(evidence based) guidelines for oncological and palliative care. We use the unique combination of data from our national cancer registry, our knowledge and experience as well as the knowledge and experience of medical professionals and patient representatives available through national and regional networks. As part of this process, each evidence based guideline is evaluated with the objective: 1. to get insight in the adherence; 2. to get insight in possible bottlenecks for the implementation in daily practice; 3. to stimulate further implementation by giving feedback.

**Description of Best Practice** The case of the guideline renal cell carcinoma will be presented. This includes the following steps: 1. selection of recommendations (based on the new guideline) by the guideline working group; 2. definition of indicators; 3. registration by trained registration staff of our national cancer registry; 4. analysis of the results; 5. presentation of results to professionals; 6. specific promotion of expertise and skills to further implement the guideline.

**Lessons for Guideline Developers/Users** The combination of development, implementation and evaluation of guidelines in one hand offers special opportunities for quality improvement. During guideline development it already becomes clear which recommendations will need extra attention during implementation. These recommendations are very interesting to evaluate, so that the feedback about these recommendations can help the professionals to further implement the guideline.

**Background** Despite research and funding, the understanding of organization's capacities of knowledge utilisation remains incomplete in health and social field.

**Objectives** To better understand organisational determinants of research result utilisation.

**Method** Between 2009 and 2012, managers (n = 75) from health and social services organisations (N = 8) have actively contributed in a participative research action process. Additionally professionals and managers (N = 2161) have answered questionnaires. Qualitative and quantitative data gathered on the organisational outcomes as well as on the process of using our tool provided empirical validation. This iterative process led to the creation of a complete toolbox designed to help organisations raise to the knowledge transfer and utilisation challenge.

**Results** The toolbox includes a conceptual framework, a user’s guide and two questionnaires to establish a diagnostic of the organisational outcomes as well as on the process of using our tool was provided empirical validation. This iterative process led to the creation of a complete toolbox designed to help organisations raise to the knowledge transfer and utilisation challenge.

**Discussion** The results demonstrate that the toolbox helps decision makers to develop a common understanding of their organisation’s strengths and weaknesses in terms of research knowledge utilisation capacities. Implications: The research and toolbox developed by our team provide a first step in unveiling the intricacies of knowledge utilisation in the social services sector. Eight key organisational capacities were found to be essential in facilitating and promoting knowledge utilisation in health and social services.
agreement test for different raters in systematic reviews. 3. How to from evidence to recommendations in guidelines. 4. Exploration of the application of GRADE in clinical stage (e.g., whether the guideline covers prevention, screening, assessment, treatment, rehabilitation or monitoring); Exploration of the application of GRADE in different areas such as public health, health policy and system. 5. The establishment and development of GRADE centre such as the Chinese GRADE centre and Spanish GRADE centre and how to promote the implementation of GRADE.

Conclusion As a new paradigm, the GRADE approach provides a comprehensive, explicit, and transparent methodology for grading the quality of evidence and strength of recommendations about the management of patients, however, GRADE is not a perfect system and still need to develop itself and been disseminated widely.

**P044 QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF TRADITIONAL CHINESE CLINICAL GUIDELINES: 2003–2012**

13Y Chen, 13L Yao, 13Q Wang, 13D Wei, 13X Wang, 13K Yang. 13Evidence-Based Medicine Center of Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, China; 13Chinese GRADE Center, Lanzhou, China.

10:1136/bmjqs-2013-002293.138

**Background** Little is known about quality and quantity of traditional Chinese clinical guidelines. We aim to systematically review all of traditional Chinese clinical guidelines.

**Methods** We searched CNKI (China National Knowledge Infrastructure/Chinese Academic Journals full text Database), VIP (a fulltext database of China), WANFANG (a fulltext database of China) and CBM (China Biomedicine Database Disc). Two groups of review authors independently applied inclusion criteria, assessed trial quality, and extracted data.

**Results** We identified 75 traditional Chinese clinical guidelines from 2003 to 2012, and only 11(15%) were recommended that an evidence based approach were used in the process of development. From the assessment with the Appraisal of Guidelines for Research and Evaluation II (AGREE II), the mean scores were low for the domains 'clarity of presentation' (28%), 'scope and purpose' (15%) and 'editorial independence' 12%; and very low for the other domains ('stakeholder involvement' 8%, 'rigour of development' 3% and 'applicability' 3%). AGREE II mean scores of traditional Chinese clinical guidelines lower than Chinese clinical practice guidelines and the world average.

**Conclusions** Traditional Chinese clinical guidelines received lower scores, which indicate a relatively poor quality of the guidelines. However, there was some increase over time. Meanwhile, given the characteristics of Traditional Chinese medicine, CONSORT group has been developing CONSORT for TCM and for Acupuncture, we plan to develop AGREE TCM to be used to inform the development, appraisal and reporting of evidence-informed traditional Chinese clinical guidelines.

**P049 EVIDENCE DISTRIBUTION OF A COMPREHENSIVE MUSCULOSKELETAL GUIDELINE**

1C Wolfkeil, 1O Ording, 2M Thies, 3M Stanhope, 4J Harris, 5K Hegmann. 1American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, Elk Grove Village, USA; 2University of Utah-Rocky Mountain Center on Occupational and Environmental Health, Salt Lake City, USA; 3Indico Ltd, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia; 4The Permanente Medical Group, San Rafael, USA; 5University of Utah-Rocky Mountain Center on Occupational and Environmental Health Salt Lake City, USA.

10:1136/bmjqs-2013-002293.139

**Background** Occupational Medicine focuses on return to functionality and work, however the overwhelming majority of injuries are musculoskeletal and require very specific clinical situation evidence review. Body part areas addressed include spine, shoulder, elbow, hand/wrist/forearm, hip/groin, knee and ankle/foot. Interventions assessed include diagnostic, therapeutic and medical therapies.

**Objectives** To assess the theoretical evidence distribution of a comprehensive musculoskeletal guideline and its potential application in practice. Methods: Evidence ratings (A,B,C) were determined by expert data extraction from over 5,000 randomised controlled trials (RCT), non-RCT evidence was designated as insufficient (I). RCT evidence ratings were quantified on an 11 point scale that assessed appropriateness, biases and effectiveness. High quality evidence was defined as 8.0–11 points, moderate 4.0–7.5, and low < 4.0 points. A level evidence (Strong) was defined as 2 or more high-quality RCTs, B (Moderate) 1 high-quality or multiple moderate-quality, C (Limited) at least one study of moderate-quality. Low quality, observational or conflicting evidence was designated as Insufficient (I). A similar profile was used for diagnostic evidence recommendations. Evidence ratings were verified by independent writing panels.

**Results** Only 0% of 2500 recommendations were supported by a Limited (C) or better evidence base. When adjusting for frequency of occurrence from a claims data base, and cost was estimated in only 14% of costs were associated with quality RCT studies.

**Conclusions** These data suggest that the majority of musculoskeletal clinical decisions do not have a sufficient evidence base for rules-based decision making.