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Today’s objectives

1. Discuss the importance of good reporting of consensus studies
2. Introduce ACCORD
3. Practice using ACCORD
4. Obtain feedback on ACCORD
Introduction
Patricia Logullo and Niall Harrison
15 minutes
How many of you have experience with …

Consensus methods?

Reporting guidelines?
When evidence is limited, you need consensus to decide what to do:

- How to treat (interventions) - CPGs
- What to treat/study (outcomes) - COS
- Priorities (service, health economy)
- Patients’ perspectives
- Disease classification
- Formulating policy
There is no gold standard – impossible to do it wrong – but there are many methods

- Delphi
- RAND/UCLA
- Nominal group technique
- Meetings and conferences
Choosing a consensus method

Anonymity?
Time for expression?
Forcing agreement?
Preparation?
Mediation?
Iteration?

Different methods balance different advantages and disadvantages
Report how you did it!

Who participated?

How many people participated?

How did they vote / express their views?

How did you summarise their views?

… and more!
Developing a reporting guideline

Statement + Checklist
Explanation & elaboration document (E&E)
ACCORD: objective

• A reporting guideline relevant for …

All types of consensus methods

All areas of health research

Researchers anywhere in the world
Project management support was provided by Mark Rolfe, Helen Bremner, Amie Hedges and Mehraj Ahmed from Oxford PharmaGenesis. ISMPP provided organisational support. Jan Schoones (Leiden University Medical Centre) assisted in development of the systematic review search strategy. Laura Harrington, PhD, an employee of Ogilvy Health, provided medical writing support.
Protocol guiding process


Systematic review informing preliminary checklist

BMJ Open

Existing guidance on reporting of consensus methodology: a systematic review to inform ACCORD guideline development

ACCORD: checklist submitted for peer review

Title: 1 item
Introduction: 3 items
Methods: 21 items
Results: 5 items
Discussion: 2 items
Other: 3 items
Today’s exercise

Read the study scenario provided (handout)

In pairs, using ACCORD items M3 and M4, write sentences reporting panelist identification and recruitment

Email your reporting to niallharrison@openhealthgroup.com for review and discussion
The scenario might not contain all of the information you need to fully report the item.

If you think additional information is needed, invent the detail and include it in your reporting.
Writing time

15 minutes
Evaluation and discussion

15 minutes
Your proposals!

- [To be added during the workshop]
• M3. Explain the criteria for panellist inclusion and the rationale for panellist numbers. State who was responsible for panellist selection.

The Steering Committee appointed by the National Society of Xology was responsible for identifying panellists. Individuals were invited from five groups identified by the Society as key stakeholders in the management of disease X: clinicians, researchers, patients, carers, and policymakers. The aim was to include at least 5 representatives from each group.

✓ Criteria – stakeholders in disease management
✓ Rationale for numbers – five groups, aimed for 5 representatives from each
✓ Who was responsible – the Steering Committee
Our proposal – M4

- M4. Describe the recruitment process (how panellists were invited to participate).
  - Include communication/advertisement method(s) and locations, numbers of invitations sent, and whether there was centralised oversight of invitations or if panellists were asked/allowed to suggest other members of the panel.

Prospective panellists were identified from the Society membership list and invited directly by email by the Society. There was no general advertisement. In total 50 invitations were sent. If a prospective panellist declined, they were asked if they could recommend a potential replacement; the qualifications of potential replacements were reviewed by the Society before they were invited.

✓ How panellists were identified – Society membership list
✓ How panellists were invited – by email
✓ Who invited them – the Society
✓ How many invitations were sent – 50
✓ Was there wider advertisement – no
✓ Were panellists allowed to suggest replacements – yes
Discussion questions

• Why it is important to describe the criteria for panelist selection?
• Did the reporting guidance help you?
• Was this asking for more information than you would have provided in the past?
• Were any aspects of reporting this information challenging?
• Are you currently involved in a consensus study and able to help pilot the full checklist?