A critical appraisal of: Terminology and Guidelines for Glaucoma 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.

Date: 20 May 2021

URL of this appraisal: http://www.agreetrust.org/appraisal/81800

Guideline URL: n.v.t. --> PDF

Overall Assessment

Title: Terminology and Guidelines for Glaucoma

Overall quality of this guideline: 2/7

Guideline recommended for use? No.

Domain	Total
1. Scope and Purpose	8
2. Stakeholder Involvement	10
3. Rigour of Development	10
4. Clarity of Presentation	9
5. Applicability	8
6. Editorial Independence	2

---

1. Scope and Purpose

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

Rating: 6

The aim of these Guidelines is to present the view of the European Glaucoma Society (EGS) on the diagnosis and management of glaucoma. Our Guidelines are intended to support ophthalmologists in managing patients affected by, or supected of having, glaucoma. The overall objective of the guideline includes all the CRITERIA: (1) health intent(s), (2) expected benefit or outcome, and (3) target(s). 6 --> uitkomst niet helder / duidelijk geformuleerd. Overige aspecten komen wel terug.

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

Rating: 1

No questions described in the guideline.

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

Rating: 1

Not specifically described.

---

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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

Rating: 2

Difficult to assess. Only a name is included. Other information such as discipline/content expertise, institution, geographical location and a description of hte member\'s role in the guidelinde develoment group were not included.

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

Rating: 1

Unclear. Probably not investigated. No information in guideline about: (1) statement of type of strategy used to capture patients\'/public\'s views and preferecnes; (2) methods by which preferences and views were sought; (3) outcomes/information gathered on patient/public information and (4) descriptoin of how the information gathered was used to inform the guideline development process and/or formation of the rcommendations. Niets in tekst over patiëntenparticipatie.

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

Rating: 7

The following is described in the guideline: Our Guidelines are intended to support ophthalmologists in managing patients affected by, or suspected of having glaucoma. The Guidelines should be considered as recommendations rather than as strict treatment protocols.

---

3. Rigour of Development

7. Systematic methods were used to search for evidence.

Rating: 1

No methods available. Nothing described about the systematic methods used to search for evidence.

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

Rating: 1

Not described. No criteria for selecting the evidence given.

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

Rating: 2

The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence were not clearly described. In the introduction chapter a method for assessing the quality of evidence was described. No descriptions of how the body of evidence was evaluated for bias and how it was interpreted by members of the guideline development group were given. Op pagina 22 staat een \'relatief\' algemene beschrijving over de kwaliteit van RCTs. Niet waar we naar op zoek

zijn. Daarnaast beschrijving over hoe evidence beoordeeld wordt. Erg summier, maar zeggen er wel wat over.

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

Rating: 1

The following was stated in the introduction: \'The strength of recommentdation is graded as either I (strong) or II (weak). A strong recommendation (I) is to be interpreted as \"we recommend\" and/or \"very relevant in clinical practice\" and a weak recommendation (II) as \"we suggest\" and/or \"very relevant in clinical practice\" and a weak recommendation II as \"we suggest\" and/or \"less relevant in clinical practice\". Nothing described about how final decisions were arrived.

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

Rating: 2

The health benefits, side effects, and risks have not been considered in formulating the recommendations. Health benefits, side effects, and risks have been considered in formulating recommendation. Soms wel beschreven, maar lastig omdat het niet duidelijk is wat de onderbouwing is per aanbeveling. Meer grotere, algemenere teksten.

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

Rating: 1

No explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence. Het enigste wat er beschikbaar is is een onderbouwing van quality of evidence per recommendation maar verder niet.

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

Rating: 1

Unclear if the guideline was externally reviewd by experts prior to its publication. The following was described \"as soon as specific sections were completed they had further editorial comment to ensure corss referencing and style continuity with other sections\".

14. A procedure for updating the guideline is provided.

Rating: 1

No procedure for updating the guideline is provided.

---

4. Clarity of Presentation

15. The recommendations are specific and unambiguous.

Rating: 4

Not all recommendations are specific and unambiguous. For example: \'Generic drops can differ from brand drops and it may be necessary to monitor patients more closely after swithcing.\' Zijn ook stroomdiagrammen beschikbaar. Formulering kan alleen duidelijker.

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

Rating: 3

Different options are presented in the recommendations. There are also flowdiagrams available. Sometimes the description is \'dubbelzinnig\' en onduidelijk.

17. Key recommendations are easily identifiable.

Rating: 2

There are boxes with recommendations. However, not always easily identifiable. Sommige staan in tekst en sommige in kader. Geen duidelijke plaats voor alle aanbevelingen.

---

5. Applicability

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

Rating: 1

Nothing described about implementation. Facilitators and barriers for implementation were not given.

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

Rating: 4

The guideline provides flowcharts. No information about the development. Not always easy to find. Op de websites kan je educational slides vinden.

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

Rating: 2

Er worden wel 4 studies aangehaald waarin iets beschreven wordt over de kosten etc. Zijn simulatiemodellen. Ze benoemen het hebben er naar gekeken.

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

Rating: 1

No monitoring or auditing criteria available.

---

6. Editorial Independence

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

Rating: 1

Source of funding / name of funding body not described. Alleen een verwijzing naar een pdf document voor conflict of interest/Financial disclosure. In de PDF staat echter niets. No statement that the funding body did not influence the content of the guideline.

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

Rating: 1

Competing interests of guideline development gruop members were not described and addressed.

Created online at www.agreetrust.org 20 May 2021