

Project Title: _____

Date: _____

In determining the strength of a recommendation, the development group makes a considered judgment.

The judgment is made explicit in a consensus process which considers critically appraised evidence, clinical experience, and other dimensions. The rationale for choices of each dimension are to be discussed in the "Discussion/Synthesis of the Evidence" section in the care recommendation documents. The development group will consider what relative weight each dimension listed below contributes when determining the strength of a recommendation.

Dimensions for Judging the Strength of a Recommendation				
1. Safety / Harm	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal adverse effects	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderate adverse effects	<input type="checkbox"/> Serious adverse effects	
2. Benefit to target population <i>(e.g., health benefit to patient)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Has significant benefit	<input type="checkbox"/> Has moderate benefit	<input type="checkbox"/> Has minimal benefit	
3. Burden on population to adhere to recommendation <i>(e.g., patient cost, hassle, discomfort, pain, motivation, ability to adhere, time)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Low burden of adherence	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to determine burden of adherence	<input type="checkbox"/> High burden of adherence	
4. Cost-effectiveness for the healthcare system <i>(e.g., balance of cost/savings of resources, staff time, supplies based on published studies/onsite analysis, length of stay)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost-effective	<input type="checkbox"/> Inconclusive economic effects	<input type="checkbox"/> Not cost-effective	
5. Directness of the Evidence <i>(i.e., the extent to which the BOE directly answers the clinical question [population/problem, intervention, comparison, outcome])</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence directly relates to recommendation for this target population	<input type="checkbox"/> There is some concern about the directness of evidence as it relates to the recommendation for this target population	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence only indirectly relates to recommendation for this target population	
6. Impact on quality of life, morbidity, or mortality <i>(including patient/family goals, values, and preferences)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive impact on quality of life, morbidity, mortality, and values/preferences	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderate/Neutral impact on quality of life, morbidity, mortality, and values/preferences	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative impact on quality of life, morbidity, mortality, and values/preferences	
7. Grade of the Body of Evidence <i>(*GNA – Grade Not Assignable)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> High BOE grade ⊕⊕⊕⊕	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderate ⊕⊕⊕○	<input type="checkbox"/> Low ⊕⊕○○	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Low ⊕○○○ <input type="checkbox"/> GNA*

Reflecting on your answers to the dimensions and given that more answers to the left of the scales* indicates support for a stronger recommendation, complete one of the sentences below to judge the strength of this recommendation.

*(Note that for negative recommendations, the left/right logic may be reversed for one or more dimensions.)

<input type="checkbox"/> It is strongly recommended that...	(Recommendation Strength: High)
<input type="checkbox"/> It is recommended that...	(Recommendation Strength: Moderate)
<input type="checkbox"/> It is suggested that...	(Recommendation Strength: Weak)
<input type="checkbox"/> There is insufficient evidence and lack of consensus.	(No recommendation could be made.)

Some of the concepts for this development based on:

Guyatt: Grading strength of recommendations and quality of evidence in clinical guidelines: report from an American College of Chest Physicians task force. *Chest*, 129(1): 174-81, 2006; **Harbour:** A new system for grading recommendations in evidence based guidelines. *BMJ*, 323(7308): 334-6, 2001; and **Steinberg:** Evidence based? Caveat emptor! *Health Aff (Millwood)*, 24(1): 80-92, 2005.