



GRADE for authors

Facilitator

Holger Schünemann & Lawrence Mbuagbaw

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University

Goals

To deepen understanding and gain practical experience in developing guidelines according to the GRADE approach.

Objectives

By the end of this workshop, participants will be able to:

Knowledge

- Identify patient important outcomes for Summary of Findings Tables
- Follow the GRADE approach to evaluate the certainty of the evidence
- Understand the relevance of GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables in Cochrane reviews
- Experience the GRADEpro (www.grade.pro) app and how it interacts with RevMan

Format

- Small group sessions enhanced by related interactive large group seminars.



Readings / Resources:

Primary reading

1. Schünemann HJ HJ, Vist GE, Glasziou P, Akl E, Skoetz N, Guyatt GH. Chapter 14: Completing Summary of findings tables and grading the certainty of evidence. In: Higgins JPT TJ, Chandler J, Cumston M, Li T, PageMJ, Welch V, editor. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 6 (updated January 29, 2019). Available from: <https://training.cochrane.org/version-6> (you need to log in through Cochrane). The Cochrane Collaboration, 2019; 2019.

Additional reading and resources

2. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, Schünemann HJ: GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2008, 336(7650):924.
3. Schünemann HJ BJ, Oxman AD, Guyatt GH. Handbook for grading the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations using the GRADE approach. : GRADEpro; 2015. Available from: http://gdt.guidelinedevelopment.org/central_prod/_design/client/handbook/handbook.html.
4. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, Montori V, Akl EA, Djulbegovic B, Falck-Ytter Y *et al*: GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidence--study limitations (risk of bias). *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011, 64(4):407-415.
5. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, Djulbegovic B, Atkins D, Falck-Ytter Y *et al*: GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidence--publication bias. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011, 64(12):1277-1282.
6. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, Rind D, Devereaux PJ, Montori VM, Freyschuss B, Vist G *et al*: GRADE guidelines 6. Rating the quality of evidence--imprecision. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011, 64(12):1283-1293.
7. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, Alonso-Coello P, Glasziou P, Jaeschke R, Akl EA *et al*: GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence--inconsistency. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011, 64(12):1294-1302.



8. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, Alonso-Coello P, Falck-Ytter Y, Jaeschke R, Vist G *et al*: GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidence--indirectness. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011, 64(12):1303-1310.
9. Schunemann HJ, Cuello C, Akl EA, Mustafa RA, Meerpohl JJ, Thayer K, et al. GRADE guidelines: 18. How ROBINS-I and other tools to assess risk of bias in nonrandomized studies should be used to rate the certainty of a body of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2018 Feb 9. pii: S0895-4356(17).
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29432858>