|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix Table 1. Mean Guideline Scores and Scaled Domain Scores Across Domains of the AGREE II Instrumenta** |
|  | **Guideline Development Group (reference)** |
| **Domain** | **ACEP**[**16**](#_ENREF_16) | **ACOEM**[**14**](#_ENREF_14) | **NICE**[**17**](#_ENREF_17) | **WSAMDG**[**15**](#_ENREF_15) |
| Scope and Purpose |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. The overall objective(s) of the guideline is (are) specifically described. | 6 | 4.7 | 6.7 | 4 |
|  | 2. The health question(s) covered by the guideline is (are) specifically described. | 6.3 | 4.7 | 6.7 | 4 |
|  | 3. The population (patients, public, etc.) to whom the guideline is meant to apply is specifically described. | 6.7 | 5 | 5.3 | 4.3 |
|  | **Scaled domain score (%)** | **89** | **63** | **87** | **52** |
| Stakeholder Involvement |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4. The guideline development group includes individuals from all relevant professional groups. | 4 | 3.7 | 5.7 | 4 |
|  | 5. The views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) have been sought. | 1.3 | 1 | 5.3 | 3.3 |
|  | 6. The target users of the guideline are clearly defined. | 6 | 3.7 | 6.7 | 4.3 |
|  | **Scaled domain score (%)** | **46** | **30** | **81** | **48** |
| Rigor of Development |  |  |  |  |
|  | 7. Systematic methods were used to search for evidence. | 5.3 | 6 | 6.7 | 5.3 |
|  | 8. The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described. | 5 | 4 | 6.7 | 3.7 |
|  | 9. The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described. | 5 | 4.3 | 6.3 | 3 |
|  | 10. The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described. | 3.3 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 1.7 |
|  | 11. The health benefits, side effects, and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations. | 5 | 4.3 | 6.3 | 5.7 |
|  | 12. There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence. | 5.7 | 3.3 | 6.7 | 4 |
|  | 13. The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication. | 4.3 | 4.7 | 2.7 | 1.7 |
|  | 14. A procedure for updating the guideline is provided. | 5.3 | 6 | 6.3 | 5 |
|  | **Scaled domain score (%)** | **65** | **61** | **81** | **46** |
| Clarity of Presentation |  |  |  |  |
|  | 15. The recommendations are specific and unambiguous. | 5 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 4.3 |
|  | 16. The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented. | 4 | 4.3 | 4 | 5.7 |
|  | 17. Key recommendations are easily identifiable. | 4.7 | 5 | 5.7 | 6 |
|  | **Scaled domain score (%)** | **59** | **59** | **63** | **72** |
| Applicability |  |  |  |  |
|  | 18. The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application. | 1.7 | 3 | 5.3 | 2.7 |
|  | 19. The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice. | 1.3 | 2 | 3.7 | 5.3 |
|  | 20. The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered. | 2 | 2 | 5.7 | 1 |
|  | 21. The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria. | 1.3 | 2.7 | 3 | 2.7 |
|  | **Scaled domain score (%)** | **10** | **24** | **57** | **32** |
| Editorial Independence |  |  |  |  |
|  | 22. The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline. | 4 | 5.3 | 4.7 | 4.3 |
|  | 23. Competing interests of guideline development group members have been recorded and addressed. | 3 | 4 | 6.7 | 5 |
|  | **Scaled domain score (%)** | **42** | **61** | **78** | **61** |
| Overall Assessment |  |  |  |  |
|  | 24. Rate the overall quality of this guideline. | 4 | 4.3 | 5.3 | 4 |
|  | 25. I would recommend this guideline for use |  |  |  |  |
|  | Yes | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Yes with modification | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
|   | No | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ACEP = American College of Emergency Physicians; ACOEM = American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine; NICE = National Institute for Healthcare Excellence; WSAMDG = Washington State Agency Medical Directors' Group |
| \*Mean guideline scores across domains of the AGREE II instrument. Each question was rated on a Likert scale with a maximum of 7 points. The scores were averaged for each of the three reviewers. The scaled domain score is calculated as follows: (obtained score [sum of the mean scores for individual items within a domain] - minimum possible score) / (maximum possible score - minimum possible score). |