

E.6.4.1 Agree II critical appraisal for the review of factors for treatment switching or stopping

Score	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 Strongly agree
--------------	--------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------------------

Assessor 1 in black script, Assessor 2 in red script.

Amoaku 2015 AGREE II score

Domain	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Total
Scope and Purpose	5 5	1 3	5 2						11 10
Stakeholder involvement	3 3	1 1	2 4						6 8
Rigour of development	2 1	1 1	2 1	1 4	4 4	4 3	1 1	1 1	16 16
Clarity of presentation	5 5	5 6	5 6						15 17
Applicability	5	1	1	1					8

Domain	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Total
	1	1	1	1					4
Editorial independence	6 1	7 4							13 5
Overall Guideline Assessment	4 2	I would recommend this guideline for use (yes/ yes with modifications/no):						No No	

Amoaku 2015 Scaled domain score calculations

Domain	Maximum score	Minimum score	Observed score	Scaled domain score
Scope and purpose	42	6	21	41.7%
Stakeholder involvement	21	6	14	22.2%
Rigour of development	112	16	32	16.7%
Clarity or presentation	42	6	32	72.2%
Applicability	56	8	12	8.3%
Editorial independence	28	4	18	58.3%
Overall Guideline assessment	14	2	6	33.3%

McKibbin 2015 AGREE II score

Domain	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Total
Scope and Purpose	3 5	1 1	5 5						9 11
Stakeholder involvement	3 7	1 1	2 5						6 13
Rigour of development	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 6	5 4	1 1	1 1	1 1	12 16
Clarity of presentation	6 5	5 5	6 5						17 15
Applicability	6 3	5 3	1 1	1 1					13 8
Editorial independence	4 1	7 4							11 5
Overall Guideline Assessment	4 3	I would recommend this guideline for use (yes/ yes with modifications/no):						YWM NO	

N.B. YWM is an abbreviation for 'yes with modifications'

McKibbin 2015 Scaled domain score calculations

Domain	Maximum score	Minimum score	Observed score	Scaled domain score
Scope and purpose	42	6	20	38.9%

Domain	Maximum score	Minimum score	Observed score	Scaled domain score
Stakeholder involvement	21	6	19	36.1%
Rigour of development	112	16	28	12.5%
Clarity of presentation	42	6	32	72.2%
Applicability	56	8	21	27.1%
Editorial independence	28	4	16	50%
Overall Guideline assessment	14	2	7	41.7%

Mitchell 2010 AGREE II score

Domain	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Total
Scope and Purpose	2 6	1 5	5 4						11 15
Stakeholder involvement	3 4	1 1	2 3						6 8
Rigour of development	6 6	3 2	4 4	1 1	5 5	5 5	5 5	1 1	30 29
Clarity of presentation	5 6	4 6	7 7						16 19
Applicability	1	1	4	1					7

Domain	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Total
	4	1	1	1					7
Editorial independence	7 4	7 5							14 9
Overall Guideline Assessment	4 4	I would recommend this guideline for use (yes/ yes with modifications/no):						YWM YWM	
N.B. YWM is an abbreviation for 'yes with modifications'									

Mitchell 2010 Scaled domain score calculations

Domain	Maximum score	Minimum score	Observed score	Scaled domain score
Scope and purpose	42	6	26	55.6%
Stakeholder involvement	21	6	14	22.2%
Rigour of development	112	16	59	44.8%
Clarity of presentation	42	6	35	80.6%
Applicability	56	8	14	12.5%
Editorial independence	28	4	23	79.2%
Overall Guideline assessment	14	2	8	50.0%

RCOphth 2013 AGREE II score

Domain	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Total
Scope and Purpose	7 2	1 1	7 5						15 8
Stakeholder involvement	7 6	5 6	7 6						19 18
Rigour of development	6 2	1 1	5 1	2 1	5 5	5 5	6 5	4 1	34 21
Clarity of presentation	7 5	7 6	7 4						21 15
Applicability	6 1	6 4	2 5	6 1					20 11
Editorial independence	4 4	5 1							9 5
Overall Guideline Assessment	4 5	I would recommend this guideline for use (yes/ yes with modifications/no):						YWM YWM	

N.B. YWM is an abbreviation for 'yes with modifications'

RCOphth 2013 Scaled domain score calculations

Domain	Maximum score	Minimum score	Observed score	Scaled domain score
Scope and purpose	42	6	23	47.2%

Domain	Maximum score	Minimum score	Observed score	Scaled domain score
Stakeholder involvement	21	6	37	86.1%
Rigour of development	112	16	55	40.6%
Clarity of presentation	42	6	36	83.3%
Applicability	56	8	31	47.9%
Editorial independence	28	4	14	41.7%
Overall Guideline assessment	14	2	9	58.3%