

Bilag

AGREE II vurdering af Cherny et al. European Association for Palliative Care (EAPC) recommended framework for the use of sedation in palliative care. Palliative Medicine, 2009; 23:581-593.

AGREE II INSTRUMENT

DOMAIN 1. SCOPE AND PURPOSE

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5 ✓	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	---	-----	---	---------------------

Comments

Beskrevet under "why a framework"

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4 ✓	5	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	-----	---	---	---------------------

Comments

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4 ✓	5 ✓	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	-----	-----	---	---------------------

Comments

Står på side 1: "selected palliative care pt's with otherwise refractory symptoms"

DOMAIN 2. STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6 ✓	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	---	---	-----	---------------------

Comments Man må gå ud fra, at EPAC repræsenterer alle relevante professionelle grupper.

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5 ✓	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	---	-----	---	---------------------

Comments Målgruppen går vi ud fra, er patienterne og deres pårørende

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5 ✓	6 ✓	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	---	-----	-----	---------------------

Comments "Medical providers "

DOMAIN 3. RIGOUR OF DEVELOPMENT

7. Systematic methods were used to search for evidence.

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5 ✓	6 ✓	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	---	-----	-----	---------------------

Comments

Ja systematisk men dog kun søgt i MEDLINE

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3 ✓	4	5	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	-----	---	---	---	---------------------

Comments

S. 583 uklare in og ekskl. kriterier. Ellers velbeskrevet .

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3 ✓	4	5	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	-----	---	---	---	---------------------

Comments

DOMAIN 3. RIGOUR OF DEVELOPMENT continued

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3 ✓	4 ✓	5	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	-----	-----	---	---	---------------------

Comments

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5 ✓	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	---	-----	---	---------------------

Comments

s 583

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4 ✓	5	6 ✓	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	-----	---	-----	---------------------

Comments

pga den manglende evidens er der "blot" vejledt på baggrund af konsensus i ekspert gruppen

DOMAIN 3. RIGOUR OF DEVELOPMENT continued

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6 ✓	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	---	---	-----	---------------------

Comments

som led i skriveprocessen har guidelinen været til ekstern gennemlæsning. (reviewed)

14. A procedure for updating the guideline is provided.

1 Strongly Disagree	✓ 2	3	4	5	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	-----	---	---	---	---	---------------------

Comments

DOMAIN 4. CLARITY OF PRESENTATION

15. The recommendations are specific and unambiguous.

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5 ✓	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	---	-----	---	---------------------

Comments

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4 ✓	5	6 ✓	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	-----	---	-----	---------------------

Comments

17. Key recommendations are easily identifiable.

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5 ✓	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	---	-----	---	---------------------

Comments

DOMAIN 5. APPLICABILITY

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2 ✓	3	4	5 ✓	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	-----	---	---	-----	---	---------------------

Comments

Her er vi ikke helt enige. Hvordan synes du spørgsmålet skal besvares?

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4 ✓	5 ✓	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	-----	-----	---	---------------------

Comments Der er bla. flere appendixsér

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2 ✓	3	4	5	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	-----	---	---	---	---	---------------------

Comments Nok ikke så velbeskrevet da denne guideline jo skal "guide" nationale guidelines.

DOMAIN 5. APPLICABILITY continued

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 Strongly Agree
-------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------------------------

Comments

DOMAIN 6. EDITORIAL INDEPENDENCE

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4 ✓	5	6	7 Strongly Agree
------------------------	---	---	-----	---	---	---------------------

Comments Vi forstår nok ikke helt spørsmålet..

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

1 Strongly Disagree ✓	2	3	4	5	6	7 Strongly Agree
--------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------

Comments

OVERALL GUIDELINE ASSESSMENT

For each question, please choose the response which best characterizes the guideline assessed:

1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline.

1 Lowest possible quality	2	3	4	5 ✓	6	7 Highest possible quality
--	----------	----------	----------	------------	----------	---

2. I would recommend this guideline for use.

Yes	
Yes, with modifications	✓
No	

NOTES

Der mangler information om ind og eksl. kriterier for den udvalgte litteratur.
Der mangler "selvkritik"

Sarah Højring

Marianne Holm Andersen
Charlotte Tambo Holm