



AGREE II

A critical appraisal of: Canadian Physical Activity Guidelines using the AGREE II Instrument

Created with the AGREE II Online Guideline Appraisal Tool.

No endorsement of the content of this document by the AGREE Research Trust should be implied.

Appraiser: Diane Hua-Stewart

Date: 21 March 2018

Email: diane.hua@sunnybrook.ca

URL of this appraisal: <http://www.agreetrust.org/appraisal/50019>

Guideline URL:

http://www.csep.ca/CMFiles/Guidelines/Backgroundinfo/CPAGuideline_Report_JAN2011.pdf

Overall Assessment

Title: Canadian Physical Activity Guidelines

Overall quality of this guideline: 7/7

Guideline recommended for use? Yes.

Notes:

The transparency and detail in reporting the process of this guideline development is excellent and unlike many other guidelines groups. Areas of improvement - see domains with lower scores for areas to improve process/reporting detail.

Domain	Total
1. Scope and Purpose	21
2. Stakeholder Involvement	19
3. Rigour of Development	55
4. Clarity of Presentation	15
5. Applicability	15
6. Editorial Independence	14

1. Scope and Purpose

1. The overall objective(s) of the guideline is (are) specifically described.

Rating: 7

2. The health question(s) covered by the guideline is (are) specifically described.

Rating: 7

3. The population (patients, public, etc.) to whom the guideline is meant to apply is specifically described.

Rating: 7

2. Stakeholder Involvement

4. The guideline development group includes individuals from all relevant professional groups.

Rating: 7

5. The views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) have been sought.

Rating: 7

6. The target users of the guideline are clearly defined.

Rating: 5

States that guidelines is made available to all Canadians, but does not specify or highlight which recommendations or sections that would be more applicable to others to certain groups (i.e. policy makers, health professionals when consulting with patients, etc.) The target population is well defined, however target users of the guideline could be more explicitly stated. I've reviewed the sections again, much of the description I found was in the stakeholder section. It is very clear that there was a strong stakeholder process and the target users were consulted, though I still feel the target users/guideline audience could be more clearly stated and evident to readers (i.e. Health care providers, health promoters, educators, policy makers etc.) I will assign the new rating to 5. Below is the full criteria outlined by AGREE: Item content includes the following CRITERIA: -clear description of intended guideline audience (e.g. specialists, family physicians, patients, clinical or institutional leaders/administrators) -description of how the guideline may be used by its target audience (e.g., to inform clinical decisions, to inform policy, to inform standards of care) .

3. Rigour of Development

7. Systematic methods were used to search for evidence.

Rating: 7

8. The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described.

Rating: 7

9. The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described.

Rating: 7

Excellent job highlighting gaps and areas where future research is needed.

10. The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described.

Rating: 7

11. The health benefits, side effects, and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations.

Rating: 6

Statements explaining that potential benefits outweigh potential risks associated with physical activity (although the risks/benefits are not detailed). Items to report on include: Item content includes the following CRITERIA: -supporting data and report of benefits -

supporting data and report of harms/side effects/risks -reporting of the balance/trade-off between benefits and harms/side effects/risks -recommendations reflect considerations of both benefits and harms/side effects/risks

12. There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence.

Rating: 7

13. The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication.

Rating: 7

14. A procedure for updating the guideline is provided.

Rating: 7

4. Clarity of Presentation

15. The recommendations are specific and unambiguous.

Rating: 7

Meets criteria as outlined by AGREE.

16. The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented.

Rating: 1

n/a no score added to calculation

17. Key recommendations are easily identifiable.

Rating: 7

5. Applicability

18. The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application.

Rating: 2

Could include info on the social supports needed, economic, lifestyle/cultural considerations that would help to make the recommendations more relevant and applicable to users/target audience. Internal CSEP score 2. Items to include: Item content includes the following CRITERIA: -identification of the types of facilitators and barriers that were considered -

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) -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) -description of how the information influenced the guideline development process and/or formation of the recommendations

19. The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice.

Rating: 6

Item content includes the following CRITERIA: -an implementation section in the guideline tools and resources to facilitate application: -guideline summary documents -links to check lists, algorithms -links to how-to manuals -solutions linked to barrier analysis (see Item 18) -tools to capitalize on guideline facilitators (see Item 18) -outcome of pilot test and lessons learned -directions on how users can access tools and resources

20. The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered.

Rating: 1

No mention of economic/resource considerations

21. The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria.

Rating: 6

6. Editorial Independence

22. The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline.

Rating: 7

23. Competing interests of guideline development group members have been recorded and addressed.

Rating: 7

Created online at www.agreetrust.org 21 March 2018