

**Moderator** Prof Ian A Scott, Director of Internal Medicine and Clinical Epidemiology, Princess Alexandra Hospital, Brisbane, Australia. **Invited Speakers** Dr Susan L Norris, Department of Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology, Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, USA. SLN is Technical Officer for the secretariat of the Guideline Review Committee at the World Health Association in Geneva, Switzerland and has conducted research on conflicts of interest. Professor Holger J Schünemann, Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. HJS is co-chair of the GRADE working group, member of the GIN board of trustees and has co-authored reports on guideline methodology, including multimorbidity. Professor Gordon H Guyatt, Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. GHG is co-chair of the GRADE working group and chaired the executive of 9th iteration of the American College of Chest Physicians Antithrombotic Guidelines. **Description of session and speaker topics** Session will comprise 3 presentations (15 mins), one for each challenge, with 5 mins for questions of clarification then 30 mins of panel discussion.

## INTERACTIVE WORKSHOPS

### 145WS EVIDENCE-BASED GUIDELINE DEVELOPMENT FOR DIAGNOSTIC QUESTIONS

<sup>1,2</sup>E Vella, <sup>1,2</sup>X Yao. <sup>1</sup>McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada; <sup>2</sup>Program in Evidence-Based Care, Cancer Care Ontario, Hamilton, Canada

10:1136/bmjqs-2013-002293.21

**Background** Developing guidelines to inform decisions regarding diagnostic tests presents unique challenges that are not encountered when addressing intervention questions. In many cases, diagnostic studies only provide test accuracy results and lack patient outcomes; outcomes that are typically sought to make recommendations.

**Objectives/Goal** Using the lessons from our guideline group, the objectives of this workshop are for participants to learn practical skills related to the development of guidelines for diagnostic questions. Specifically, the following areas will be addressed: Generating an appropriate research question. Developing relevant eligibility criteria for choosing diagnostic studies. Critically appraising diagnostic studies using existing tools and quality criteria. Determining what types of recommendations can be generated when different types of evidence and information are available and to respond when the most relevant information is not available.

**Target Group, Suggested Audience** Guideline developers or anyone interested in how to develop a guideline for diagnostic questions.

**Description of the Workshop and of the Methods used to Facilitate Interactions** Using a problem-based educational approach, the workshop will begin with a quick review of the background information and objectives, and an illustrative example will be presented. Participants will then be guided through the steps of guideline development for diagnostic questions, and given problems in each step to consider and work through in small groups. Finally, participants will develop recommendations for one or two guidelines, based on evidence from diagnostic guideline projects we have completed in our guideline group.

### 138WS THE US INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) CRITERIA FOR TRUSTWORTHY GUIDELINES, THE NATIONAL GUIDELINE CLEARINGHOUSE (NGC) AND YOU: A WORKSHOP ON NGC'S REVISED INCLUSION CRITERIA

<sup>1</sup>M Nix, <sup>2</sup>J Jue, <sup>2</sup>L Haskell, <sup>2</sup>S Cunningham, <sup>2</sup>V Coates. <sup>1</sup>Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville MD, USA; <sup>2</sup>ECRI Institute, Inc., Plymouth Meeting, PA, USA

10:1136/bmjqs-2013-002293.22

**Background** The National Guideline Clearinghouse (NGC), funded by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, will adopt the 2011 IOM revised definition of an evidence-based clinical practice guideline (CPG) and change its criteria for inclusion; thereby raising the bar CPGs must meet in order to be included. Systematic evidence review and benefits and harms of care options are the key changes.

**Objectives/Goal** At the end of the workshop, participants will be able to recognise the new aspects of the inclusion criteria; understand how the criteria will be applied; apply them to CPGs provided by instructors and estimate eligibility for inclusion; and apply this learning to their organisation's readiness to submit new/updated guidelines to NGC.

**Target Group, Suggested Audience** Current and future CPG developers; CPG implementers and disseminators; researchers and clinicians.

**Description of the Workshop and of the Methods used to Facilitate Interactions** This workshop will discuss the revised NGC inclusion criteria and describe specific requirements around a systematic review underpinning the CPG as well as descriptions of benefits and harms. The workshop will include a didactic portion, an interactive exercise, and a take-away checklist. There will be ample question and answer opportunities. Instructors will distribute guidelines and materials and participants will determine eligibility for inclusion in NGC. A checklist will enable participants to understand the changes needed to ensure inclusion of their CPGs in NGC.

### 144WS HOW TO MAKE JUDGEMENTS ABOUT THE QUALITY OR STRENGTH OF EVIDENCE TRANSPARENT

<sup>1</sup>M Langendam, <sup>2</sup>R Mustafa, <sup>2</sup>M Ventresca, <sup>1</sup>P Heus, <sup>2</sup>N Santesso, <sup>2</sup>A Carrasco, <sup>4</sup>R Moustgaard, <sup>3</sup>T Lasserson, <sup>2</sup>H Schunemann. <sup>1</sup>Dutch Cochrane Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; <sup>2</sup>McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada; <sup>3</sup>Central Editorial Unit, Cochrane Collaboration, London, United Kingdom; <sup>4</sup>Nordic Cochrane Centre, Copenhagen, Denmark

10:1136/bmjqs-2013-002293.23

**Background** When assessing the confidence in intervention effects, i.e. the quality of evidence, guideline developers should make their judgement about this confidence transparent and provide an overall assessment (or grade) of the evidence (GIN & IOM standards 2011). The GRADE approach requires these judgments to be described in comments and footnotes. In a recent review of GRADE evidence summaries, we observed important variability in how guideline developers and authors of Cochrane systematic reviews perform these tasks.

**Objectives** In this interactive workshop the participants will learn how to formulate understandable and informative reasons for down- and upgrading the quality of evidence by using a footnotes checklist.

**Target Group** Systematic reviewers and guideline developers assessing the quality or strength of evidence.