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Aim

To develop a tool to structure the process from conclusion to recommendation in a transparent way
Development of a tool

• Review of ‘Other considerations’
  
  Literature
  
  Handbooks guideline development organisations

• Outcomes
  
  Few organisations formally grade and/or transparently show the effect of other considerations on the recommendation
  
  Some organisations use a list of other considerations
  
  Different items on these lists
  
  GRADE mentions other considerations, it describes what to do but not how to do it
Development of a tool

• Tool: a manual, which includes

  Stepwise instruction

  Checklists
  1. Other considerations
  2. Formulating recommendations

  Explanation of checklists

  Example

  Additional literature search on considerations
Checklist ‘Other considerations’

• Intentions
  All considerations included in checklist
  Filling in checklist forced group to judge each item
  Prioritising items shows relative weight of item
  Pilot in guideline Renal Cell Carcinoma
## Checklist ‘Other considerations’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Explanation (text): which aspects are important and how</th>
<th>Priority (1-6)</th>
<th>Take into account formulating recommendation?</th>
<th>Effect consideration on conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Strenghtens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weakens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patient perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Strenghtens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weakens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perspective professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Strenghtens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weakens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cost-effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Strenghtens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weakens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Strenghtens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weakens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Strenghtens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weakens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Checklist ‘Formulating recommendations’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade conclusion</th>
<th>Effect consideration on conclusion</th>
<th>Classification recommendation</th>
<th>Formulation recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 High level of evidence</td>
<td>Strengthens conclusion or is neutral</td>
<td>Strong recommendation</td>
<td>One should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 High level of evidence</td>
<td>Weakens conclusion</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>It is recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 Low level of evidence</td>
<td>Strengthens conclusion or is neutral</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>It is recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 Low level of evidence</td>
<td>Weakens conclusion</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td>No recommendation can be formulated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional: the guideline development group believes
Results examples

• **Quantitative evidence strengthened qualitative evidence**
  Example: additional literature search clarified that the frequency of complications after thick needle histology was low → recommendation was strengthened.

• **Other considerations changed recommendation**
  Is surgery the treatment of choice for local recurrence?
  Conclusion literature search: surgery is not effective
  Other consideration: patient wants surgery
  → Updated recommendation: limit surgery for certain patients
Checklists within guideline development

- Literature search
- Conclusions
- Other considerations
- Checklist ‘Formulating recommendations’
- Recommendations

Checklist ‘Other considerations’
Experiences with checklist ‘Other considerations’

• Difficult to fill in table
• Multi interpretable items
• Only useful if additional search supplies new facts
  Additional literature search was useful for items ‘Safety’ and ‘Organisation’
• Discussing the table items was useful
• The order of columns should be changed
• If summary table used for > 1 conclusion, it became confusing

• Item ‘Society’ always empty
• Item ‘Cost-effectiveness’ sometimes empty when statement was expected
• Item ‘Organisation’ had variable content
Experiences checklist ‘Formulating recommendations’

• Experts found it reasonably useful, suitable for internal use if additional search revealed new facts (risks, complications, costs, limiting regulations)

• If recommendation was weakened: GDG preferred recommendation for specific situation

• Checklist improved reasoning, strengthened certain recommendations
Conclusion

• Tool is useful: recommendations made more powerful

• Checklist ‘Other considerations’
  Change order of columns to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Explanation (text): which aspects are important and how</th>
<th>Effect consideration on conclusion</th>
<th>Take into account formulating recommendation?</th>
<th>Priority (1-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

• Checklist ‘Formulating recommendations’
  Maintain current format

• Use checklist for each individual conclusion, instead of for entire topic

• Enables simple updating of recommendations if setting, not conclusions, changes
Intended future use within ACCC

→ ACCC will make mentioned improvements and will implement it in certain other guidelines

→ If more countries use it, better understanding of national differences

→ Other organisations are encouraged to test this tool and share experiences
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