AGREE
Short Guideline Appraisal Form

	Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree
Domain 1: Scope and Purpose				
1. The overall objective(s) of the guideline is (are) specifically described	4	3	2	1
2. The clinical question(s) covered by the guideline is (are) specifically described	4	3	2	1
3. The patients to whom the guideline is meant to apply are specifically described	4	3	2	1
Domain 2: Stakeholder Involvement				
4. The guideline development group includes individuals from all the relevant disciplines or stakeholders	4	3	2	1
5. The patients views and preferences have been sought	4	3	2	1
6. The target users of the guideline are clearly defined	4	3	2	1
7. The Guideline has been piloted among target users	4	3	2	1
Domain 3: Methodology				
8. Systematic methods were used to look for evidence	4	3	2	1
9. The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described	4	3	2	1
10. The methods used for formulating the recommendations are clearly described	4	3	2	1
11. The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations	4	3	2	1
12. There is an explicit link between the evidence and the supporting evidence	4	3	2	1
13. The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to publication	4	3	2	1
14. A procedure for updating the guideline is provided	4	3	2	1
Domain 4: Clarity and Presentation				
15. The recommendations are specific and unambiguous	4	3	2	1
16. The different options for management of the condition are clearly presented	4	3	2	1
17. Key recommendations are clearly identifiable	4	3	2	1
18. The guideline is supported with tools for application	4	3	2	1
Domain 5: Applicability				
19. The potential organisational barriers in applying the guideline have been discussed	4	3	2	1

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

4	3	2	1

21. The guideline presents key review criteria for monitoring and/or audit purposes

4	3	2	1

Domain 6: Methodology

22. The guideline is editorially independent from the funding body

4	3	2	1

23. Conflicts of interest of guideline development members have been recorded.

4	3	2	1

Example Scoring for each domain

	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Total
Appraiser 1	2	3	3	8
Appraiser 2	3	3	4	10
Appraiser 3	2	4	3	9
Appraiser 4	2	3	4	9
Total	**9**	**13**	**14**	**36**

Max possible score:
4 (strongly agree) x 3 (items) x 4 appraisers = 48

Min possible score:
1 (strongly disagree) x 3 (items) x 4 appraisers = 12

The standardised domain score will be:

Obtained score – min. possible score
Max. possible score – min possible score

$\frac{36-12}{48-12} = \frac{24}{36} = 0.67 \times 100 = 67\%$

Overall Assessment

Would you recommend this guideline for use in practice?

Strongly Recommend ☐ Rate 3-4 on majority of items and most domain scores are >60%

Recommend (with provisos or alteration) ☐ Rates 3-4 or 1-2 on similar number of items and most domain scores are between 30 – 60%

Would not recommend ☐ Rate 1-2 on majority of items and most domain scores <30%

Unsure ☐

Number of Appraisers:
Recommended to have at least 2, preferably 4. The more appraisers the higher the reliability