

GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes

Gordon H. Guyatt, Andrew D. Oxman, Regina Kunz, David Atkins, Jan Brozek, Gunn Vist, Philip Alderson, Paul Glasziou, Yngve Falck-Ytter, Holger J. Schünemann

【日本語訳】

GRADEガイドライン: 2. 疑問の定式化と重要なアウトカムの決定

抄録

GRADEにおいては、対象となるセッティング、集団、介入、対象を明確に示すことが要求される。さらに、研究から得られるエビデンスが利用できるかどうかに関わらず、全ての重要なアウトカムを明確に示す必要がある。治療に関するある特定に疑問に関し、似たような効果の大きさがあるとするには、研究間で集団、介入、アウトカムが十分似ているべきである。ガイドライン作成者は、エビデンスの収集前に各アウトカムの相対的重要性を示し、エビデンスの要約後も再び各アウトカムの相対的重要性を示すべきである。代理アウトカムの重要性を考慮する場合は、著者らはまず当該代理アウトカムによって代替される患者にとって重要なアウトカムの重要性を評価した上で、アウトカムの非直接性を理由にエビデンスの質をグレードダウンすべきである。

Table 1
Three steps for considering the relative importance of outcomes

Step	What	Why	How	Evidence
1	Preliminary classification of outcomes as critical, important but not critical, or low importance, before reviewing the evidence	To focus attention on those outcomes that are considered most important when searching for and summarizing the evidence and to resolve or clarify disagreements	By asking panel members and possibly patients or members of the public to identify important outcomes, judging the relative importance of the outcomes and discussing disagreements. Conducting a systematic review of the relevant literature	These judgments can draw on the experience of the panel members, patients, and members of the public. Prior knowledge of the research evidence or, ideally, a systematic review of that evidence is likely to be helpful
2	Reassessment of the relative importance of outcomes after reviewing the evidence	To ensure that important outcomes identified by reviews of the evidence that were not initially considered are included and to reconsider the relative importance of outcomes in light of the available evidence	By asking the panel members (and, if relevant, patients and members of the public) to reconsider the relative importance of the outcomes included in the first step and any additional outcomes identified by reviews of the evidence	Experience of the panel members and other informants and systematic reviews of the effects of the intervention
3	Judging the balance between the desirable and undesirable effects of an intervention	To make a recommendation and to determine the strength of the recommendation	By asking the panel members (and, if relevant, patients and members of the public) to judge the balance between the desirable and undesirable effects using a balance sheet (summary-of-findings table) and, if relevant, using a decision analysis or an economic analysis	Experience of the panel members and other informants, systematic reviews of the effects of the intervention, evidence of the value that patients attach to key outcomes (if relevant and available), and decision analyses or economic analyses (if relevant and available)