



AGREE II

A critical appraisal of: dementia 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.

Appraiser: morio aihara

Date: 7 May 2012

Email: 01757@nifty.ne.jp

URL of this appraisal: <http://www.agreetrust.org/appraisal/2241>

Guideline URL:

Overall Assessment

Title: dementia

Overall quality of this guideline: 2/7

Guideline recommended for use? No.

Domain	Total
1. Scope and Purpose	13
2. Stakeholder Involvement	13
3. Rigour of Development	23
4. Clarity of Presentation	9
5. Applicability	10
6. Editorial Independence	7

1. Scope and Purpose

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

Rating: 5

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

Rating: 4

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

Rating: 4

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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

Rating: 4

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

Rating: 5

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

Rating: 4

3. Rigour of Development

7. Systematic methods were used to search for evidence.

Rating: 4

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

Rating: 3

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

Rating: 2

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

Rating: 2

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

Rating: 2

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

Rating: 2

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

Rating: 4

14. A procedure for updating the guideline is provided.

Rating: 4

4. Clarity of Presentation

15. The recommendations are specific and unambiguous.

Rating: 3

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

Rating: 3

17. Key recommendations are easily identifiable.

Rating: 3

5. Applicability

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

Rating: 0

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

Rating: 2

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

Rating: 3

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

Rating: 5

6. Editorial Independence

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

Rating: 2

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

Rating: 5

Created online at www.agreetrust.org 7 May 2012