



AGREE II

A critical appraisal of: Canadian Diabetes Association Clinical Practice 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: 22 November 2017

Email: diane.hua@sunnybrook.ca

URL of this appraisal: <http://www.agreetrust.org/appraisal/50616>

Guideline URL:

http://guidelines.diabetes.ca/app_themes/cdacpg/resources/cpg_2013_full_en.pdf

Overall Assessment

Title: Canadian Diabetes Association Clinical Practice Guidelines

Overall quality of this guideline: 7/7

Guideline recommended for use? Yes.

Notes:

Meets a lot of the criteria. More details or information could be disclosed where ratings were lower.

Domain	Total
1. Scope and Purpose	21
2. Stakeholder Involvement	18
3. Rigour of Development	55
4. Clarity of Presentation	20
5. Applicability	25
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: 4

More details needed on the of role of target population, patients, public, caregivers etc. in the guidelines development process, and in the dissemination/implementation of the guidelines and the planned awareness campaigns mentioned. Information that can be included: • statement of type of strategy used to capture patients'/public's' views and preferences (e.g., participation in the guideline development group, literature review of values and preferences) • methods by which preferences and views were sought (e.g., evidence from literature, surveys, focus groups) • outcomes/information gathered on patient/public information • description of how the information gathered was used to inform the guideline development process and/or formation of the recommendations

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

Rating: 7

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

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: 7

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: 6

Could provide more details on the methodology for the updating procedure/potential updates related to the individual chapters. Items to include: Item content includes the following CRITERIA: -a statement that the guideline will be updated -explicit time interval or explicit criteria to guide decisions about when an update will occur -methodology for the updating procedure is reported

4. Clarity of Presentation

15. The recommendations are specific and unambiguous.

Rating: 6

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

Rating: 7

17. Key recommendations are easily identifiable.

Rating: 7

5. Applicability

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

Rating: 7

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

Rating: 7

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

Rating: 7

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

Rating: 4

Examples of information to include: • identification of criteria to assess guideline implementation or adherence to recommendations • criteria for assessing impact of implementing the recommendations • advice on the frequency and interval of measurement • descriptions or operational definitions of how the criteria should be measured

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 22 November 2017