GRADE Training Workshop
Report

Date: 23 February 2016
Venue: South African Medical Research Council Conference Centre, Cape Town
Participants: Thirty-two participants
Duration: One day (09h00 - 18h00)
Facilitators: Holger Schünemann, Nandi Siegfried, Tamara Kredo

Goals and objectives

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

The objectives for the workshop were:

Knowledge

- Understand Evidence to Decision making processes in guideline development
- Understand the relevance of evidence profiles and summary of findings tables in the guideline development process
- Experience the GRADE (www.gradepro.org) Guideline Development Software
- Identify different ways to use and implement the GRADE methodology for assessing evidence and developing recommendations

Attitude

- Understand key components of the guideline production process including issues around adoption, adaptation and new development focusing on issues such as the question formulation, guideline group, the evidence, developing the recommendations
- Formulate guideline and other health care questions
- Identify patient important outcomes
- Follow the GRADE approach to evaluate the quality of the evidence
South Africa Guidelines Excellence Project - SAGE

SAGE aims to enhance the quality of primary health care by engaging in a stakeholder-driven process to improve the standards of local guideline development, adaptation, contextualisation and, ultimately, implementation (http://www.mrc.ac.za/cochrane/sage.htm). Project SAGE has been made possible as a result of a three-year (2014-2016) flagship grant from the South African Medical Research Council (SAMRC).

Workshop Programme

The one day workshop comprised of presentations, small group sessions and large interactive group discussions. Appendix 2 provides details of the programme. This event formed part of a larger SAGE Guidelines Summit (24 February 2016), in which over 60 participants from sectors spanning the government, researchers and private health care gathered. The Summit aimed to provide a platform to discuss both the development and implementation of guidelines in South Africa and did so via multi-sectoral panels that discussed experiences and best practices in guidelines development and implementation in our setting.
Workshop Participants

Invitations were sent to researchers/organisations who are or will be actively engaged in the development of clinical guidelines or evidence assessments in South Africa or globally. In total 35 (including 3 facilitators) participants from academic institutions, Department of Health (local and national) and the private sector attended the workshop (Appendix 1).

Evaluation

Participants were asked to complete an evaluation form to obtain feedback of their experience of the workshop including what aspects they found most or least useful. See Appendix 3 for the full details of the evaluation.
## Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Abulfathi</td>
<td>Stellenbosch University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zahiera</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Metropolitan Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaidah</td>
<td>Asmall</td>
<td>National Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajibola</td>
<td>Awotiwon</td>
<td>KTU, University of Cape Town Lung Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Boyles</td>
<td>University of Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elma</td>
<td>Burger</td>
<td>Gauteng Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky</td>
<td>Cardenas</td>
<td>Aurum Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Chademana</td>
<td>University of the Western Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renier</td>
<td>Coetzee</td>
<td>University of the Western Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solange</td>
<td>Durao</td>
<td>SA Medical Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Gerritsen</td>
<td>Epi Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet</td>
<td>Hannington</td>
<td>KTU, University of Cape Town Lung Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khadija</td>
<td>Jamaloodien</td>
<td>National Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine</td>
<td>Jugathpal</td>
<td>National Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laetitia</td>
<td>Makan-Moses</td>
<td>Metropolitan Health Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memela</td>
<td>Makiwane</td>
<td>Stellenbosch University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selaelo</td>
<td>Mametja</td>
<td>South African Medical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>McCaul</td>
<td>CEBHC, Stellenbosch University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thando</td>
<td>Mtshizana</td>
<td>University of Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hushendree</td>
<td>Naicker</td>
<td>Red Cross Children’s Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste</td>
<td>Naude</td>
<td>CEBHC, Stellenbosch University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine</td>
<td>Ndze</td>
<td>CEBHC, Stellenbosch University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Ochodo</td>
<td>CEBHC, Stellenbosch University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Okwen</td>
<td>G-I-N/CAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabela</td>
<td>Petros</td>
<td>HIA/Western Cape Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Pienaar</td>
<td>SA Medical Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Riddin</td>
<td>National Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krisela</td>
<td>Steyn</td>
<td>University of Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blose</td>
<td>Sthembisa</td>
<td>KwaZulu Natal Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henk</td>
<td>Temmingh</td>
<td>University of Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsime</td>
<td>Visser Kift</td>
<td>Stellenbosch University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Wiysonge</td>
<td>Stellenbosch University/SA Medical Research Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tutors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holger</td>
<td>Schünemann</td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandi</td>
<td>Siegfried</td>
<td>SA Medical Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara</td>
<td>Kredo</td>
<td>SA Medical Research Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 2

## Training Course on GRADE Guideline Development

### 23 February 2016

## Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Who is in charge?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Gathering and registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:15</td>
<td>Welcome, introduction and goals of day</td>
<td>Large Group session</td>
<td>Tamara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>Introduction to guideline development process</td>
<td>Large group session</td>
<td>Holger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>The health care question: PICO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50</td>
<td>GRADE: Understanding the certainty, quality or strength of evidence</td>
<td>Large group session</td>
<td>Holger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Understanding of GRADE Tables: Summary of Findings (SoF) and Evidence Profiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discussion about PICO</td>
<td>Small group – hands on</td>
<td>Tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- GRADEing evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Moving from evidence to recommendations: Understanding GRADE Evidence to Decision Framework tables</td>
<td>Large group lecture with discussion</td>
<td>Holger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand the key criteria when moving from evidence to recommendations including resource implications, equity, feasibility, values and preferences and the balance of health benefits and downsides</td>
<td>Small groups – hands on</td>
<td>Tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15</td>
<td>Evidence to Decision Frameworks: Making recommendations: Guideline Simulation</td>
<td>Small group – hands on</td>
<td>Tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop exercise: Evidence to Recommendations Framework – simulation making recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:50</td>
<td>Continue guideline simulation – making recommendations</td>
<td>Small group – hands on</td>
<td>Tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>Recommendations: adoption, adaptation and de novo development</td>
<td>Large group session</td>
<td>Holger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45</td>
<td>Summary of day</td>
<td>Large group session</td>
<td>Tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion about key issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>End of workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tutors: Holger Schünemann, Nandi Siegfried, Tamara Kredo
Appendix 3

GRADE Training Workshop
23 February 2016
Evaluation Form

Thank you for taking the time to complete this form. Through your suggestions we can continue to improve our training events to better meet your needs.

Please complete the questions below that best describes your thoughts regarding the workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did you like most about the workshop?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Workshop was informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presenter was knowledgeable on the subject and showed great understanding and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was excellent, well arranged. Learnt a lot. Keen to try out all of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The group work i.e. the afternoon session – the learning fell into place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was aimed at the level of participants present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fairly interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Simulation making recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitators were well prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workshop well organized and informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EtD – I learnt a new term thus expanding on my current knowledge base and certainly something to incorporate into our current process. Practical example relevant to SA used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Practical!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well prepared!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Structured!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mind blowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feel empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good balance of lectures vs small group interaction. Very well thought out and well prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group discussion lead by experts / with ample time to ask questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Small group discussions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction to guideline development
- EtD frameworks
- Practical sessions
- The presentation of the GRADE process by Holger in the morning and the exercise of going through Bedaquiline GRADE in the afternoon
- The hands-on experience
- The practical component was very useful to understand the process, and the usefulness of working through it
- Relatively quick introduction to the topic background
- Introduction to the software
- Group discussions on how to get to a recommendation
- As a new comer in the field, I have been so impressed with the rigorous methodology in adapting, adopting and writing/developing new recommendations in guidelines

What did you like least about the workshop?
- Not everyone has had experience in the process of developing guidelines, therefore some were lost and could not understand some of the terms/processes
- Difficult to evaluate on article that one is not familiar with subject
- The group work i.e. the midday session of populating the GRADE assessment tool. I felt like I was working blind
- Was a bit long
- Also would have preferred some focus on clinical tools as well
- Initial most of us were confused with what to do with all the handouts. Explaining more clearly what the documents were and how we will work through it during the day in group discussions session would have improve efficiency (in my opinion)
- Group work. Introduction of new concepts
- Too short
- Too cold!
- Quite long!
- Was a bit difficult to engage in software
- Time too short
- The morning exercise of going online to GRADEPro to input data
- Lots of content, but valuable to start seeing potential of process
- Day could be a bit shorter ; shorten the lecture if people to read the material they received for preparation
- Time for this important issue was small
Please share any other comments and suggest other workshops you might want to attend relevant to evidence-based healthcare and systematic reviews

- A workshop on introduction to evidence-based healthcare and systematic reviews should be done, taking into consideration the background and level of exposure into these processes
- Would have loved to have more time... Many thanks – really enjoyed it
- Some of this may be semantics but what was referred to in the workshop as clinical practice guidelines could be called policy or protocol in SA
- I would like to thank all involved with the training workshop for your input. I enjoyed the teaching (and the food!) and feel better equipped now
- Organizers of these workshops need to consider providing CPD points/certificates for participants
- More workshops of this nature will be most welcome. Thank you for the opportunity
- Writing skills
- Conducting systematic reviews
- More examples on how to evaluate systematic reviews
- ADAPTE training may be useful considering most guidelines could be adapted
- I am interested in learning more about EBH & systematic reviews
- The need for slides of the presentations to be emailed to participants
- Good to learn from various experts and hear different views
- RevMan workshop