. • Decision aids were provided to 512 patients with gallstones of whom 80.7% (413/512) used the decision aid and to 528 patients with an inguinal hernia, which was used by 80.7% (426/528). • Before implementation, the operation rate in patients with gallstones was 72.0% (586/814) and after implementation 56.7% (460/811) (– 15.3%, p < 0.001). • The operation rate in patients with an inguinal hernia decreased from 77.8% (700/900) to 64.6% (580/898) (– 13.2%, p < 0.001). • Patient satisfaction with final treatment was high (9/10).

Source	Summary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of decision aids in the surgical outpatient clinic for patients with gallstones or an inguinal hernia is associated with reduced elective operation rates and is associated with high decision aids compliance.
<p>Active patient decision making regarding nerve sparing during radical prostatectomy: a novel approach</p> <p>Lavery, et al. 2011 (3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nerve sparing during radical prostatectomy has been demonstrated to improve erectile and urinary outcomes, but also has the potential to compromise oncologic outcomes in the setting of locally advanced tumours. • A total of 150 patients treated with prostatectomy participated in a standardised preoperative discussion regarding the concept of nerve sparing, extracapsular extension and the potential need for adjuvant radiation in the event of local recurrence. • Each patient was given his nomogram predicted risk of extracapsular extension and then elected nerve sparing or non-nerve sparing. Overall, 109 chose nerve sparing (73%) and 41 chose non-nerve sparing (27%). • In patients with a nomogram predicted risk of extracapsular extension less than 20%, nerve sparing was elected by 88%. In risk of 20% to 50%, 41% opted for nerve sparing; and in those with risk greater than 50%, 25% chose nerve sparing. • With proper counselling, informed patients made reasonable decisions and appeared to be conservative, prioritising cancer control in the majority of scenarios where extracapsular extension risk was high and erectile function when risk was low.
<p>Strategies for implementing shared decision making in elective surgery by health care practitioners: A systematic review</p> <p>Pham, et al. 2020 (4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This systematic review included 20 studies on strategies aimed at facilitating or improving healthcare practitioners' adoption of shared decision-making in elective surgery. • Published evidence on shared decision-making interventions in elective surgery is most prevalent in the breast cancer and endocrine. and urology specialties, with most studies targeting their shared decision-making interventions at the patient population. • All interventions included an educational component regarding the medical condition of interest and available treatment options and a supportive component to encourage patients to ask questions and involve themselves in the decision making. • Interventions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ interactive multimedia interventions pre-consultation ○ providing written and verbal communication prior to the surgical consultation ○ individualised multimedia and decision aid (before and during consultation)

Source	Summary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ interventions targeted at health professionals (performance feedback and opinion leader, interactive training workshop). ● In those receiving interactive multimedia interventions prior to the surgical consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the use of multiple media components including interactive video appeared to improve patient satisfaction with the shared decision-making process ○ a lower proportion of urology and orthopaedic and neurology patients opted to proceed with surgery, compared to those receiving written educational materials only ○ a greater proportion of patients chose breast conservation over breast removal, compared to those receiving written materials only. ● Findings suggest that patients who participated in shared decision-making were less likely to opt for surgery. This is also reliant on the type of shared decision-making intervention.
<p>Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions Stacey, et al. 2017 (8)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This Cochrane review assessed 105 randomised controlled trials to evaluate the effects of decision aids in people facing treatment or screening decisions. The randomised controlled trials compared decision aids to usual care and/or alternative interventions. ● Decision aids were found to reduce the number of people choosing major elective surgery in favour of less invasive options (RR 0.86; 95% CI: 0.75-1.00; 18 studies; N = 3844), but this reduction reached statistical significance only after removing the study on prophylactic mastectomy for breast cancer gene carriers (RR 0.84; 95% CI: 0.73-0.97; 17 studies; N = 3108). ● Compared to usual care, decision aids reduced the number of people choosing prostate-specific antigen screening (RR 0.88; 95% CI: 0.80-0.98; 10 studies; N = 3996) and increased those choosing to start new medications for diabetes (RR 1.65; 95% CI: 1.06-2.56; 4 studies; N = 447). For other testing and screening choices, mostly there were no difference between decision aids and usual care. ● Compared to usual care, decision aids were found to increase participants' knowledge; accuracy of risk perceptions; and congruency between informed values and care choices. ● They were found to decrease decisional conflict related to feeling uninformed; indecision about personal values; the proportion of people who were passive in decision-making; and the proportion of undecided participants.

Source	Summary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision aids also appeared to have a positive effect on patient-clinician communication, and led to patients feeling equally or more satisfied with their decision, the decision-making process, and/or the preparation for decision-making compared to usual care.
<p>Understanding Preferences for Treatment After Hypothetical First-Time Anterior Shoulder Dislocation: Surveying an Online Panel Utilizing a Novel Shared Decision-Making Tool Streufert, et al. 2017 (5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This cross-sectional study tested a novel shared decision-making tool after sustained first-time anterior shoulder dislocation. 374 individuals participated, of which most were young, active males; one-third reported prior dislocation. A survey was created and included an adaptive conjoint analysis exercise to find out each person’s relative preference for several scenario, which varied based on a fixed set of attributes. Attributes were features of treatment alternatives that are important to patients or stakeholders. The adaptive conjoint analysis exercise was constructed by first presenting detailed attribute descriptions and then by gathering individuals’ preliminary importance ratings on each attribute. Next, combinations of different levels of attributes were created and placed side-by-side as hypothetical situations, asking the individual to rate their preference for one relative to the other (Figure 1). These pairs were customised for each individual to efficiently gather relative preferences for each attribute. Respondents were asked to rate their preferences for 10 pairs of alternatives. The tool, via software algorithm, then estimated the relative importance of each attribute based on that respondent’s preference ratings for the 10 pair tasks. A total of 125 (55%) males and 33 (23%) females chose surgery after a first-time anterior shoulder dislocation, as did 37% of previous dislocators, compared with 45% of nondislocators. When given thorough information about the risks and benefits, respondents had strong preferences for operative treatment after a first-time anterior shoulder dislocation. Respondents agreed with the survey results and wanted to share the information with providers. Recurrent dislocation and cost of treatment were the attributes that played the most important role in decisions about treatment.
<p>The cost-effectiveness of patient decision aids: A systematic review Trenaman, et al. 2014 (9)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This systematic review assessed 29 studies reviewing the economic evidence from patient decision aid trials.

Source	Summary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The authors found that there are upfront costs associated with administering and delivering patient decision aids, but there was unclear evidence on whether these costs provided good value for money. • The vast majority of evidence relating patient decision aids to short-term costs has focused on situations where patients appear to be choosing less expensive options, primarily in the area of elective surgery. In these cases, patient decision aid may be reducing the use of unwanted services and so may be cost-effective. However, the evidence is sparse and it is unclear whether implementing patient decision aids in contexts where beneficial services are known to be under-utilised will be cost-effective. • The authors note that policy makers need to consider both the short and long-term implications of using a patient decision aid. For example, while some patients may choose medication over surgery, this may simply delay surgery until a later point. This delay may lead to short-term cost savings, but it may also possibly lead to a more complicated or expensive surgery at a later date, increasing the total lifetime costs. • Based on current evidence, the authors believe it is inappropriate to promote patient decision aids as a means of realising cost savings. The appropriate evaluation of patient decision aids requires careful consideration of both costs and benefits.
<p>A randomized study of telephonic care support in populations at risk for musculoskeletal preference-sensitive surgeries</p> <p>Veroff, et al. 2013 (6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In an effort to assess more effective approaches to spurring use of shared decision-making, the authors tested a natural voice interactive voice recognition application with the capability to transfer participants from the application to a health coach (known as AutoDialog®). • The aim of this comparative study was to consider the relative impact of targeting by an interactive voice recognition call versus a standard mailer or no materials on health coach interaction rates, as well as healthcare costs and utilisation for individuals at risk for musculoskeletal preference-sensitive surgeries. • The preference-sensitive surgery rate per 1,000 members was 34.3 in the intervention group and 38.9 in the control group. However, this was not a statistically significant difference after adjustment for appropriate potential covariates. • The lack of statistically significant impact on surgery rates raises several important issues. Firstly, given the relatively low rate of surgery in the control group, significant impact on

Source	Summary
	<p>surgery rates was difficult to detect. Secondly, while there was a strong association between the increased level of health coaching and statistically significant reductions in actionable medical costs, this is not explainable simply by the measured changes in surgery rates. This cost reduction may have resulted from improvements in general self-care and navigation skills or may have resulted from knowledge and decision-making that impacted much more than the decisions about surgeries.</p>
<p>Grey literature and shared decision-making resources for surgery</p>	
<p>Shared decision making Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Healthcare (ACSQHC) 2020 (169)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Healthcare developed tools and resources to support shared decision-making, including freely available short videos to challenge common myths about shared decision-making and explain the role of patient decision aids and an eLearning module to support health professionals to enhance their shared decision-making knowledge and skills. • Includes a collection of decision support tools on antibiotics use and navigating different treatment options for osteoarthritis of the knee.
<p>Making shared decision-making a reality Coulter, et al. 2011 (170)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The authors of this King’s Fund report provide evidence from literature that patients are often more risk-averse than the clinicians who advise them, so when they are given full information about the benefits and harms of treatment, they tend to opt for the least invasive therapy or for self-management support. • They cite three examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Women referred to hospitals in south-west England facing the choice of whether or not to undergo hysterectomy to treat excessive menstrual bleeding were much less likely to opt for the procedure after being given a decision aid plus a chance to talk it through with a nurse (Kennedy, et al. 2002). Other trials involving elective surgery have found similar results (O’Connor, et al. 2009) ○ A meta-analysis of eight trials involving patients facing possible surgical procedures found that rates of surgery were 24% lower among patients who used decision aids (O’Connor and Stacey, 2005) ○ A US trial of telephone health coaching showed that it could reduce the rate of hospital admissions and healthcare costs among a large group of people with

Source	Summary
	<p>chronic conditions or conditions that might require elective surgery (Wennberg, et al. 2010).</p>
<p>National Strategies for Implementing Shared Decision Making Coulter, 2018 (171)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This report examined the state of shared decision-making implementation in nine leading countries (Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Taiwan, UK and USA) with a view to identifying best practice and developing proposals for a system-wide strategy to promote wider use of shared decision-making, including implications for elective surgery. • The author reiterates findings from the literature (e.g. Stacey, et al. 2017) that suggest patients who use tools such as decision aids are clearer about the decisions they need to make, more willing and able to participate, and they tend to be less likely to choose elective surgery over other alternatives. • A framework for a system-wide shared decision-making implementation strategy is proposed, involving policy, professional and patient leadership and development of basic infrastructure. It includes training, tools and public campaigns, with practical support and learning from demonstration projects, standardised measurement and feedback, together with practical support and coordination of implementation efforts.
<p>Patient Decision Aids The Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, 2020 (172)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ottawa Hospital Research Institute in Canada leads and updates the Cochrane review on decision aids and maintains the A–Z international inventory on decision aids. • Patient decision aids present evidence-based information about options, the benefits and harms of each and can be used to guide patients through the decision-making process. • Examples of available decisions aids for surgery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Arthritis: should I have hip replacement surgery? ○ Is knee replacement surgery right for me? a decision for people with osteoarthritis ○ Should I have gallbladder surgery? ○ Enlarged prostate: should I have surgery? ○ ACL injury: should I have knee surgery? ○ Rotator cuff problems: should I have surgery?

Appendix 1

PubMed search terms

Evidence Check Question 1:

Search 1

(Elective Surgical Procedures[MeSH Terms] AND ("wait"[Title/Abstract] OR "avoid"[Title/Abstract] OR "divert"[Title/Abstract] OR "diversion"[Title/Abstract] OR "diverting"[Title/Abstract] OR "defer"[Title/Abstract]) AND (2011:2020[pdat])) NOT ((COVID-19[Title/Abstract]) OR (COVID19[Title/Abstract])) AND (english[Filter])

424 hits (12 August 2020)

Search 2

((("treatment"[Title/Abstract] OR "management"[Title/Abstract] OR "care"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("nonoperative"[Title/Abstract] OR "non-operative"[Title/Abstract] OR "outpatient"[Title/Abstract] OR "alternative"[Title/Abstract] OR "conservative"[Title/Abstract])) AND (primary health care[MeSH Terms] OR Primary Care Nursing[MeSH Terms] OR Physicians, Primary Care[MeSH Terms] OR General Practice[MeSH Terms] OR General Practitioners[MeSH Terms] OR Allied Health Occupations[MeSH Terms] OR Allied Health Personnel[MeSH Terms] OR Telemedicine[MeSH Terms] OR Delivery of Health Care, Integrated[MeSH Terms] OR "self-management"[MeSH Terms] OR "risk reduction behavior"[MeSH Terms] OR "exercise"[MeSH Terms] OR "diet therapy"[MeSH Terms])) AND (((("unnecessary"[Title/Abstract] OR "non-essential"[Title/Abstract] OR "nonessential"[Title/Abstract] OR "unessential"[Title/Abstract] OR "low-value"[Title/Abstract] OR "optional"[Title/Abstract] OR "elective"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("General Surgery"[MeSH Terms] OR "surgical procedures, operative"[MeSH Terms] OR "Surgeons"[MeSH Terms] OR "surgery"[Title/Abstract] OR "surgical"[Title/Abstract] OR "operation"[Title])) OR Elective Surgical Procedures[MeSH Terms])) NOT ((COVID-19[Title/Abstract]) OR (COVID19[Title/Abstract]) OR (SARS-COV-2[Title/Abstract])) AND ((english[Filter]) AND (2011:2020[pdat]))

79 hits (13 August 2020)

Search 3

((("elective"[Title/Abstract] OR "non-essential"[Title/Abstract] OR "low-value"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("surger"[Title/Abstract] OR "surgical procedure"[Title/Abstract])) OR ("surgical procedures, operative"[MeSH Terms] OR "elective surgical procedures"[MeSH Terms])) AND ("conservative treatment"[MeSH Terms] OR "watchful waiting"[MeSH Terms] OR "conservative treatment"[Title/Abstract] OR "conservative management"[Title/Abstract] OR "conservative option"[Title/Abstract] OR "watchful waiting"[Title/Abstract] OR "wait-and-watch"[Title/Abstract] OR "active surveillance"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("systematic review"[Publication Type] OR "systematic review"[Title])) NOT (("severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2"[Supplementary Concept] OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2"[All Fields] OR "ncov"[All Fields] OR "2019 ncov"[All Fields] OR "covid 19"[All Fields] OR "sars cov 2"[All Fields] OR ("coronavirus"[All Fields] OR "cov"[All Fields]) AND 2019/11/01:3000/12/31[Date - Publication])) OR (protocol[Title]))

397 hits (17 September 2020)

For Evidence Check Question 2:

(#1 AND #2 AND #3), filtered by English and 2011-2020

#1. String relating to avoidance

"avoid*"[Title/Abstract] OR "divert*"[Title/Abstract] OR "diversion*"[Title/Abstract] OR "alternat*"[Title/Abstract] OR "conservative"[Title/Abstract] OR "defer*"[Title/Abstract] OR "option*"[Title/Abstract]

#2. String relating to elective or low-value surgery (adapted from de [Mik et al. 2018](#))

(((((("unnecessary"[Title/Abstract] OR "non-essential"[Title/Abstract]) OR "nonessential"[Title/Abstract]) OR "unessential"[Title/Abstract]) OR "low-value"[Title/Abstract]) OR "low-value"[Title/Abstract]) OR "optional"[Title/Abstract]) OR "high-risk"[Title/Abstract]) OR "high-risk"[Title/Abstract]) OR "elective"[Title/Abstract] AND (((("General Surgery"[MeSH Terms] OR "surgical procedures, operative"[MeSH Terms]) OR "Surgeons"[MeSH Terms]) OR "surgery"[Title/Abstract]) OR "surgical"[Title/Abstract]) OR "operat*"[Title])

#3. String relating to shared decision-making (from [Légaré et al. 2018 Cochrane Review](#))

((("professional-patient relations"[MeSH Terms] OR (((((((((((("nurses"[MeSH Terms] OR "physicians"[MeSH Terms]) OR "nurse*"[Title] OR "physician*"[Title]) OR "clinician*"[Title] OR "doctor*"[Title]) OR "general practitioner*"[Title] OR "gps"[Title] OR "health care professional*"[Title] OR "healthcare professional*"[Title] OR "health care provider*"[Title] OR "healthcare provider*"[Title]) OR "resident*"[Title]) AND (((("patients"[MeSH Terms] OR "patient*"[Title] OR "consumer*"[Title] OR "people*"[Title]))) AND (((("patient participation"[MeSH Terms] OR "patient participation*"[Title/Abstract]) OR "consumer participation*"[Title/Abstract]) OR "patient involvement*"[Title/Abstract]) OR "consumer involvement*"[Title/Abstract]) OR (("patient*"[Title] OR "consumer*"[Title] AND (((("involvement*"[Title] OR "involving*"[Title] OR "participation*"[Title] OR "participating*"[Title]))) OR (("professional-patient relations"[MeSH Terms] OR (((((((((((("nurses"[MeSH Terms] OR "physicians"[MeSH Terms]) OR "nurse*"[Title] OR "physician*"[Title] OR "clinician*"[Title] OR "doctor*"[Title] OR "general practitioner*"[Title] OR "gps"[Title] OR "health care professional*"[Title] OR "healthcare professional*"[Title] OR "health care provider*"[Title] OR "healthcare provider*"[Title] OR "resident*"[Title]) AND (((("patients"[MeSH Terms] OR "patient*"[Title] OR "consumer*"[Title] OR "people*"[Title]))) AND (((("decision making"[MeSH Terms:noexp] OR "decision support techniques"[MeSH Terms:noexp] OR "decision support systems, clinical"[MeSH Terms]) OR "choice behavior"[MeSH Terms:noexp] OR "decision making*"[Title/Abstract]) OR "decision support*"[Title/Abstract]) OR "choice behaviour*"[Title/Abstract]) OR (("decision*"[Title] OR "choice*"[Title] AND (("making*"[Title] OR "support*"[Title] OR "behaviour*"[Title]))) OR (((("patient participation"[MeSH Terms] OR "patient participation*"[Title/Abstract]) OR "consumer participation*"[Title/Abstract]) OR "patient involvement*"[Title/Abstract]) OR "consumer involvement*"[Title/Abstract]) OR (("patient*"[Title] OR "consumer*"[Title] AND (((("involvement*"[Title] OR "involving*"[Title] OR "participation*"[Title] OR "participating*"[Title]))) AND (((("decision making"[MeSH Terms:noexp] OR "decision support techniques"[MeSH Terms:noexp] OR "decision support systems, clinical"[MeSH Terms]) OR "choice behavior"[MeSH Terms:noexp] OR "decision making*"[Title/Abstract]) OR "decision support*"[Title/Abstract]) OR "choice behaviour*"[Title/Abstract]) OR (("decision*"[Title] OR

"choice"[Title]) AND (("making"[Title] OR "support"[Title]) OR "behaviour"[Title])))) OR (((("shared decision"[Title/Abstract] OR "sharing decision"[Title/Abstract]) OR "informed decision"[Title/Abstract]) OR "informed choice"[Title/Abstract] OR "decision aid"[Title/Abstract]) OR (("share"[Title] OR "sharing"[Title]) OR "informed"[Title]) AND (("decision"[Title] OR "deciding"[Title]) OR "choice"[Title]))))

154 hits (3 August 2020)

Google and Google Scholar

- Conservative option elective surgery
- Alternative elective surgery
- Effectiveness of conservative approaches to elective surgery
- Effectiveness of alternative approaches to elective surgery
- Safety of conservative approaches to elective surgery
- Safety of alternative approaches to elective surgery
- Shared decision making elective surgery avoid

References

1. Chawla R, Weidler EM, Hernandez J, Grimbsy G, van Leeuwen K. Utilization of a shared decision-making tool in a female infant with congenital adrenal hyperplasia and genital ambiguity. *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab.* 2019;32(6):643-6.
2. Hurwitz LM, Cullen J, Elsamanoudi S, Kim DJ, Hudak J, Colston M, et al. A prospective cohort study of treatment decision-making for prostate cancer following participation in a multidisciplinary clinic. *Urol Oncol.* 2016;34(5):233.e17-25.
3. Lavery HJ, Prall DN, Abaza R. Active patient decision making regarding nerve sparing during radical prostatectomy: a novel approach. *J Urol.* 2011;186(2):487-92.
4. Pham C, Lizarondo L, Karnon J, Aromataris E, Munn Z, Gibb C, et al. Strategies for implementing shared decision making in elective surgery by health care practitioners: A systematic review. *J Eval Clin Pract.* 2020;26(2):582-601.
5. Streufert B, Reed SD, Orlando LA, Taylor DC, Huber JC, Mather RC, 3rd. Understanding Preferences for Treatment After Hypothetical First-Time Anterior Shoulder Dislocation: Surveying an Online Panel Utilizing a Novel Shared Decision-Making Tool. *Orthop J Sports Med.* 2017;5(3):2325967117695788.
6. Veroff DR, Ochoa-Arvelo T, Venator B. A randomized study of telephonic care support in populations at risk for musculoskeletal preference-sensitive surgeries. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.* 2013;13:21.
7. Latenstein CSS, van Wely BJ, Klerkx M, Meinders MJ, Thomeer B, de Reuver PR. Reduced Elective Operation Rates and High Patient Satisfaction After the Implementation of Decision Aids in Patients with Gallstones or an Inguinal Hernia. *World J Surg.* 2019;43(9):2149-56.
8. Stacey D, Légaré F, Lewis K, Barry MJ, Bennett CL, Eden KB, et al. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2017;4(4):Cd001431.
9. Trenaman L, Bryan S, Bansback N. The cost-effectiveness of patient decision aids: A systematic review. *Healthc (Amst).* 2014;2(4):251-7.
10. Boss EF, Mehta N, Nagarajan N, Links A, Benke JR, Berger Z, et al. Shared Decision Making and Choice for Elective Surgical Care: A Systematic Review. *Otolaryngology--head and neck surgery : official journal of American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery.* 2016;154(3):405-20.

11. Chau DB, Ciullo SS, Watson-Smith D, Chun TH, Kurkchubasche AG, Luks FI. Patient-centered outcomes research in appendicitis in children: Bridging the knowledge gap. *J Pediatr Surg*. 2016;51(1):117-21.
12. Légaré F, Adekpedjou R, Stacey D, Turcotte S, Kryworuchko J, Graham ID, et al. Interventions for increasing the use of shared decision making by healthcare professionals. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2018(7).
13. The Commonwealth Fund. Helping Patients Make Better Treatment Choices with Decision Aids 2020 [Available from: <https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/newsletter-article/helping-patients-make-better-treatment-choices-decision-aids>].
14. Lim HC, Adie S, Naylor JM, Harris IA. Randomised Trial Support for Orthopaedic Surgical Procedures. *PLOS ONE*. 2014;9(6):e96745.
15. Sepucha KR, Atlas SJ, Chang Y, Freiberg A, Malchau H, Mangla M, et al. Informed, Patient-Centered Decisions Associated with Better Health Outcomes in Orthopedics: Prospective Cohort Study. *Medical Decision Making*. 2018;38(8):1018-26.
16. Shinkunas LA, Klipowicz CJ, Carlisle EM. Shared decision making in surgery: a scoping review of patient and surgeon preferences. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*. 2020;20(1):190.
17. Ankuda CK, Block SD, Cooper Z, Correll DJ, Hepner DL, Lasic M, et al. Measuring critical deficits in shared decision making before elective surgery. *Patient Education and Counseling*. 2014;94(3):328-33.
18. Bancos I, Alahdab F, Crowley RK, Chortis V, Delivanis DA, Erickson D, et al. THERAPY OF ENDOCRINE DISEASE: Improvement of cardiovascular risk factors after adrenalectomy in patients with adrenal tumors and subclinical Cushing's syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Endocrinol*. 2016;175(6):R283-r95.
19. Iacobone M, Citton M, Scarpa M, Viel G, Boscaro M, Nitti D. Systematic review of surgical treatment of subclinical Cushing's syndrome. *Br J Surg*. 2015;102(4):318-30.
20. Fugazzola P, Coccolini F, Tomasoni M, Stella M, Ansaloni L. Early appendectomy vs. conservative management in complicated acute appendicitis in children: A meta-analysis. *J Pediatr Surg*. 2019;54(11):2234-41.
21. Cheng Y, Xiong X, Lu J, Wu S, Zhou R, Cheng N. Early versus delayed appendectomy for appendiceal phlegmon or abscess. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;6(6):Cd011670.
22. Harnoss JC, Zelienska I, Probst P, Grummich K, Müller-Lantzsch C, Harnoss JM, et al. Antibiotics Versus Surgical Therapy for Uncomplicated Appendicitis: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Controlled Trials (PROSPERO 2015: CRD42015016882). *Ann Surg*. 2017;265(5):889-900.
23. Kessler U, Mosbahi S, Walker B, Hau EM, Cotton M, Peiry B, et al. Conservative treatment versus surgery for uncomplicated appendicitis in children: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Dis Child*. 2017;102(12):1118-24.
24. Sakran JV, Mylonas KS, Gryparis A, Stawicki SP, Burns CJ, Matar MM, et al. Operation versus antibiotics--The "appendicitis conundrum" continues: A meta-analysis. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg*. 2017;82(6):1129-37.
25. Darwazeh G, Cunningham SC, Kowdley GC. A Systematic Review of Perforated Appendicitis and Phlegmon: Interval Appendectomy or Wait-and-See? *Am Surg*. 2016;82(1):11-5.
26. Josephson CB, Sauro K, Wiebe S, Clement F, Jette N. Medical vs. invasive therapy in AVM-related epilepsy: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neurology*. 2016;86(1):64-71.
27. Newman S, Boulter JH, Malcolm JG, Pradilla I, Pradilla G. Outcomes in Patients with Moyamoya Syndrome and Sickle Cell Disease: A Systematic Review. *World Neurosurg*. 2020;135:165-70.
28. Whitelaw A, Lee-Kelland R. Repeated lumbar or ventricular punctures in newborns with intraventricular haemorrhage. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;4(4):Cd000216.
29. Vuong KT, Walker J, Powell HB, Thomas NE, Jonas DE, Adamson AS. Surgical re-excision vs. observation for histologically dysplastic naevi: a systematic review of associated clinical outcomes. *Br J Dermatol*. 2018;179(3):590-8.

30. Guo RQ, Li XG. Comparison of survival benefits of nephron-sparing intervention or active surveillance for patients with localized renal masses: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Urol.* 2019;19(1):74.
31. Patel HD, Pierorazio PM, Johnson MH, Sharma R, Iyoha E, Allaf ME, et al. Renal Functional Outcomes after Surgery, Ablation, and Active Surveillance of Localized Renal Tumors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2017;12(7):1057-69.
32. Zhang ZY, Dong KS, Zhang EL, Zhang LW, Chen XP, Dong HH. Resection might be a meaningful choice for hepatocellular carcinoma with portal vein thrombosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2019;98(50):e18362.
33. Angeles CV, Kang R, Shirai K, Wong SL. Meta-analysis of completion lymph node dissection in sentinel lymph node-positive melanoma. *Br J Surg.* 2019;106(6):672-81.
34. Kyrgidis A, Tzellos T, Mocellin S, Apalla Z, Lallas A, Pilati P, et al. Sentinel lymph node biopsy followed by lymph node dissection for localised primary cutaneous melanoma. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2015;2015(5):Cd010307.
35. Wang J, Qin J, Jing S, Liu Q, Cheng Y, Wang Y, et al. Clinical complete response after chemoradiotherapy for carcinoma of thoracic esophagus: Is esophagectomy always necessary? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Thorac Cancer.* 2018;9(12):1638-47.
36. Cao Y, Wang T, Yu C, Guo X, Li C, Li L. Elective Neck Dissection Versus Wait-and-Watch Policy for Oral Cavity Squamous Cell Carcinoma in Early Stage: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Based on Survival Data. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2019;77(10):2154-67.
37. Abu-Ghanem S, Horowitz G, Abergel A, Yehuda M, Gutfeld O, Carmel NN, et al. Elective neck irradiation versus observation in squamous cell carcinoma of the maxillary sinus with N0 neck: A meta-analysis and review of the literature. *Head Neck.* 2015;37(12):1823-8.
38. Abu-Ghanem S, Yehuda M, Carmel NN, Leshno M, Abergel A, Gutfeld O, et al. Elective Neck Dissection vs Observation in Early-Stage Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Oral Tongue With No Clinically Apparent Lymph Node Metastasis in the Neck: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2016;142(9):857-65.
39. Partelli S, Cirocchi R, Crippa S, Cardinali L, Fendrich V, Bartsch DK, et al. Systematic review of active surveillance versus surgical management of asymptomatic small non-functioning pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms. *Br J Surg.* 2017;104(1):34-41.
40. Vernooij RW, Lancee M, Cleves A, Dahm P, Bangma CH, Aben KK. Radical prostatectomy versus deferred treatment for localised prostate cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2020;6(6):Cd006590.
41. Tian Z, Wang X, Wu P, Shi T, Liu M. Comparison of radical prostatectomy versus conservative treatment in localized prostate cancer: systematic review and meta-analysis. *J buon.* 2019;24(1):239-48.
42. Fenton JJ, Weyrich MS, Durbin S, Liu Y, Bang H, Melnikow J. Prostate-Specific Antigen-Based Screening for Prostate Cancer: Evidence Report and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *Jama.* 2018;319(18):1914-31.
43. Serrell EC, Pitts D, Hayn M, Beaulé L, Hansen MH, Sammon JD. Review of the comparative effectiveness of radical prostatectomy, radiation therapy, or expectant management of localized prostate cancer in registry data. *Urol Oncol.* 2018;36(4):183-92.
44. Lardas M, Liew M, van den Bergh RC, De Santis M, Bellmunt J, Van den Broeck T, et al. Quality of Life Outcomes after Primary Treatment for Clinically Localised Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review. *Eur Urol.* 2017;72(6):869-85.
45. Becerra V, Ávila M, Jimenez J, Cortes-Sanabria L, Pardo Y, Garin O, et al. Economic evaluation of treatments for patients with localized prostate cancer in Europe: a systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2016;16(1):541.
46. Augustin H, Mayerhofer K, Seles M, Pummer K. Is There a Role for Active Surveillance in Low-Risk Prostate Cancer? *Urol Int.* 2015;95(2):125-31.
47. Papatsoutsos E, Spielmann PM. Self-Evaluated Quality of Life and Functional Outcomes After Microsurgery, Stereotactic Radiation or Observation-Only for Vestibular Schwannoma of the Adult Patient: A Systematic Review. *Otol Neurotol.* 2018;39(2):232-41.

48. Peng KA, Wilkinson EP. Optimal outcomes for hearing preservation in the management of small vestibular schwannomas. *J Laryngol Otol*. 2016;130(7):606-10.
49. Gosselin É, Maniakas A, Saliba I. Meta-analysis on the clinical outcomes in patients with intralabyrinthine schwannomas: conservative management vs. microsurgery. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2016;273(6):1357-67.
50. Cereda AF, De Luca F, Lanzzone AM, Cottini M, Pastori L, Sangiorgi G. Case report and systematic review of iatrogenic left atrial dissection in different cardiovascular specialties: A common treatment for an uncommon complication? *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. 2020;95(1):E30-e6.
51. Jamil A, Tajrishi FZ, Kahe F, Najafi H, Montazerin SM, Shojaei F, et al. Spontaneous coronary artery dissection managed with a conservative or revascularization approach: a meta-analysis. *J Cardiovasc Med (Hagerstown)*. 2020;21(1):42-50.
52. Reaño JDP, Shiu LAB, Miralles KV, Dimalala MGC, Pestaño NS, Punzalan FER, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis on the effectiveness of an invasive strategy compared to a conservative approach in patients > 65 years old with non-ST elevation acute coronary syndrome. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(2):e0229491.
53. Saraswat A, Rahman A, Singh K. An Invasive vs a Conservative Approach in Elderly Patients with Non-ST-Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Can J Cardiol*. 2018;34(3):274-80.
54. Briceño DF, Markman TM, Lupercio F, Romero J, Liang JJ, Villablanca PA, et al. Catheter ablation versus conventional treatment of atrial fibrillation in patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol*. 2018;53(1):19-29.
55. Giannini C, D'Ascenzo F, Fiorelli F, Spontoni P, Swaans MJ, Velazquez EJ, et al. A meta-analysis of MitraClip combined with medical therapy vs. medical therapy alone for treatment of mitral regurgitation in heart failure patients. *ESC Heart Fail*. 2018;5(6):1150-8.
56. Benito-González T, Estévez-Loureiro R, Iglesias-Gárriz I, Gualis J, Pérez de Prado A, Garrote C, et al. Survival Advantage of MitraClip® Over Medical Treatment in Patients with Mitral Regurgitation: A Meta-Analysis. *J Heart Valve Dis*. 2017;26(6):651-8.
57. Li HL, Chan YC, Cheng SW. Current Evidence on Management of Aortic Stent-graft Infection: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 2018;51:306-13.
58. Martins JL, Afreixo V, Santos L, Costa M, Santos J, Gonçalves L. Medical treatment or revascularisation as the best approach for spontaneous coronary artery dissection: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Heart J Acute Cardiovasc Care*. 2018;7(7):614-23.
59. Haussen DC, Jadhav A, Jovin T, Grossberg JA, Grigoryan M, Nahab F, et al. Endovascular Management vs Intravenous Thrombolysis for Acute Stroke Secondary to Carotid Artery Dissection: Local Experience and Systematic Review. *Neurosurgery*. 2016;78(5):709-16.
60. Liu Y, Han M, Zhao J, Kang L, Ma Y, Huang B, et al. Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Current Literature on Isolated Abdominal Aortic Dissection. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2020;59(4):545-56.
61. Karaolanis G, Antonopoulos C, Tsilimigras DI, Moris D, Moulakakis K. Spontaneous isolated superior mesenteric artery dissection: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Vascular*. 2019;27(3):324-37.
62. Kimura Y, Kato T, Inoko M. Outcomes of Treatment Strategies for Isolated Spontaneous Dissection of the Superior Mesenteric Artery: A Systematic Review. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 2018;47:284-90.
63. Filardo G, Powell JT, Martinez MA, Ballard DJ. Surgery for small asymptomatic abdominal aortic aneurysms. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015;2015(2):Cd001835.
64. Perini P, Bianchini Massoni C, Mariani E, Ucci A, Fanelli M, Azzarone M, et al. Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Outcome of Different Treatments for Type 1a Endoleak After EVAR. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 2019;60:435-46.e1.
65. Hajibandeh S, Ahmad N, Antoniou GA, Torella F. Is intervention better than surveillance in patients with type 2 endoleak post-endovascular abdominal aortic aneurysm repair? *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg*. 2015;20(1):128-34.

66. Ravani P, Quinn RR, Oliver MJ, Karsanji DJ, James MT, MacRae JM, et al. Preemptive Correction of Arteriovenous Access Stenosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2016;67(3):446-60.
67. Fakhry F, Fokkenrood HJ, Spronk S, Teijink JA, Rouwet EV, Hunink MGM. Endovascular revascularisation versus conservative management for intermittent claudication. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2018;3(3):Cd010512.
68. Paravastu SC, Horne M, Dodd PD. Endovenous ablation therapy (laser or radiofrequency) or foam sclerotherapy versus conventional surgical repair for short saphenous varicose veins. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2016;11(11):Cd010878.
69. Tollow P, Ogden J, Whiteley MS. The comparative impact of conservative treatment versus superficial venous surgery, for the treatment of venous leg ulcers: A systematic review of the impact on patients' quality of life. *Phlebology.* 2016;31(2):82-93.
70. Khan MA, Khan Z, Tombazzi CR, Gadiparthi C, Lee W, Wilcox CM. Role of Cholecystectomy After Endoscopic Sphincterotomy in the Management of Choledocholithiasis in High-risk Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Clin Gastroenterol.* 2018;52(7):579-89.
71. Song GM, Bian W, Zeng XT, Zhou JG, Luo YQ, Tian X. Laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute cholecystitis: early or delayed?: Evidence from a systematic review of discordant meta-analyses. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2016;95(23):e3835.
72. Brazzelli M, Cruickshank M, Kilonzo M, Ahmed I, Stewart F, McNamee P, et al. Systematic review of the clinical and cost effectiveness of cholecystectomy versus observation/conservative management for uncomplicated symptomatic gallstones or cholecystitis. *Surg Endosc.* 2015;29(3):637-47.
73. Fuiano M, Mosca M, Caravelli S, Massimi S, Benedetti MG, Di Caprio F, et al. Current concepts about treatment options of plantar fibromatosis: A systematic review of the literature. *Foot Ankle Surg.* 2019;25(5):559-64.
74. Klugarova J, Hood V, Bath-Hextall F, Klugar M, Mareckova J, Kelnarova Z. Effectiveness of surgery for adults with hallux valgus deformity: a systematic review. *JBIC Database System Rev Implement Rep.* 2017;15(6):1671-710.
75. Vadera S, Yong CWK, Gluud LL, Morgan MY. Band ligation versus no intervention for primary prevention of upper gastrointestinal bleeding in adults with cirrhosis and oesophageal varices. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2019;6(6):Cd012673.
76. Gouriou C, Chambaz M, Ropert A, Bouguen G, Desfourneaux V, Siproudhis L, et al. A systematic literature review on solitary rectal ulcer syndrome: is there a therapeutic consensus in 2018? *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 2018;33(12):1647-55.
77. Madruga-Neto AC, Bernardo WM, de Moura DTH, Brunaldi VO, Martins RK, Josino IR, et al. The Effectiveness of Endoscopic Gastroplasty for Obesity Treatment According to FDA Thresholds: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Based on Randomized Controlled Trials. *Obes Surg.* 2018;28(9):2932-40.
78. Oyo-lta A, Chinnock P, Ikpeme IA. Surgical versus non-surgical management of abdominal injury. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2015(11):Cd007383.
79. Bodner-Adler B, Hanzal E, Pablik E, Koelbl H, Bodner K. Management of vesicovaginal fistulas (VVF) in women following benign gynaecologic surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(2):e0171554.
80. Kazmi Z, Gupta S. Best practice in management of paediatric and adolescent hydrosalpinges: a systematic review. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.* 2015;195:40-51.
81. Singh SD, Brouwers HB, Senff JR, Pasi M, Goldstein J, Viswanathan A, et al. Haematoma evacuation in cerebellar intracerebral haemorrhage: systematic review. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry.* 2020;91(1):82-7.
82. Joyce KE, Beyer F, Thomson RG, Clarke MP. A systematic review of the effectiveness of treatments in altering the natural history of intermittent exotropia. *Br J Ophthalmol.* 2015;99(4):440-50.
83. Momesso GAC, Lemos CAA, Santiago-Júnior JF, Faverani LP, Pellizzer EP. Laser surgery in management of medication-related osteonecrosis of the jaws: a meta-analysis. *Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2020;24(2):133-44.

84. Rozeboom AVJ, Dubois L, Bos RRM, Spijker R, de Lange J. Closed treatment of unilateral mandibular condyle fractures in adults: a systematic review. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2017;46(4):456-64.
85. Loh R, Phua M, Shaw CL. Management of paediatric acute mastoiditis: systematic review. *J Laryngol Otol.* 2018;132(2):96-104.
86. Sinno S, Mehta K, Lee ZH, Kidwai S, Saadeh PB, Lee MR. Inferior Turbinate Hypertrophy in Rhinoplasty: Systematic Review of Surgical Techniques. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2016;138(3):419e-29e.
87. Reistrup H, Fonnes S, Rosenberg J. Watchful waiting vs repair for asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic inguinal hernia in men: a systematic review. *Hernia.* 2020.
88. Gong W, Li J. Operation versus watchful waiting in asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic inguinal hernias: The meta-analysis results of randomized controlled trials. *Int J Surg.* 2018;52:120-5.
89. Vila PM, Bhatt NK, Paniello RC. Early-injection laryngoplasty may lower risk of thyroplasty: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Laryngoscope.* 2018;128(4):935-40.
90. Lenza M, Buchbinder R, Johnston RV, Ferrari BA, Faloppa F. Surgical versus conservative interventions for treating fractures of the middle third of the clavicle. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2019;1(1):Cd009363.
91. Scott ML, Baldwin KD, Mistovich RJ. Operative Versus Nonoperative Treatment of Pediatric and Adolescent Clavicular Fractures: A Systematic Review and Critical Analysis. *JBJS Rev.* 2019;7(3):e5.
92. Ahmed AF, Salameh M, AlKhatib N, Elmhiregh A, Ahmed GO. Open Reduction and Internal Fixation Versus Nonsurgical Treatment in Displaced Midshaft Clavicle Fractures: A Meta-Analysis. *J Orthop Trauma.* 2018;32(7):e276-e83.
93. Robertson GA, Wood AM. Return to sport following clavicle fractures: a systematic review. *Br Med Bull.* 2016;119(1):111-28.
94. Biz C, Crimi A, Belluzzi E, Maschio N, Baracco R, Volpin A, et al. Conservative Versus Surgical Management of Elbow Medial Ulnar Collateral Ligament Injury: A Systematic Review. *Orthop Surg.* 2019;11(6):974-84.
95. Ho ES, Zuccaro J, Klar K, Anthony A, Davidge K, Borschel GH, et al. Effectiveness of non-surgical and surgical interventions for elbow flexion contractures in brachial plexus birth injury: A systematic review. *J Pediatr Rehabil Med.* 2019;12(1):87-100.
96. Delniotis I, Delniotis A, Saloupis P, Gavriilidou A, Galanis N, Kyriakou A, et al. Management of the Pediatric Pulseless Supracondylar Humeral Fracture: A Systematic Review and Comparison Study of "Watchful Expectancy Strategy" Versus Surgical Exploration of the Brachial Artery. *Ann Vasc Surg.* 2019;55:260-71.
97. Caliandro P, La Torre G, Padua R, Giannini F, Padua L. Treatment for ulnar neuropathy at the elbow. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2016;11(11):Cd006839.
98. Yap RY, Babel A, Phoon KM, Ward AE. Functional Outcomes Following Operative and Nonoperative Management of Weber C Ankle Fractures: A Systematic Review. *J Foot Ankle Surg.* 2020;59(1):105-11.
99. Elgayar L, Arnall F, Barrie J. A Systematic Review Investigating the Effectiveness of Surgical Versus Conservative Management of Unstable Ankle Fractures in Adults. *J Foot Ankle Surg.* 2019;58(5):933-7.
100. Larsen P, Rathleff MS, Elsoe R. Surgical versus conservative treatment for ankle fractures in adults - A systematic review and meta-analysis of the benefits and harms. *Foot Ankle Surg.* 2019;25(4):409-17.
101. Liu FQ, Diao NC. Surgical therapy vs conservative therapy for patients with acute injury of lateral ankle ligament: A meta-analysis and systematic review. *Int Wound J.* 2019;16(4):925-31.
102. Lokerman RD, Smeeing DPJ, Hietbrink F, van Heijl M, Houwert RM. Treatment of a Scientifically Neglected Ankle Injury: The Isolated Medial Malleolar Fracture. A Systematic Review. *J Foot Ankle Surg.* 2019;58(5):959-68.
103. Deng S, Sun Z, Zhang C, Chen G, Li J. Surgical Treatment Versus Conservative Management for Acute Achilles Tendon Rupture: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *J Foot Ankle Surg.* 2017;56(6):1236-43.

104. van Dijk CN, Longo UG, Loppini M, Florio P, Maltese L, Ciuffreda M, et al. Conservative and surgical management of acute isolated syndesmotic injuries: ESSKA-AFAS consensus and guidelines. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2016;24(4):1217-27.
105. Veltman ES, Halma JJ, de Gast A. Longterm outcome of 886 posterior malleolar fractures: A systematic review of the literature. *Foot Ankle Surg.* 2016;22(2):73-7.
106. Yates J, Feeley I, Sasikumar S, Rattan G, Hannigan A, Sheehan E. Jones fracture of the fifth metatarsal: Is operative intervention justified? A systematic review of the literature and meta-analysis of results. *Foot (Edinb).* 2015;25(4):251-7.
107. Abe Y, Rokkaku T, Tokunaga S, Yamada T, Okamoto S. Closed mallet thumb injury: Our experience of 10 patients treated with surgery and a systematic review. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg.* 2016;69(6):835-42.
108. Ren YM, Wang XS, Wei ZJ, Fan BY, Lin W, Zhou XH, et al. Efficacy, safety, and cost of surgical versus nonsurgical treatment for carpal tunnel syndrome: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2016;95(40):e4857.
109. Ju JH, Jin GZ, Li GX, Hu HY, Hou RX. Comparison of treatment outcomes between nonsurgical and surgical treatment of distal radius fracture in elderly: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Langenbecks Arch Surg.* 2015;400(7):767-79.
110. Eberbach H, Hohloch L, Feucht MJ, Konstantinidis L, Südkamp NP, Zwingmann J. Operative versus conservative treatment of apophyseal avulsion fractures of the pelvis in the adolescents: a systematic review with meta-analysis of clinical outcome and return to sports. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2017;18(1):162.
111. Xu DF, Bi FG, Ma CY, Wen ZF, Cai XZ. A systematic review of undisplaced femoral neck fracture treatments for patients over 65 years of age, with a focus on union rates and avascular necrosis. *J Orthop Surg Res.* 2017;12(1):28.
112. Shapira J, Chen SL, Wojnowski NM, Lall AC, Rosinsky PJ, Maldonado DR, et al. Outcomes of Nonoperative Management, Iliopsoas Tenotomy, and Revision Arthroplasty for Iliopsoas Impingement after Total Hip Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review. *J Arthroplasty.* 2019;34(9):2184-91.
113. Lee JK, Jung M, Yang JH, Song SY, Shin YS, Cha M, et al. Repair versus nonrepair of medial meniscus posterior root tear: A systematic review of patients' selection criteria, including clinical and radiographic outcomes. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2020;99(10):e19499.
114. Lee SH, Lee OS, Kim ST, Lee YS. Revisiting Arthroscopic Partial Meniscectomy for Degenerative Tears in Knees With Mild or No Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Clin J Sport Med.* 2020;30(3):195-202.
115. Brignardello-Petersen R, Guyatt GH, Buchbinder R, Poolman RW, Schandelmaier S, Chang Y, et al. Knee arthroscopy versus conservative management in patients with degenerative knee disease: a systematic review. *BMJ Open.* 2017;7(5):e016114.
116. Lamplot JD, Brophy RH. The role for arthroscopic partial meniscectomy in knees with degenerative changes: a systematic review. *Bone Joint J.* 2016;98-b(7):934-8.
117. Hong T, Wang H, Li G, Yao P, Ding Y. Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of 12 Randomized Controlled Trials Evaluating the Efficacy of Invasive Radiofrequency Treatment for Knee Pain and Function. *Biomed Res Int.* 2019;2019:9037510.
118. Yang F, Guo W, Wang Q, Zhu Z, Guan C, Zhao S, et al. Surgical versus nonsurgical treatment of primary acute patellar dislocation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2019;98(29):e16338.
119. Lee DY, Park YJ, Song SY, Hwang SC, Park JS, Kang DG. Which Technique Is Better for Treating Patellar Dislocation? A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Arthroscopy.* 2018;34(11):3082-93.e1.
120. Ahn S, Lee YS, Song YD, Chang CB, Kang SB, Choi YS. Does surgical reconstruction produce better stability than conservative treatment in the isolated PCL injuries? *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2016;136(6):811-9.
121. Monk AP, Davies LJ, Hopewell S, Harris K, Beard DJ, Price AJ. Surgical versus conservative interventions for treating anterior cruciate ligament injuries. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.* 2016(4).

122. Tickner A, Thorng S, Martin M, Marmolejo V. Management of Isolated Anterior Tibial Tendon Rupture: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Foot Ankle Surg.* 2019;58(2):213-20.
123. Kuo LT, Chi CC, Chuang CH. Surgical interventions for treating distal tibial metaphyseal fractures in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2015(3):Cd010261.
124. Beks RB, Peek J, de Jong MB, Wessem KJP, Öner CF, Hietbrink F, et al. Fixation of flail chest or multiple rib fractures: current evidence and how to proceed. A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg.* 2019;45(4):631-44.
125. Liang YS, Yu KC, Wong CS, Kao Y, Tiong TY, Tam KW. Does Surgery Reduce the Risk of Complications Among Patients with Multiple Rib Fractures? A Meta-analysis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2019;477(1):193-205.
126. Liu X, Xiong K. Surgical management versus non-surgical management of rib fractures in chest trauma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2019;14(1):45.
127. Dombrowsky AR, Boudreau S, Quade J, Brabston EW, Ponce BA, Momaya AM. Clinical outcomes following conservative and surgical management of floating shoulder injuries: a systematic review. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg.* 2020;29(3):634-42.
128. Morey VM, Chua KHZ, Ng ZD, Tan HMB, Kumar VP. Management of the floating shoulder: Does the glenopolar angle influence outcomes? A systematic review. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res.* 2018;104(1):53-8.
129. Schemitsch C, Chahal J, Vicente M, Nowak L, Flurin PH, Lambers Heerspink F, et al. Surgical repair versus conservative treatment and subacromial decompression for the treatment of rotator cuff tears: a meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Bone Joint J.* 2019;101-b(9):1100-6.
130. Piper CC, Hughes AJ, Ma Y, Wang H, Neviasser AS. Operative versus nonoperative treatment for the management of full-thickness rotator cuff tears: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg.* 2018;27(3):572-6.
131. Louwerens JK, Veltman ES, van Noort A, van den Bekerom MP. The Effectiveness of High-Energy Extracorporeal Shockwave Therapy Versus Ultrasound-Guided Needling Versus Arthroscopic Surgery in the Management of Chronic Calcific Rotator Cuff Tendinopathy: A Systematic Review. *Arthroscopy.* 2016;32(1):165-75.
132. Adam M, Attia AK, Alhammoud A, Aldahamsheh O, Al Ateeq Al Dosari M, Ahmed G. Arthroscopic Bankart repair for the acute anterior shoulder dislocation: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int Orthop.* 2018;42(10):2413-22.
133. Longo UG, Ciuffreda M, Locher J, Buchmann S, Maffulli N, Denaro V. The effectiveness of conservative and surgical treatment for shoulder stiffness: a systematic review of current literature. *Br Med Bull.* 2018;127(1):111-43.
134. Hohloch L, Eberbach H, Wagner FC, Strohm PC, Reising K, Südkamp NP, et al. Age- and severity-adjusted treatment of proximal humerus fractures in children and adolescents-A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(8):e0183157.
135. Erickson BJ, Mascarenhas R, Sayegh ET, Saltzman B, Verma NN, Bush-Joseph CA, et al. Does Operative Treatment of First-Time Patellar Dislocations Lead to Increased Patellofemoral Stability? A Systematic Review of Overlapping Meta-analyses. *Arthroscopy.* 2015;31(6):1207-15.
136. Longo UG, Rizzello G, Loppini M, Locher J, Buchmann S, Maffulli N, et al. Multidirectional Instability of the Shoulder: A Systematic Review. *Arthroscopy.* 2015;31(12):2431-43.
137. Saltychev M, Äärimaa V, Virolainen P, Laimi K. Conservative treatment or surgery for shoulder impingement: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2015;37(1):1-8.
138. Nwachukwu BU, Bozic KJ, Schairer WW, Bernstein JL, Jevsevar DS, Marx RG, et al. Current status of cost utility analyses in total joint arthroplasty: a systematic review. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2015;473(5):1815-27.
139. Arts MP, Kuršumović A, Miller LE, Wolfs JFC, Perrin JM, Van de Kelft E, et al. Comparison of treatments for lumbar disc herniation: Systematic review with network meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2019;98(7):e14410.
140. Chen BL, Guo JB, Zhang HW, Zhang YJ, Zhu Y, Zhang J, et al. Surgical versus non-operative treatment for lumbar disc herniation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Rehabil.* 2018;32(2):146-60.

141. Zigler J, Ferko N, Cameron C, Patel L. Comparison of therapies in lumbar degenerative disc disease: a network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Comp Eff Res*. 2018;7(3):233-46.
142. Reiman MP, Sylvain J, Loudon JK, Goode A. Return to sport after open and microdiscectomy surgery versus conservative treatment for lumbar disc herniation: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2016;50(4):221-30.
143. Grazina R, Andrade R, Santos FL, Marinhos J, Pereira R, Bastos R, et al. Return to play after conservative and surgical treatment in athletes with spondylolysis: A systematic review. *Phys Ther Sport*. 2019;37:34-43.
144. Schulte TL, Ringel F, Quante M, Eicker SO, Mueche-Borowski C, Kothe R. Surgery for adult spondylolisthesis: a systematic review of the evidence. *Eur Spine J*. 2016;25(8):2359-67.
145. Kempen DHR, Delawi D, Altena MC, Kruijff MC, van den Bekerom MPJ, Oner FC, et al. Neurological Outcome After Traumatic Transverse Sacral Fractures: A Systematic Review of 521 Patients Reported in the Literature. *JBJS Rev*. 2018;6(6):e1.
146. Li HM, Zhang RJ, Gao H, Jia CY, Zhang JX, Dong FL, et al. New vertebral fractures after osteoporotic vertebral compression fracture between balloon kyphoplasty and nonsurgical treatment PRISMA. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2018;97(40):e12666.
147. Murphy H, Schroeder GD, Shi WJ, Kepler CK, Kurd MF, Fleischman AN, et al. Management of Hangman's Fractures: A Systematic Review. *J Orthop Trauma*. 2017;31 Suppl 4:S90-s5.
148. Mattie R, Laimi K, Yu S, Saltychev M. Comparing Percutaneous Vertebroplasty and Conservative Therapy for Treating Osteoporotic Compression Fractures in the Thoracic and Lumbar Spine: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2016;98(12):1041-51.
149. Chen LX, Li YL, Ning GZ, Li Y, Wu QL, Guo JX, et al. Comparative efficacy and tolerability of three treatments in old people with osteoporotic vertebral compression fracture: a network meta-analysis and systematic review. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(4):e0123153.
150. Song D, Meng B, Gan M, Niu J, Li S, Chen H, et al. The incidence of secondary vertebral fracture of vertebral augmentation techniques versus conservative treatment for painful osteoporotic vertebral fractures: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Radiol*. 2015;56(8):970-9.
151. Poetscher AW, Gentil AF, Ferretti M, Lenza M. Interspinous process devices for treatment of degenerative lumbar spine stenosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(7):e0199623.
152. Ma XL, Zhao XW, Ma JX, Li F, Wang Y, Lu B. Effectiveness of surgery versus conservative treatment for lumbar spinal stenosis: A system review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Int J Surg*. 2017;44:329-38.
153. Zaina F, Tomkins-Lane C, Carragee E, Negrini S. Surgical versus non-surgical treatment for lumbar spinal stenosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016;2016(1):Cd010264.
154. Lee SH, Seol A, Cho TY, Kim SY, Kim DJ, Lim HM. A Systematic Review of Interspinous Dynamic Stabilization. *Clin Orthop Surg*. 2015;7(3):323-9.
155. Jørgensen SG, Öberg S, Rosenberg J. Treatment of longstanding groin pain: a systematic review. *Hernia*. 2019;23(6):1035-44.
156. Lohrer H, Malliaropoulos N, Korakakis V, Padhiar N. Exercise-induced leg pain in athletes: diagnostic, assessment, and management strategies. *Phys Sportsmed*. 2019;47(1):47-59.
157. Zhang K, Zhu X, Hou C, Shi C, Miao Y, Li Q. Minimally invasive drainage versus open surgical debridement in SAP/SMAP - a network meta-analysis. *BMC Gastroenterol*. 2019;19(1):168.
158. Coutinho LMA, Bernardo WM, Rocha RS, Marinho FR, Delgado A, Moura ETH, et al. Early Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography Versus Conservative Treatment in Patients With Acute Biliary Pancreatitis: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Pancreas*. 2018;47(4):444-53.
159. Ahmed Ali U, Pahlplatz JM, Nealon WH, van Goor H, Gooszen HG, Boermeester MA. Endoscopic or surgical intervention for painful obstructive chronic pancreatitis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015(3):Cd007884.
160. Singh Ospina N, Maraka S, Rodriguez-Gutierrez R, Espinosa de Ycaza AE, Jasim S, Gionfriddo M, et al. Comparative efficacy of parathyroidectomy and active surveillance in patients with mild

primary hyperparathyroidism: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Osteoporos Int*. 2016;27(12):3395-407.

161. Altman ES, Crossingham I, Wilson S, Davies HR. Intra-pleural fibrinolytic therapy versus placebo, or a different fibrinolytic agent, in the treatment of adult parapneumonic effusions and empyema. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019;2019(10).

162. Kapralik J, Wayne C, Chan E, Nasr A. Surgical versus conservative management of congenital pulmonary airway malformation in children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Pediatr Surg*. 2016;51(3):508-12.

163. Easow Mathew M, Sharma A, Aravindakshan R. Splenectomy for people with thalassaemia major or intermedia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016(6):Cd010517.

164. Crucitti P, Mangiameli G, Petitti T, Condoluci A, Rocco R, Gallo IF, et al. Does prophylactic ligation of the thoracic duct reduce chylothorax rates in patients undergoing oesophagectomy? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg*. 2016;50(6):1019-24.

165. Taioli E, Paschal PK, Liu B, Kaufman AJ, Flores RM. Comparison of Conservative Treatment and Thymectomy on Myasthenia Gravis Outcome. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2016;102(6):1805-13.

166. Burton MJ, Pollard AJ, Ramsden JD, Chong LY, Venekamp RP. Tonsillectomy for periodic fever, aphthous stomatitis, pharyngitis and cervical adenitis syndrome (PFAPA). *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019;12(12):Cd008669.

167. Morad A, Sathe NA, Francis DO, McPheeters ML, Chinnadurai S. Tonsillectomy Versus Watchful Waiting for Recurrent Throat Infection: A Systematic Review. *Pediatrics*. 2017;139(2).

168. Venekamp RP, Hearne BJ, Chandrasekharan D, Blackshaw H, Lim J, Schilder AG. Tonsillectomy or adenotonsillectomy versus non-surgical management for obstructive sleep-disordered breathing in children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015(10):Cd011165.

169. The Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. Shared decision making Sydney, Australia 2020 [updated 2019. Available from: <https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/partnering-consumers/shared-decision-making>.

170. Coulter A, Collins A. Making shared decision-making a reality. London: King's Fund. 2011.

171. Coulter A. National Strategies for Implementing Shared Decision Making. Bertelsmann Stiftung; 2018.

172. The Ottawa Hospital Research Institute. Patient Decision Aids Ottawa, Canada 2020 [updated 26 June 2019. Available from: <https://decisionaid.ohri.ca/AZsearch.php?criteria=surgery>.