

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

^{1,2}E Vella, ^{1,2}X Yao. ¹McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada; ²Program 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

¹M Nix, ²J Jue, ²L Haskell, ²S Cunningham, ²V Coates. ¹Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville MD, USA; ²ECRI 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

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

Description of the Workshop and of the Methods used to Facilitate Interactions We will present the development of the footnotes checklist. To get hands-on experience the participants will work in large and small groups to: 1) use the checklist on several examples of GRADE evidence profiles and 2) make a judgement about how informative these footnotes are, in particular with guideline panel meetings in mind. The examples will include challenging topics like evidence from single RCT and narrative reviews (no pooled estimates). The outcomes of these exercises will be discussed with the large group and will be used to further improve the checklist.

279WS USING A NEW ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK TO CREATE EVIDENCE-BASED COVERAGE GUIDANCE

V King, A Little, S Vandegriff. *Center for Evidence-based Policy, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, USA*

10:1136/bmjqs-2013-002293.24

Background A state passed comprehensive health reform legislation in 2009 that directed it to develop a process to translate evidence into coverage guidance to be applied rapidly and uniformly across public and private healthcare payers. A Governor-appointed committee managing the state's Medicaid benefit package developed an analytic framework with a decision algorithm to facilitate coverage decisions. The framework is built upon six decision point priorities: sufficiency of evidence, effectiveness of the treatment and availability of alternatives, treatment risk, cost, prevalence of treatment and research feasibility.

Objectives/Goal To practice applying decision-making principles and best available evidence to reach coverage decisions.

Target Group, Suggested Audience Policy makers, guideline developers and users.

Description of the Workshop and of the Methods used to Facilitate Interactions A short didactic presentation will present the analytic framework development history. We will discuss alternative priorities that could have been adopted. Participants will then work in facilitated small groups to reach coverage decisions using the framework and algorithm. Each small group will have a summary of the evidence available. The topics will include surgery for femoroacetabular syndrome, carotid endarterectomy and treatment of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Facilitators will encourage participants to attempt to reach a coverage decision as if they were a policy-making body and will assist with interpretation of the evidence. The group will identify and consider any potential implementation barriers or considerations and propose management strategies. The groups will share their experience using the framework and the facilitators will present the actual decisions the state committee made.

064WS HOW TO USE THE GRADE "EVIDENCE-TO-RECOMMENDATIONS FRAMEWORK" TO DEVELOP GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THERAPEUTIC INTERVENTIONS

^{2,3,4,6}H Schunemann, ^{3,5,6}R Brignardello-Petersen, ^{1,3}W Chan, ^{3,6,7,8}p Alonso-Coello, ^{1,3,4}M Koster, ^{1,3}C Robbins. ¹Kaiser Permanente, Pasadena, CA, USA; ²McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada; ³The GRADE Working Group, Hamilton, ON, Canada; ⁴G-I-N North America Steering Group, USA; ⁵University of Chile, Santiago, Chile; ⁶DECIDE Project Institute of Biomedical Research Sant Pau Barcelona, Spain, Iberoamerican Cochrane Centre, Barcelona, Spain

10:1136/bmjqs-2013-002293.25

Background Moving from evidence to recommendations in guideline development requires balancing evidence quality with the benefits and harms of therapeutic interventions, patient preferences, and resource and cost considerations. The GRADE Working Group has developed an approach to integrate these factors into development of clinical practice recommendations that is currently further defined in the DECIDE (Developing and Evaluating Communication Strategies to Support Informed Decisions and Practice Based on Evidence) project.

Objectives/Goal To train guideline developers and those working with guideline panels to facilitate the decision-making process for development of recommendations for therapeutic interventions using the GRADE "Evidence-to-Recommendations Framework."

Target Audience Guideline developers, especially those working with guideline panels to develop recommendations for clinical practice.

Description of the Workshop and of the Methods used to Facilitate Interactions An overview of the GRADE "Evidence-to-Recommendations Framework" will be followed by facilitated small group work to develop guideline recommendations. Participants will work together in a simulated guideline panel, and be asked to develop guideline recommendations taking into consideration the quality of evidence from a GRADE evidence summary profile, the balance of benefits vs. harms of an intervention, patient preferences and resource implications. Facilitators will guide the small workgroups through the decision-making process using materials from recent examples of guidelines developed using the "Evidence-to-Recommendations Framework."

313WS ELECTRONIC MULTILAYERED GUIDELINE FORMAT: A NOVEL STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION OF TRUSTWORTHY GUIDELINES AT THE POINT OF CARE

¹A Kristiansen, ¹P Vandvik, ²P Alonso-Coello, ²D Rigau, ¹L Brandt, ³G Guyatt. ¹Hospital Innlandet Trust, Gjøvik, Norway; ²Iberoamerican Cochrane Centre, Institute of Biomedical Research (IB Sant Pau), Barcelona, Spain; ³Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada

10:1136/bmjqs-2013-002293.26

Background The DECIDE Project – created by the GRADE Working Group and funded by the European Union – aims at developing and evaluating strategies to improve dissemination and uptake of evidence-based recommendations. Work Package I targets health care professionals and has developed an electronic multilayered guideline format that includes the top layer; consisting of the minimum set of information components deemed necessary for clinicians to act on a recommendation. The first phase of iterative refinements through stakeholder feedback and user testing is completed and we're now initiating the second phase consisting of surveys and randomised trials of alternative formats.

Objectives To update participants on the DECIDE project (WP1) and gather feedback on current and alternative guideline formats.

Target Group Guideline developers.

Description The workshop will open with an introduction to the background and progress of the DECIDE project/WP1. Participants will be given a clinical scenario together with relevant examples of guidelines after which they're asked to provide anonymous information on attitudes and perceptions of trustworthy guidelines, the use of GRADE and current presentation formats. Following this they'll be given a systematic review on the same subject and asked to write a draft recommendation in