



AGREE Reporting Checklist

2016

This checklist is intended to guide the reporting of clinical practice guidelines.

CHECKLIST ITEM AND DESCRIPTION	REPORTING CRITERIA	Reported on Page Number/Line Number	Reported on Section/Paragraph
DOMAIN 1: SCOPE AND PURPOSE			
1. OBJECTIVES Report the overall objective(s) of the guideline. The expected health benefits from the guideline are to be specific to the clinical problem or health topic.	<input type="checkbox"/> Health intent(s) (i.e., prevention, screening, diagnosis, treatment, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Expected benefit(s) or outcome(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Target(s) (e.g., patient population, society)	Page 2/line 27-28	ABSTRACT /paragraph
2. QUESTIONS Report the health question(s) covered by the guideline, particularly for the key recommendations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Target population <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention(s) or exposure(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Comparisons (if appropriate) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Health care setting or context	Page 5/line 9	Development of guidance statements /paragraph 2
3. POPULATION Describe the population (i.e., patients, public, etc.) to whom the guideline is meant to apply.	<input type="checkbox"/> Target population, sex and age <input type="checkbox"/> Clinical condition (if relevant) <input type="checkbox"/> Severity/stage of disease (if relevant) <input type="checkbox"/> Comorbidities (if relevant) <input type="checkbox"/> Excluded populations (if relevant)	Page 4/line 6-7	Introduction/paragraph
DOMAIN 2: STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT			
4. GROUP MEMBERSHIP Report all individuals who were involved in the development process. This may include members of the steering group, the research team involved in selecting and reviewing/rating the evidence and individuals involved in formulating the final recommendations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Name of participant <input type="checkbox"/> Discipline/content expertise (e.g., neurosurgeon, methodologist) <input type="checkbox"/> Institution (e.g., St. Peter's hospital) <input type="checkbox"/> Geographical location (e.g., Seattle, WA) <input type="checkbox"/> A description of the member's role in the guideline development group	Page 6/line 8-9	Consensus process /paragraph

<p>5. TARGET POPULATION PREFERENCES AND VIEWS Report how the views and preferences of the target population were sought/considered and what the resulting outcomes were.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Statement of type of strategy used to capture patients'/publics' views and preferences (e.g., participation in the guideline development group, literature review of values and preferences) <input type="checkbox"/> Methods by which preferences and views were sought (e.g., evidence from literature, surveys, focus groups) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes/information gathered on patient/public information <input type="checkbox"/> How the information gathered was used to inform the guideline development process and/or formation of the recommendations	NA	This consensus does not involve patient treatment
<p>6. TARGET USERS Report the target (or intended) users of the guideline.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> The intended guideline audience (e.g. specialists, family physicians, patients, clinical or institutional leaders/administrators) <input type="checkbox"/> How the guideline may be used by its target audience (e.g., to inform clinical decisions, to inform policy, to inform standards of care)	Page 4/line 6-7	Introduction /paragraph
DOMAIN 3: RIGOUR OF DEVELOPMENT			
<p>7. SEARCH METHODS Report details of the strategy used to search for evidence.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Named electronic database(s) or evidence source(s) where the search was performed (e.g., MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsychINFO, CINAHL) <input type="checkbox"/> Time periods searched (e.g., January 1, 2004 to March 31, 2008) <input type="checkbox"/> Search terms used (e.g., text words, indexing terms, subheadings) <input type="checkbox"/> Full search strategy included (e.g., possibly located in appendix)	Page 4/line 5-9	Literature search and consensus process /paragraph 1
<p>8. EVIDENCE SELECTION CRITERIA Report the criteria used to select (i.e., include and exclude) the evidence. Provide rationale, where appropriate.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Target population (patient, public, etc.) characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Study design <input type="checkbox"/> Comparisons (if relevant) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Language (if relevant) <input type="checkbox"/> Context (if relevant)	Page 5/line 20-21	Literature search methodology /paragraph
<p>9. STRENGTHS & LIMITATIONS OF THE EVIDENCE Describe the strengths and limitations of the evidence. Consider from the perspective of the individual studies and the body of evidence aggregated across all the studies. Tools exist that can facilitate the reporting of this concept.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Study design(s) included in body of evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Study methodology limitations (sampling, blinding, allocation concealment, analytical methods) <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriateness/relevance of primary and secondary outcomes considered <input type="checkbox"/> Consistency of results across studies <input type="checkbox"/> Direction of results across studies <input type="checkbox"/> Magnitude of benefit versus magnitude of harm <input type="checkbox"/> Applicability to practice context	Page 6/line 2-3	Literature search methodology /paragraph

<p>10. FORMULATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS Describe the methods used to formulate the recommendations and how final decisions were reached. Specify any areas of disagreement and the methods used to resolve them.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation development process (e.g., steps used in modified Delphi technique, voting procedures that were considered) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes of the recommendation development process (e.g., extent to which consensus was reached using modified Delphi technique, outcome of voting procedures) <input type="checkbox"/> How the process influenced the recommendations (e.g., results of Delphi technique influence final recommendation, alignment with recommendations and the final vote) 	Page 6/line 9-14	consensus process /paragraph
<p>11. CONSIDERATION OF BENEFITS AND HARMS Report the health benefits, side effects, and risks that were considered when formulating the recommendations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Supporting data and report of benefits <input type="checkbox"/> Supporting data and report of harms/side effects/risks <input type="checkbox"/> Reporting of the balance/trade-off between benefits and harms/side effects/risks <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendations reflect considerations of both benefits and harms/side effects/risks 	NA	NA (This consensus is not relating the patients benefit or side effects)
<p>12. LINK BETWEEN RECOMMENDATIONS AND EVIDENCE Describe the explicit link between the recommendations and the evidence on which they are based.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> How the guideline development group linked and used the evidence to inform recommendations <input type="checkbox"/> Link between each recommendation and key evidence (text description and/or reference list) <input type="checkbox"/> Link between recommendations and evidence summaries and/or evidence tables in the results section of the guideline 	Page 6/line 2-3	Literature search methodology /paragraph
<p>13. EXTERNAL REVIEW Report the methodology used to conduct the external review.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Purpose and intent of the external review (e.g., to improve quality, gather feedback on draft recommendations, assess applicability and feasibility, disseminate evidence) <input type="checkbox"/> Methods taken to undertake the external review (e.g., rating scale, open-ended questions) <input type="checkbox"/> Description of the external reviewers (e.g., number, type of reviewers, affiliations) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes/information gathered from the external review (e.g., summary of key findings) <input type="checkbox"/> How the information gathered was used to inform the guideline development process and/or formation of the recommendations (e.g., guideline panel considered results of review in forming final recommendations) 	Page 5/line 6-8	Development of guidance statements /paragraph 2
<p>14. UPDATING PROCEDURE Describe the procedure for updating the guideline.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A statement that the guideline will be updated <input type="checkbox"/> Explicit time interval or explicit criteria to guide decisions about when an update will occur <input type="checkbox"/> Methodology for the updating procedure 	Page 4/line 21 Page 5/1-2	Development of guidance statements /paragraph 1

DOMAIN 4: CLARITY OF PRESENTATION			
<p>15. SPECIFIC AND UNAMBIGUOUS RECOMMENDATIONS Describe which options are appropriate in which situations and in which population groups, as informed by the body of evidence.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> A statement of the recommended action <input type="checkbox"/> Intent or purpose of the recommended action (e.g., to improve quality of life, to decrease side effects) <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant population (e.g., patients, public) <input type="checkbox"/> Caveats or qualifying statements, if relevant (e.g., patients or conditions for whom the recommendations would not apply) <input type="checkbox"/> If there is uncertainty about the best care option(s), the uncertainty should be stated in the guideline	Page 5/line 7-8	Development of guidance statements /paragraph 1
<p>16. MANAGEMENT OPTIONS Describe the different options for managing the condition or health issue.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Description of management options <input type="checkbox"/> Population or clinical situation most appropriate to each option	Page 7/line 5-6	results/ paragraph
<p>17. IDENTIFIABLE KEY RECOMMENDATIONS Present the key recommendations so that they are easy to identify.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommendations in a summarized box, typed in bold, underlined, or presented as flow charts or algorithms <input type="checkbox"/> Specific recommendations grouped together in one section	Page 6/line 18	results/ paragraph
DOMAIN 5: APPLICABILITY			
<p>18. FACILITATORS AND BARRIERS TO APPLICATION Describe the facilitators and barriers to the guideline's application.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Types of facilitators and barriers that were considered <input type="checkbox"/> Methods by which information regarding the facilitators and barriers to implementing recommendations were sought (e.g., feedback from key stakeholders, pilot testing of guidelines before widespread implementation) <input type="checkbox"/> Information/description of the types of facilitators and barriers that emerged from the inquiry (e.g., practitioners have the skills to deliver the recommended care, sufficient equipment is not available to ensure all eligible members of the population receive mammography) <input type="checkbox"/> How the information influenced the guideline development process and/or formation of the recommendations	Page 5/line 6-7	Development of guidance statements /paragraph 2
<p>19. IMPLEMENTATION ADVICE/TOOLS Provide advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be applied in practice.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional materials to support the implementation of the guideline in practice. For example: <input type="checkbox"/> Guideline summary documents <input type="checkbox"/> Links to check lists, algorithms <input type="checkbox"/> Links to how-to manuals <input type="checkbox"/> Solutions linked to barrier analysis (see Item 18) <input type="checkbox"/> Tools to capitalize on guideline facilitators (see Item 18) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome of pilot test and lessons learned	Page 25/line 6-7	supplementary information /paragraph

<p>20. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS Describe any potential resource implications of applying the recommendations.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Types of cost information that were considered (e.g., economic evaluations, drug acquisition costs)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Methods by which the cost information was sought (e.g., a health economist was part of the guideline development panel, use of health technology assessments for specific drugs, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Information/description of the cost information that emerged from the inquiry (e.g., specific drug acquisition costs per treatment course)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> How the information gathered was used to inform the guideline development process and/or formation of the recommendations</p>	page 4/line 18-20	literature search methodology /paragraph
<p>21. MONITORING/ AUDITING CRITERIA Provide monitoring and/or auditing criteria to measure the application of guideline recommendations.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Criteria to assess guideline implementation or adherence to recommendations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Criteria for assessing impact of implementing the recommendations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Advice on the frequency and interval of measurement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Operational definitions of how the criteria should be measured</p>	NA	NA(This consensus is only used to guide laboratory work)
DOMAIN 6: EDITORIAL INDEPENDENCE			
<p>22. FUNDING BODY Report the funding body's influence on the content of the guideline.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The name of the funding body or source of funding (or explicit statement of no funding)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A statement that the funding body did not influence the content of the guideline</p>	NA/	NA(no funding)
<p>23. COMPETING INTERESTS Provide an explicit statement that all group members have declared whether they have any competing interests.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Types of competing interests considered</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Methods by which potential competing interests were sought</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A description of the competing interests</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> How the competing interests influenced the guideline process and development of recommendations</p>	page 25/line 12	conflicts of interest

From: Brouwers MC, Kerkvliet K, Spithoff K, on behalf of the AGREE Next Steps Consortium. The AGREE Reporting Checklist: a tool to improve reporting of clinical practice guidelines. *BMJ* 2016;352:i1152. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i1152.

For more information about the AGREE Reporting Checklist, please visit the AGREE Enterprise website at www.agreetrust.org.

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-20-4060>
 *As the checklist was provided upon initial submission, the page number/line number reported may be changed due to copyediting and may not be referable in the published version. In this case, the section/paragraph may be used as an alternative reference.