

## Supplement 10| External Review Format

In order to collect consultation and external review opinions before the publication of the developed CPG, separate from the development committee, each research group under the KSN, the Korean Society of Dialysis Therapy, the Korean Society of Dialysis Access, and the Korean Society of Diagnostic and Interventional Nephrology, etc. An external advisory committee composed of clinical experts and methodology experts who are expected to be end-users of the recommended practice guidelines was formed. The advisory committee did not prepare recommendations to be included in the CPG but served as an external reviewer who consulted at the stage of consensus on the derived recommendations. As a method of external review, an expert questionnaire survey was conducted to investigate the degree of the consent of the recommendations for each key question. The subject of the survey was an advisory committee (including one methodology expert), and a questionnaire evaluation table was used to respond within the range of 1 point (very disagreeing) to 5 points (very agreeing) to the degree of consent to the recommendation. The questionnaire was composed of a question so that the key question, draft recommendation, recommendation grade, and evidence level could be viewed at a glance, and the degree of consent could be indicated. It consisted of contents such as the necessity and appropriateness of development of the guidelines, the methodological strictness of the development of the guidelines, the rationality of the decision of the recommendations, the degree of agreement and utilization of the overall CPG, and the revised opinions on individual recommendations. In addition, a separate document and protocol that summarizes the development process step by step is provided so that it can be used as a reference for determining the degree of consent. The draft file was circulated by e-mail to the advisory committee and each society in advance to obtain opinions, and the steering committee members, advisors, recommended persons from related societies, and interested experts and methodology experts gathered to reflect stakeholder participation, external review, and opinions on implementation plans. Through the convergence, feedback was obtained and the revised opinion was reflected in the contents of the treatment guidelines. Since then, dozens of e-mails and phone calls have been made to the working-level members and members of each society, collecting and revising opinions such as review contents, opinions, and processing contents (reflected or not and reason), and then obtained certification of CPG by the Korean Medical Association.

### I. Overall evaluation of guideline development

#### 1. Necessity to develop medical guidelines and appropriateness of development planning

- 1) Opinions on the necessity and background of the development of medical guidelines, the scope of development, and the adequacy of development planning (group composition, etc.)

Strongly	Disagree	Moderately	Agree	Strongly Agree

- 2) Other comments (description)

#### 2. Methodological rigor in developing guidelines

1) Consistency in evidence search and synthesis method and conclusion

Strongly	Disagree	Moderately	Agree	Strongly Agree

2) Other comments (description)

--

**3. Reasonability of making recommendations**

1) Opinion on whether it is a reasonable recommendation based on evidence and considering its use in clinical practice

Strongly	Disagree	Moderately	Agree	Strongly Agree

2) Other comments (description)

--

**4. The degree of agreement and usability of the overall treatment guidelines**

1) Degree of agreement on the overall treatment guideline development method and usability

Strongly	Disagree	Moderately	Agree	Strongly Agree

2) Other comments (description)

--

**II. Opinions for revision to individual advisories**

Topic	No. of key question	Review opinion