

Supplementary Materials

The Quality of Practice Guidelines for Melanoma: A Methodologic Appraisal with the AGREE II and AGREE-REX Instruments

Theresa Steeb, Anja Wessely, Konstantin Drexler, Martin Salzmann, Frédéric Toussaint, Lucie Heinzerling, Markus Reinholz, Carola Berking and Markus V. Heppt

Table S1. Overview of AGREE II mean scores (\pm standard deviation) of the 6 CM guidelines assessed by 5 independent reviewers on a scale ranging from 1 (lowest quality) to 7 (highest quality).

Domain/item	Australia	France	Germany	Scotland	Spain	USA
Scope and Purpose						
1 Description overall objectives	6.00 \pm 0.71	3.80 \pm 1.79	6.80 \pm 0.45	6.40 \pm 0.55	2.40 \pm 1.67	5.00 \pm 1.58
2 Description health questions	7.00 \pm 0.00	4.40 \pm 1.82	6.80 \pm 0.45	6.40 \pm 0.55	2.80 \pm 1.30	6.20 \pm 1.30
3 Description of patient population at focus	3.20 \pm 1.80	3.80 \pm 2.12	7.00 \pm 0.00	5.80 \pm 1.79	2.60 \pm 1.82	6.20 \pm 1.79
Overall percentage of scope and purpose	73%	50%	98%	87%	27%	80%
Stakeholder Involvement						
4 Relevant groups included in guideline group	6.80 \pm 0.45	4.60 \pm 0.89	6.00 \pm 1.73	6.00 \pm 1.00	3.00 \pm 1.41	5.00 \pm 2.12
5 Patient preferences considered	5.00 \pm 1.00	2.40 \pm 1.52	6.20 \pm 0.45	5.60 \pm 1.14	1.20 \pm 0.45	4.40 \pm 1.67
6 Target users defined	3.40 \pm 2.10	3.20 \pm 1.64	7.00 \pm 0.00	5.60 \pm 1.95	1.60 \pm 0.55	4.00 \pm 1.23
Overall percentage of stakeholder involvement	68%	41%	90%	79%	16%	58%
Rigor of Development						
7 Systematic literature research	6.40 \pm 0.89	5.20 \pm 0.45	7.00 \pm 0.00	6.80 \pm 0.45	2.60 \pm 1.34	6.40 \pm 0.89
8 Description of literature selection criteria	5.20 \pm 2.12	4.60 \pm 1.52	6.80 \pm 0.45	5.20 \pm 1.30	2.20 \pm 0.45	6.40 \pm 0.89
9 Strengths and limitations of evidence	5.40 \pm 0.89	5.20 \pm 0.45	6.60 \pm 0.55	5.40 \pm 1.34	4.20 \pm 1.79	4.80 \pm 1.10
10 Description methods for formulating recommendations	6.40 \pm 0.89	4.00 \pm 2.12	7.00 \pm 0.00	5.40 \pm 1.14	2.40 \pm 1.67	4.80 \pm 1.30
11 Side-effect, risks considered in recommendations	5.40 \pm 1.34	2.60 \pm 2.07	6.20 \pm 0.84	6.20 \pm 0.45	3.40 \pm 1.52	5.80 \pm 0.45
12 Link between evidence and recommendations	6.80 \pm 0.45	4.20 \pm 2.95	7.00 \pm 0.00	6.40 \pm 1.34	5.40 \pm 1.52	6.00 \pm 1.23
13 External review prior to publication	5.40 \pm 1.14	2.80 \pm 1.10	6.20 \pm 1.30	6.40 \pm 1.34	2.40 \pm 1.14	4.40 \pm 1.67
14 Procedure for updating provided	6.80 \pm 0.45	1.80 \pm 0.45	6.60 \pm 0.55	5.60 \pm 2.61	1.00 \pm 0.00	3.60 \pm 2.07
Overall percentage of methodology	83%	47%	95%	82%	33%	71%
Clarity and Presentation						
15 Recommendation specific and unanimous	5.80 \pm 1.10	4.80 \pm 2.17	6.80 \pm 0.45	6.00 \pm 1.73	4.60 \pm 1.95	4.80 \pm 1.92
16 Clear presentation of different treatment options	5.80 \pm 0.84	4.00 \pm 2.00	6.60 \pm 0.55	6.00 \pm 1.23	4.80 \pm 1.79	5.20 \pm 2.05
17 Key recommendations easily identifiable	6.60 \pm 0.55	7.00 \pm 0.00	7.00 \pm 0.00	6.60 \pm 0.89	3.40 \pm 2.41	5.00 \pm 2.74
18 Tools for application available	5.40 \pm 2.51	2.40 \pm 1.95	3.60 \pm 2.07	3.20 \pm 1.92	2.00 \pm 1.41	2.60 \pm 2.30
Overall percentage of clarity and presentation	86%	71%	97%	87%	54%	67%
Applicability						
19 Discussion of organizational facilitators and barriers	6.40 \pm 0.55	2.40 \pm 1.95	6.20 \pm 1.10	5.40 \pm 1.52	2.00 \pm 1.41	2.60 \pm 2.30
20 Consideration of costs of guideline implementation	5.00 \pm 2.55	2.40 \pm 1.94	5.00 \pm 1.41	5.20 \pm 1.92	2.00 \pm 1.41	3.00 \pm 1.52
21 Inclusion of monitoring/auditing criteria	5.20 \pm 2.05	3.80 \pm 1.64	6.20 \pm 0.84	5.00 \pm 1.58	3.60 \pm 1.34	4.20 \pm 1.10
Overall percentage of applicability	75%	29%	71%	62%	23%	35%
Editorial Independence						
22 Editorial independence from funding body	5.00 \pm 1.00	6.20 \pm 1.30	5.60 \pm 1.14	4.00 \pm 2.00	2.40 \pm 1.95	6.20 \pm 1.30
23 Reporting of conflicts of interests	5.20 \pm 2.49	4.80 \pm 2.39	5.80 \pm 2.68	4.80 \pm 2.28	3.40 \pm 2.41	5.80 \pm 2.68

Overall percentage of editorial independence	68%	75%	78%	57%	32%	83%
Total Score	5.80 ± 0.45	3.40 ± 0.89	6.60 ± 0.55	5.80 ± 0.45	2.80 ± 0.45	5.00 ± 0.71
Overall Assessment	60%	27%	70%	60%	20%	50%

Table S2. Overview of AGREE-REX mean scores (± standard deviation) of the 6 CM guidelines assessed by 5 independent reviewers on a scale ranging from 1 (lowest quality) to 7 (highest quality).

Item	Australia	France	Germany	Scotland	Spain	USA	Overall assessment
Clinical Applicability							
Evidence	6.60 ± 0.55	4.00 ± 1.23	6.80 ± 0.45	5.40 ± 1.95	4.80 ± 2.17	5.40 ± 1.34	5.50 ± 1.64
To users	5.20 ± 1.10	5.40 ± 0.55	6.80 ± 0.45	5.00 ± 1.23	3.20 ± 1.10	5.00 ± 1.58	5.10 ± 1.45
To patients and populations	4.80 ± 0.84	3.80 ± 1.48	6.60 ± 0.55	4.80 ± 1.79	3.00 ± 1.58	4.60 ± 2.19	4.60 ± 1.77
Overall percentage	76%	57%	96%	68%	44%	67%	
Values and Preferences							
Of target users	5.00 ± 1.41	3.40 ± 1.67	6.00 ± 1.41	5.40 ± 0.89	3.20 ± 1.79	4.60 ± 1.34	4.60 ± 1.67
Of patients and populations	5.40 ± 0.55	2.20 ± 1.64	6.20 ± 0.45	4.80 ± 1.64	1.40 ± 0.89	4.00 ± 1.58	4.00 ± 2.07
Of policy and decision-makers	5.00 ± 2.35	3.40 ± 1.95	5.20 ± 2.49	3.20 ± 2.28	1.60 ± 0.55	2.20 ± 1.64	3.43 ± 2.25
Of guideline developer	5.60 ± 0.89	2.00 ± 1.23	5.40 ± 1.52	3.40 ± 1.52	2.20 ± 1.63	3.00 ± 1.23	3.60 ± 2.01
Overall percentage	71%	29%	78%	53%	18%	41%	
Implementability							
Purpose	5.60 ± 0.89	4.20 ± 1.30	5.80 ± 1.10	4.80 ± 1.64	4.00 ± 1.23	5.20 ± 0.45	4.93 ± 1.26
Local application and adoption	5.60 ± 0.55	3.80 ± 1.48	5.60 ± 1.14	4.60 ± 2.07	2.60 ± 0.89	5.00 ± 1.41	4.53 ± 1.63
Overall percentage	77%	50%	78%	62%	38%	68%	

Table S3. Overview of the guideline databases searched for “cutaneous melanoma”.

Guideline Database (Last Update: 20 December 2019)	Initial Hits
Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Wissenschaftlichen Medizinischen Fachgesellschaften: AWMF (https://www.awmf.org/leitlinien/leitlinien-suche.html)	27
Ärztliches Zentrum für Qualität in der Medizin: ÄZQ (leitlinien.de)	0
Arzneimittelkommission der deutschen Ärzteschaft (AkdÄ) (http://www.akdae.de)	66
National Institute for Health and Care Excellence: NICE (guidance.nice.org.uk/CG/Published)	20
Guidelines International Network: GIN (g-i-n.net)	22
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality: NGC (guidelines.gov/)	277
Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network: SIGN (sign.ac.uk/)	18
Dutch Guidelines (oncoline.nl/index.php?language=en)	2
Cross references	2

Table S4. Overview of the search strategy in Medline and Embase via Ovid.

Search Query in Medline (Ovid MEDLINE (R) and Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations, Daily and Versions (R) 1946 to December 20, 2019; n = 833 hits)
1. practice guideline.mp. or exp Practice Guideline/
2. health planning guideline.mp. or exp Health Planning Guidelines/
3. guideline*.m_titl.
4. clinical protocol.mp or exp. Clinical Protocols/
5. guidance.m_titl.
6. guidance.mp.
7. care pathway.mp.
8. exp Evidence-Based Medicine/
8. consensus development.mp. or exp Consensus/
10. exp Guideline/ or guideline.mp
11. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10
12. exp Melanoma/ or melanoma.mp
13. 11 and 12
13. limit 12 to (english or german)
14. limit 13 to yr = "2016-Current"
Search Query in Embase (Embase 1974 to 2019 December 20 n = 1,222 hits)
1. practice guideline.mp. or exp practice guideline/

-
2. health planning guidelines.mp. or exp health care planning/
 3. guideline.mp.
 4. care pathway.mp.
 5. consensus development.mp. or exp consensus development/
 6. exp consensus/ or consensus.mp
 7. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6
 8. exp melanoma/ or exp cutaneous melanoma/
 9. 7 and 8
 10. limit 9 to (english or german)
 11. limit 10 to yr = "2016-Current"
-



© 2020 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).