Background We have been developing CPGs for use within our organisation since 2002. Our lengthy, text-based rationales were not widely read by guideline users. We created a decision support (rationale) table, based on GRADE methodology, and added a summary statement (basis of recommendation) to allow readers a concise and transparent snapshot of our justification for recommendation and strength.

Context The rationale serves as a bridge between systematic review and recommendation, and provides users with a high-level justification for a recommendation. The basis of recommendation (BoR) summarises the 4 GRADE domains of strength of recommendation and how they are integrated to derive the final recommendation & strength. The BoR serves to: •Provide information to the Guideline Development Team and frontline clinicians to facilitate discussion and consensus and aid clinical decision-making. •Provide a structured, standardised portal into more detailed information in the CPG.

Description of Best Practice We follow GRADE’s 2-level designation of recommendation strength (strong/weak), and developed standardised recommendation language to align with recommendation strength. We considered two approaches to derive the final recommendation strength, finally settling on an approach that allows flexible weighting of the contribution of each domain to recommendation strength. With this approach, in special circumstances, a strong recommendation may be given in the absence of a high-level of certainty. We plan to provide direct links from the CPG to our electronic medical record’s decision support tools.

Implications for Guideline Developers/Users A concise and targeted rationale helps clinicians understand how the evidence was used to develop clinical practice recommendations.

Results We identified 33 issues; the GDG accepted 26 as potentially remediable guideline -coordinated by European Renal Best Practice - and introduced, it was based on the results of studies conducted in the respective countries. The methods of HPV testing were different, because interpretations of the results of the RCTs were different among these guidelines and reports.

Discussion Using GLIA during the development process resulted in a revised guideline. We felt that GDG representation in the consensus meeting optimize our appraisal process. This may raise GDGs’ awareness of potential implementability issues, and allow revision of the guideline accordingly prior to publication. Future research should explore the effect of GLIA-based revisions on implementability as assessed by guideline users.

Discussion Although new techniques are expected to be introduced early in commentaries, long follow-up is needed to evaluate efficacy. In such situations, studies conducted in respective countries are often considered to represent favourable results. To resolve this problem, a modelling approach could be used, but the appropriateness of such an approach for guideline development needs to be investigated.

Implications for Guideline Developers To evaluate the efficacy of a new technique, modelling studies should be standardized for guideline development.

Results Eight guidelines and two evidence reports matching our criteria were identified. When HPV testing was introduced and introduced, it was based on the results of studies conducted in the respective countries. The methods of HPV testing were different, because interpretations of the results of the RCTs were different among these guidelines and reports.

Discussion Although new techniques are expected to be introduced early in commentaries, long follow-up is needed to evaluate efficacy. In such situations, studies conducted in respective countries are often considered to represent favourable results. To resolve this problem, a modelling approach could be used, but the appropriateness of such an approach for guideline development needs to be investigated.

Implication for Guideline Developers To evaluate the efficacy of a new technique, modelling studies should be standardized for guideline development.

Results Two different languages and two evidence reports matching our criteria were identified. When HPV testing was recommended and introduced, it was based on the results of studies conducted in the respective countries. The methods of HPV testing were different, because interpretations of the results of the RCTs were different among these guidelines and reports.

Discussion Although new techniques are expected to be introduced early in commentaries, long follow-up is needed to evaluate efficacy. In such situations, studies conducted in respective countries are often considered to represent favourable results. To resolve this problem, a modelling approach could be used, but the appropriateness of such an approach for guideline development needs to be investigated.

Implication for Guideline Developers To evaluate the efficacy of a new technique, modelling studies should be standardized for guideline development.

Results Two different languages and two evidence reports matching our criteria were identified. When HPV testing was recommended and introduced, it was based on the results of studies conducted in the respective countries. The methods of HPV testing were different, because interpretations of the results of the RCTs were different among these guidelines and reports.

Discussion Although new techniques are expected to be introduced early in commentaries, long follow-up is needed to evaluate efficacy. In such situations, studies conducted in respective countries are often considered to represent favourable results. To resolve this problem, a modelling approach could be used, but the appropriateness of such an approach for guideline development needs to be investigated.

Implication for Guideline Developers To evaluate the efficacy of a new technique, modelling studies should be standardized for guideline development.