

GRADE equity guidelines 2: considering health equity in GRADE guideline development: equity extension of the guideline development checklist

Elie A. Akl^{a,b,c,*}, Vivian Welch^d, Kevin Pottie^e, Javier Eslava-Schmalbach^{f,g}, Andrea Darzi^{a,c}, Ivan Sola^h, Srinivasa Vittal Katikireddiⁱ, Jasvinder Singh^{j,k,l}, M. Hassan Murad^m, Joerg Meerpohl^{n,o,p}, Roger Stanev^q, Eddy Lang^r, Elizabeth Matovinovic^s, Beverley Shea^t, Thomas Agoritsas^{u,v}, Paul E. Alexander^{u,v}, Alexandra Snellman^w, Romina Brignardello-Petersen^{u,v,x}, David Gloss^y, Lehana Thabane^{u,v}, Chunhu Shi^z, Airton T. Stein^{aa}, Ravi Sharaf^{ab}, Matthias Briel^{ac}, Gordon Guyatt^{u,v}, Holger Schünemann^{u,v,ad,ae}, Peter Tugwell^{af}

^aClinical Research Institute, American University of Beirut, PO Box 11-0236, Riad El Solh, Beirut, 1107 2020, Lebanon

^bDepartment of Medicine, American University of Beirut, PO Box 11-0236, Riad El Solh, Beirut, 1107 2020, Lebanon

^cAUB GRADE Center, American University of Beirut, PO Box 11-0236, Riad El Solh, Beirut, 1107 2020, Lebanon

^dBruyère Research Institute, Bruyère Continuing Care and University of Ottawa, Bruyère St., Ottawa, Ontario, K1N 5C8, Canada

^eCentre for Global Health, Institute of Population Health, University of Ottawa, 43 Bruyère St, Ottawa, Ontario, K1N 5C8, Canada

^fGroup of Equity in Health, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Edif. Uriel Gutiérrez, Bogotá D.C., Colombia

^gTechnology Development Center, Sociedad Colombiana de Anestesiología y Reanimación, Sociedad Colombiana de Anestesiología y Reanimación Cra, 15 A No 120-74, Piso 4y5, Edif. Concord Center, Santa Fe de Bogotá, Colombia

^hClinical Epidemiology and Public Health Department, Iberoamerican Cochrane Centre, Biomedical Research Institute Sant Pau (IIB Sant Pau), C/Sant Antoni Maria Claret, 167, Pavelló 18, planta 0, 08025 Barcelona, Spain

ⁱPublic Health MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, 200, Renfield Street, Glasgow G2 3QB, Scotland

^jDepartment of Medicine, School of Medicine, Birmingham VA Medical Center, 700 19th St S, Birmingham, AL 35233, USA

^kDivision of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB), 1720 2nd Ave S, Birmingham, AL 35294, USA

^lDepartment of Orthopedic Surgery, Mayo Clinic College of Medicine, 5777 E. Mayo Blvd., Phoenix, AZ 85054, USA

^mMayo Clinic Evidence-based Practice Center, Preventive Medicine, Mayo Clinic, 200 1st Street SW, Rochester, MN 55905, USA

ⁿCentre de Recherche Épidémiologie et Statistique Sorbonne Paris Cité—U1153, Inserm/Université Paris Descartes, 1 place du Parvis Notre-Dame, 75004 Paris, France

^oCochrane France, Hôpital Hôtel-Dieu, 1 place du Parvis Notre Dame, 75181 Paris, Cedex 04, France

^pCochrane Germany, Medical Center—University of Freiburg, Breisacher Strasse 153, 79110 Freiburg, Germany

^qInstitute of Technology, University of Washington, Tacoma, Washington, USA

^rDepartment of Emergency Medicine, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, 3330 Hospital Drive NW Calgary, Alberta, T2N 4N1, Canada

^sFaculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Su Thep, Mueang Chiang Mai District, Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand

^tOttawa Hospital Research Institute, University of Ottawa, 75 Laurier Ave E, Ottawa, Ontario, K1N 6N5, Canada

^uDepartment of Health Research Methods, Evidence and Impact, Faculty of Health Sciences, Hamilton, 1280 Main St., W. Hamilton, Ontario, L8S 4K1, Canada

^vDepartment of Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, Hamilton, 1280 Main St., W. Hamilton, Ontario, L8S 4K1, Canada

^wSocialstyrelsen, Rålambsvägen 3, Stockholm, 112 59, Sweden

^xEvidence Based Dentistry Unit, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Chile, Av. Libertador Bernardo O'Higgins, Santiago 1058, Chile

^yDepartment of Neurology, Charleston Area Medical Center, 1201 Washington Street East, Suite 100, Charleston, WV 25301, USA

^zDivision of Nursing, Midwifery & Social Work, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Oxford Rd, Manchester M13 9PL, UK

^{aa}Public Health Ufcspsa, Ulbra and Conceicao Hospital, Av. Farroupilha, 8001, Bairro São José, Canoas (RS), Brasil

^{ab}Long Island Jewish Medical Center North Shore University Hospital, 270-05 76th Ave, Queens, NY 11040, USA

^{ac}Basel Institute for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University Hospital Basel, Spitalstrasse 21, 4056 Basel, Switzerland

Funding: S.V.K. is funded by an NRS Scottish Senior Clinical Fellowship (SCAF/15/02), the Medical Research Council (MC_UU_12017/13 and MC_UU_12017/15), and Chief Scientist's Office (SPHSU13 and SPHSU15).

Conflict of interest: All members are authors of the GRADE working group. Also EAA, GG, RBP, HJS were involved in the "Guidelines 2.0:

systematic development of a comprehensive checklist for a successful guideline enterprise".

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +961-1-374374.

E-mail address: ea32@aub.edu.lb (E.A. Akl).

^{ad}McMaster GRADE Center, McMaster University, 1280 Main St W, Hamilton, Ontario, L8S 4L8, Canada^{ac}Department of Medicine, McMaster University, 1280 Main St W, Hamilton, Ontario, L8S 4L8, Canada^{af}The Centre for Global Health, Institute of Population Health, University of Ottawa, 75 Laurier Ave E, Ottawa, Ontario, K1N 6N5, Canada

Accepted 19 January 2017; Published online 9 May 2017

Abstract

Objective: To provide guidance for guideline developers on how to consider health equity at key stages of the guideline development process.

Study Design and Setting: Literature review followed by group discussions and consensus building.

Results: The key stages at which guideline developers could consider equity include setting priorities, guideline group membership, identifying the target audience(s), generating the guideline questions, considering the importance of outcomes and interventions, deciding what evidence to include and searching for evidence, summarizing the evidence and considering additional information, wording of recommendations, and evaluation and use. We provide examples of how guidelines have actually considered equity at each of these stages.

Conclusion: Guideline projects should consider the aforementioned suggestions for recommendations that are equity sensitive. © 2017 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Health equity; Disadvantaged; Underserved; Special populations; GRADE; Guidelines

1. Introduction

Given the potential for recommendations to have differential impact on different social groups, it is important to consider equity in the process of health guideline development [1]. A systematic evaluation of clinical practice guidelines addressing patients with multiple chronic conditions found a complete absence of incorporating sociopersonal context in 39% of the guidelines [2]. In spite of its importance, considering equity in the guideline development process is methodologically challenging. Indeed, a recent content analysis of the methodological literature identified eight challenges when addressing equity in clinical practice guidelines [3]. These range from determining the scoping of the guideline questions to monitoring implementation.

Although detailed published guidance has addressed equity in the process of conducting a systematic review [4], we have not identified such a guidance for guidelines. Moreover, existing guidance does not address equity in the context of guidelines developed following the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) methodology [5].

The objective of this study was to provide guidance for guideline developers on how to consider equity at key stages of the guideline development process. This is the second in a series of four papers describing GRADE guidance for considering equity in guideline development.

2. Existing guidance

Guidance on how to address health equity in guideline development is limited to a few publications. Oxman et al. reviewed the literature on the subject for the World Health Organization (WHO) Advisory Committee on

Health Research [6]. Although the authors found little empirical research on the subject, they presented a number of considerations for guideline developers. These considerations address a number of issues relevant to equity (e.g., differences in baseline risk, effect modifiers, availability of resources), but they do not offer a comprehensive framework that includes specific equity considerations in the guideline development process. As a result, their equity considerations do not address process stages such as guideline group membership, priority setting, identifying the target audience, and evaluation.

Dans et al. proposed an “equity lens” consisting of five criteria to evaluate how well guidelines address equity (see Box) [7]. The equity lens is meant to identify issues in

Box The five criteria of the “equity lens” by Dans et al. [7]

- 1) Do public health recommendations detailed in the guidelines address a priority problem for disadvantaged populations?
- 2) Is there a reason to anticipate different effects of interventions in disadvantaged and privileged populations?
- 3) Are the effects of the intervention valued differently by disadvantaged populations compared to privileged populations?
- 4) Is specific attention given to minimizing barriers to implementation in disadvantaged populations?
- 5) Do plans for assessing the impact of the recommendations include disadvantaged populations?

What is new?**Key findings**

- The key stages at which guideline developers could consider equity include the following topics of the Guidelines Development Checklist:
- Setting priorities.
- Guideline group membership.
- Identifying the target audience(s).
- Generating the guideline questions.
- Considering the importance of outcomes and interventions.
- Deciding what evidence to include and searching for evidence.
- Summarizing the evidence and considering additional information.
- Wording of recommendations.
- Evaluation and use.

What this adds to what was known?

- This is the first guidance to address equity consideration at key stages of the guideline development process using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation methodology.

What is the implication?

- It is important to consider equity in the process of health guideline development as recommendations may have a differential impact on different social groups.

What should change now?

- Train representatives of disadvantaged populations in both the content and the process of guideline development.
- Use a structured format to facilitate active participation of representatives of disadvantaged populations and their provision of valuable feedback.
- Include a section in reports of equity-sensitive guidelines that details any lack of evidence relating to relevant disadvantaged populations.

formulating, implementing, and evaluating the impact of recommendations. However, the five criteria are not comprehensive and may not be specific enough for guideline developers.

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) has published “Positively Equal,” as a tool to help consider equality issues as a systematic and integrated part of the clinical guideline development process [8]. The document helps in considering many of the issues related to inequity. Health inequity has been defined as differences in health that are not only unnecessary and avoidable but also unfair or unjust [9].

The WHO Handbook for Guideline Development includes an informative section on incorporating equity into the steps of guidelines development [10]. The section is relatively short and addresses other factors besides equity, such as human rights, gender, and social determinants.

We have identified additional documents that provide equity guidance for guideline developers, all of which have only a narrow scope. Aldrich et al. proposed a framework to incorporate socioeconomic evidence in clinical practice guidelines [11]. Eslava-Schmalbach et al. proposed a number of equity-related factors to consider when developing guidelines [1]. Keuken et al. proposed recommendations to highlight the importance of considering sex-related factors in guideline development [12]. Although these approaches complement one another in important ways, none is comprehensive enough in addressing all relevant equity issues in guideline development.

3. Methods*3.1. Composition of the team*

The team (members of the GRADE equity project group) that developed this guidance was composed of a diverse set of individuals with different backgrounds and expertise, including clinicians, public health care professionals, systematic reviewers, and guideline methodologists.

3.2. Process

To identify the topics where equity could play an integral role, we considered the different steps of the Guideline 2.0 checklist [13]. Then, the project group had a series of conference calls and e-mail exchanges on the specific steps to cover and selected those steps using informal consensus.

3.3. Literature search and summarizing information

We conducted a comprehensive but not systematic search of the literature. In addition, members of the team suggested illustrative examples. The primary authors reviewed relevant articles and integrated them in the text as appropriate.

3.4. Validating the guidelines

All members of the team reviewed and commented on successive drafts of the guidelines. This was followed by review by and discussions with members of the GRADE working group, both during an in-person meeting as well as through e-mail.

4. Proposed guidance

This guidance is based on stages of the guideline development process described in the comprehensive checklist suggested by Schünemann et al. [13]. The checklist includes 18 stages of the guideline development process, from the organizational aspects, to the development of recommendations, to their implementation, evaluation, and update. Although equity could potentially be taken into consideration at each of these stages, we provide specific suggestions on how to consider equity for the following most relevant stages (the number in parenthesis indicates the position of each step within the sequence suggested by Schünemann et al., with order not reflecting relative importance):

- Setting priorities (step 2)
- Guideline group membership (step 3)
- Identifying the target audience(s) (step 5)
- Generating the guideline questions (step 8)
- Considering the importance of outcomes and interventions (step 9)
- Deciding what evidence to include and searching for evidence (step 10)
- Summarizing the evidence and considering additional information (step 11)
- Wording of recommendations (step 14)
- Evaluation and use (step 17)

We then provide, when available, examples of how guidelines have actually considered equity for those specific stages. Papers 3 and 4 of the series address, respectively, two key stages of the process, not listed previously: Evidence synthesis and rating the certainty of evidence (Welch et al., paper 3 of the series) and developing recommendations and determining their strength (Pottie et al., paper 4 of the series). Therefore, we do not address these stages in this paper.

4.1. Setting priorities

Given the amount of resources, effort, and time required to develop guidelines, there is a need to set priorities for identifying the health area(s) and relevant questions to address. According to the first criterion of the “equity lens” described by Dans et al. [7], a problem with a higher prevalence and/or burden of disease among disadvantaged populations should be classified as a priority topic. The PROGRESS-Plus, an acronym, can help guideline panels

when considering health equity issues: Place of residence, Race/ethnicity/culture/language, Occupation, Gender/sex, Religion, Education, Socioeconomic status, or Social capital. “Plus” refers to other relevant characteristics such as age, disability, sexual orientation, time-dependent situations, and relationships need [14].

Guideline-developing organizations should thus prioritize equity-sensitive questions or create a full guideline focusing on a disadvantaged population, using one of the published approaches to priority setting [15].

Specific suggestion is as follows:

- Consider dedicating part of or a whole guideline (as opposed to no part) to the care of disadvantaged populations

For example, population-based epidemiological studies have provided evidence on a higher prevalence of obesity in individuals living with intellectual disabilities [9]. This would justify developing guidelines on obesity for the population of people living with intellectual disabilities [16]. Similarly, the new cases of cancer and cancer-related deaths in low-income and middle-income countries (LMICs) accounts for more than half of the global cancer burden. Specific guidelines would be crucial to address resource constraints in these settings [17].

Guideline developers should also keep in mind the potential for stigma when developing guidelines for specific disadvantaged populations [18]. “Proportionate universalism” describes the concept that the scale and intensity of allocation of universal “universal” services may actually benefit those who are disadvantaged the most (i.e., they are proportionate to need) [19].

4.2. Guideline group membership

The guideline development process may include a number of groups, such as a coordinating group, a literature review group, a voting panel, a peer-review group, and an oversight group. Guideline group membership refers to who is involved, in what capacity, and how members are selected. The greater and more diverse the representation from disadvantaged populations [20], the more likely subsequent steps of the process will adequately account for equity considerations. Evidence suggests that patient and public engagement in guideline development is feasible as they can provide consultation, participate in seminars and meetings, help formulate recommendations, and revise guideline drafts [21].

Specific suggestions are as follows:

- Include representatives of the disadvantaged populations in the different guideline groups, particularly the voting panel;
- Ensure the method for recruitment of group members considers representatives of all relevant disadvantaged populations;

- Recruit a methodologist who is familiar with and mindful of equity issues
- Ensure the chair of the voting panel is familiar with equity issues.

An example comes from the WHO guidelines on health sector interventions and services for HIV prevention and treatment in men who have sex with men (MSM) and transgender persons in LMICs [22]. This project involved representatives of the MSM community in the core working group and the final meeting consensus panel. The latter group included 14 individuals representing 13 civil society organizations. In addition, a community member from an LMIC and another from a high-income country (HIC) were involved in the review of final drafts.

4.3. Identifying the target audience(s)

The target audience of a guideline consists of the potential users or consumers, such as health care providers or other community or civil society organizations, who might be concerned with a specific disadvantaged population. Identifying that target audience may help keep the guidelines process—including selecting questions, deciding what evidence to include, and developing recommendations—focused on reducing health inequities.

Specific suggestions:

- Specify relevant disadvantaged populations when identifying the target audience(s);
- Involve representatives of disadvantaged populations when identifying the target audience(s).

For example, the 2013 WHO HIV guidelines addressing the general population [23] recognized the inequity related to the higher HIV prevalence and poorer HIV-related outcomes in LMICs compared with HICs [24]. To enhance the uptake of the guidelines in LMICs, the target audience was defined as “national HIV program managers, especially in low- and middle-income countries” [23].

Two other HIV guidelines, one addressing MSM and transgender people, and another involving sex workers, explicitly specify as their target audiences “community and civil society organizations” that typically represent the disadvantaged populations [22,25].

4.4. Generating the guideline questions

The guideline development process should include defining the key questions that the recommendations would address. This is typically done by following the PICO (population, intervention, control, outcomes) framework [26].

Specific suggestions:

- Consider equity when specifying elements of the PICO questions;

- Consider “good-practice statements” that could help address equity issues.

Specific components of PICO questions can capture key equity issues, such as when specifying the population (e.g., disadvantaged populations as subpopulations if one anticipates differential relative effects), the setting (e.g., LMICs), the intervention (e.g., low-cost interventions), and the outcome (e.g., access to health services).

A good-practice statement is an appropriate alternative when the benefits of an intervention unequivocally outweigh undesirable consequences, but the available evidence is only indirect, and summarizing that evidence would be a poor use of the guideline panel’s limited time and resources [27]. For example, the WHO HIV guidelines addressing MSM and transgender people included two good-practice statements on (1) establishing and enforcing antidiscrimination and protective laws respectively, (2) ensuring safe and inclusive public services. The aim of these statements was to reduce the impact of stigma, discrimination, and violence faced by MSM and transgender people.

4.5. Considering the importance of outcomes and interventions

In this stage of the process, equity considerations refer to how those who might be affected by its recommendations value the possible desirable and undesirable outcomes of those recommendations, and their preferences for the alternative interventions. Indeed, balancing desirable and undesirable outcomes always involve value judgments on their relative importance. These values and preference may well differ according to the subgroups considered as well as the composition of the guideline panel.

Specific suggestions:

- Involve representatives of disadvantaged populations in rating the importance of interventions and outcomes;
- Search selected databases (e.g., UK DUETs [28], COMET [29]) for outcomes rated as important by disadvantaged populations;
- Consider separate recommendations for disadvantaged populations if their values and preferences are thought to differ substantively to the point of affecting the strength and/or direction of recommendation.

In a guideline for patients with sickle cell disease or thalassemia, the panel might need to choose between oral iron chelation medication (e.g., deferasirox) and subcutaneous iron chelation pump. One could assume that for people who have to work physically, wearing a subcutaneous pump might be difficult and less preferred. On the other hand, people who have a desk job might actually prefer

the pump to medication that has a number of adverse effects. Taking these considerations into account might affect the final recommendation. In another example, racial and ethnic disparities had an important role in end-of-life decisions: non-Latino white patients were more likely than Latino or black patients to express preferences against life-prolonging care [30].

The balance of the benefits and harms of an intervention may vary for a disadvantaged population if its values attached to the outcomes of interest differ from those of the general population. For example, a higher value assigned by a disadvantaged population to the ability to quickly return to work might tip the balance between the benefits and harms for that population and result in different recommendations.

4.6. Deciding what evidence to include and searching for evidence

The development of guidelines requires a synthesis of the available and relevant evidence, ideally conducted in the form of a systematic review [31]. However, the populations studied in published research may exclude or underrepresent some disadvantaged populations [32].

Specific suggestions:

- Seek evidence specific to disadvantaged populations, for example, baseline risks specific to those groups;
- Consider including evidence derived from fields other than health (e.g., social science) that address disadvantaged populations.
- Search literature published in the language relevant to the disadvantaged population

Disadvantaged populations (e.g., sex workers, drug users, migrant workers) typically have higher baseline risk of experiencing adverse health outcomes (e.g., higher incidence of HIV morbidity and mortality) [33]. As a consequence, their balance of benefits and harms, a key determinant of strength of recommendation, may differ from the general population.

For example, the Euro–global burden of disease project found that equity policies aiming to reduce inequalities between educational levels in risk factors for mortality (e.g., equity-oriented tobacco control policies) would lead to a reduction in inequalities in mortality [34].

The information sources for equity-sensitive evidence may include gray literature (e.g., from unpublished reports of organizations involved with disadvantaged populations), and health and welfare statistics in countries that have national registries. These also include literature from fields other than health of specific relevance to the recommendation of interest (e.g., social science, economics) [35].

The review group should consider special search filters for guideline questions related to specific geographic

locations (e.g., LMICs) [36] or “harder-to-reach populations” [37]. In addition, research conducted among disadvantaged populations may be published in non-English languages warranting the inclusion of those languages in the search strategy.

4.7. Summarizing the evidence and considering additional information

Systematic reviews are typically conducted to summarize evidence on the relative effects of options on desirable and undesirable outcomes. In the setting of guideline development, ideally systematic reviews are also conducted to summarize evidence on factors such as effect on equity, resource use, cost, feasibility, and acceptability relative to disadvantaged populations [4].

Specific suggestions when conducting and reporting systematic reviews on equity-sensitive questions:

- Consider the PROGRESS-plus elements when synthesizing the evidence [38];
- Follow the PRISMA-equity statement when reporting the systematic reviews [36];
- Consider information on resource use, cost, effect on equity, feasibility, and acceptability from the perspective of disadvantaged populations.

The third paper of this series addresses in more detail health equity considerations in evidence synthesis and confidence rating (reference to third paper in the series).

4.8. Wording of recommendations

A recommendation should be worded as clear and actionable statements [39]. This means clear description of the population (or groups) for which the recommendation is intended, the recommended intervention being, and the alternative options considered. It may also include “remarks” or “key considerations” to clarify the “conditions” needed to balance desirable and undesirable consequence of adopting the recommendation.

Specific suggestions:

- Be as specific as possible in defining the population to maximize the understanding that it applies to a disadvantaged populations (when applicable);
- Include the necessary remarks following the recommendation to ensure its appropriate implementation in disadvantaged populations;
- Ensure that language is used carefully so that the recommendation does not stigmatize already disadvantaged populations.

One good example is the NICE guideline on recognition of and response to acute illness in adults in hospital [3]. The guideline included a recommendation addressing the care of patients with communication difficulties. The recommendation included the following statement: “The formal

structured handover of care should include...physical and rehabilitation needs; psychological and emotional needs; specific communication or language needs.”

4.9. Evaluation and use

Following publication of guidelines, the developers may evaluate the implementation of the guideline and monitor its use by the intended audience.

Specific suggestions:

- Produce tools to facilitate implementation and use among disadvantaged populations;
- Monitor and audit implementation and use among disadvantaged populations.

For example, in its interim guidance on the use of bedaquiline to treat multidrug-resistant tuberculosis, [40] the WHO called for establishing active pharmacovigilance among patient groups treated with the drug.

5. Methodological challenges

The extent to which a guideline project should consider the aforementioned suggestions will depend on how many of the included recommendations are equity sensitive.

There are logistical challenges to implementing the aforementioned suggestions. The implementation will require specific expertise in addressing health equity in systematic reviews and guideline development. Incorporating health equity considerations in guideline development will most likely also require additional time and financial resources.

A potential challenge to engaging representatives of a disadvantaged population in the process of the guideline development is that such engagement can become tokenistic. Indeed, investigations on patients' engagement in research found that they might be quiet, nonparticipatory or intimidated by experts and researchers [41]. Potential solutions include the following: using expertise in engaging representatives; training representatives in both the content and the process; using a structured format to facilitate active participation and the provision of valuable feedback.

Another major challenge for guideline developers is the extent to which the relevant additional required evidence (e.g., baseline risks, impact on equity, feasibility, acceptability) is available for integration in the guideline process. Highlighting the importance of this information in guideline development may improve reporting of primary studies and greater inclusion of disadvantaged populations. Similarly, reports of equity-sensitive guidelines should include a section that details a lack of evidence relating to relevant disadvantaged populations.

Key to this process is maintaining the necessary transparency and systematic approaches to guideline development.

6. Research agenda

Future research should assess the extent to which guideline development projects, particularly those addressing equity-sensitive questions, are considering equity at the different stages in their processes.

More importantly, studies should examine the extent that equity considerations during guideline development actually impacts health equity at the population level.

7. Conclusion

We have provided guidance for guideline developers on how to consider equity at key stages of the guideline development process. Guideline developers will need to consider which of the suggestions to adopt depending on the extent to which equity is relevant to the guidelines under consideration. This paper, along with the other papers in the series, clarifies the GRADE guidance in the area of health equity.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the help of Jennifer Vincent in providing input on the final version of the article.

References

- [1] Eslava-Schmalbach J, Sandoval-Vargas G, Mosquera P. Incorporating equity into developing and implementing for evidence-based clinical practice guidelines. *Revista de Salud Pública* 2011;13:339–51.
- [2] Wyatt KD, Stuart LM, Brito JP, Carranza Leon B, Domecq JP, Prutsky GJ, et al. Out of context: clinical practice guidelines and patients with multiple chronic conditions: a systematic review. *Med Care* 2014;52:S92–100.
- [3] Shi CH, Tian JH, Wang Q, Petkovic J, Ren D, Yang KH, et al. How equity is addressed in clinical practice guidelines: a content analysis. *BMJ Open* 2014;4:e005660.
- [4] Welch VA, Petticrew M, O'Neill J, Waters E, Armstrong R, Bhutta ZA, et al. Health equity: evidence synthesis and knowledge translation methods. *Syst Rev* 2013;2:43.
- [5] Gordon G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction—GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64:383–94.
- [6] Oxman AD. Improving the use of research evidence in guideline development: 12. Incorporating considerations of equity. *Health Res Policy Syst* 2006;4:24.
- [7] Dans AM, Dans L, Oxman AD, Robinson V, Acuin J, Tugwell P, et al. Assessing equity in clinical practice guidelines. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2007;60:540–6.
- [8] National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Positively equal. A guide to addressing equality issues in developing NICE clinical guidelines*. 2nd ed. 2012.
- [9] Whitehead M. The concepts and principles of equity and health. *Int J Health Serv* 1992;22:429–45.
- [10] Organization WH. *WHO handbook for guideline development*. 2nd ed. 2014.
- [11] Aldrich R, Kemp L, Williams JS, Harris E, Simpson S, Wilson A, et al. Using socioeconomic evidence in clinical practice guidelines. *Br Med J* 2003;327:1283–5.

- [12] Keuken DG, Haafkens JA, Moerman CJ, Klazinga NS, ter Riet G. Attention to sex-related factors in the development of clinical practice guidelines. *J women's Health* 2007;16:82–92.
- [13] Schünemann HJ, Wiercioch W, Etzeandia I, Falavigna M, Santesso N, Mustafa R, et al. Guidelines 2.0: systematic development of a comprehensive checklist for a successful guideline enterprise. *Can Med Assoc J* 2014;186:E123–42.
- [14] O'neill J, Tabish H, Welch V, Petticrew M, Pottie K, Clarke M, et al. Applying an equity lens to interventions: using PROGRESS ensures consideration of socially stratifying factors to illuminate inequities in health. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014;67:56–64.
- [15] Cowan K, Oliver S. *The James Lind Alliance Guidebook*. 5th ed. 2013.
- [16] Mizen LA, Macfie ML, Findlay L, Cooper SA, Melville CA. Clinical guidelines contribute to the health inequities experienced by individuals with intellectual disabilities. *Implement Sci* 2012;7:42.
- [17] Anderson BO. Evidence-based methods to address disparities in global cancer control: the development of guidelines in Asia. *Lancet Oncol* 2013;14:1154–5.
- [18] Katikireddi SV, Valles SA. Coupled ethical-epistemic analysis of public health research and practice: categorizing variables to improve population health and equity. *Am J Public Health* 2015;105:e36–42.
- [19] Benach J, Malmusi D, Yasui Y, Martinez JM. A new typology of policies to tackle health inequalities and scenarios of impact based on Rose's population approach. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2013;67:286–91.
- [20] O'Mara-Eves A, Brunton G, McDaid D, Oliver S, Kavanagh J, Jamal F, et al. Community engagement to reduce inequalities in health: a systematic review, meta-analysis and economic analysis. Southampton (UK): Public Health Research 1.4; 2013.
- [21] Legare F, Boivin A, van der Weijden T, Pakenham C, Burgers J, Legare J, et al. Patient and public involvement in clinical practice guidelines: a knowledge synthesis of existing programs. *Med Decis making* 2011;31:E45–74.
- [22] Organization WH. Prevention and treatment of HIV and other sexually transmitted infections among men who have sex with men and transgender people 2011.
- [23] Organization WH. Consolidated guidelines on the use of antiretroviral drugs for treating and preventing HIV infection 2013.
- [24] Williamson YSaC. *The HIV-1 Epidemic: Low- to Middle-Income Countries*. Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Medicine; 2012:2.
- [25] Organization WH. Prevention and treatment of HIV and other sexually transmitted infections for sex workers in low- and middle-income countries 2012: Recommendations for a public health approach.
- [26] Gordon H, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Atkins D, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2010;64:395–400.
- [27] Guyatt GH, Schünemann HJ, Djulbegovic B, Akl EA. Guideline panels should not GRADE good practice statements. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2015;68:597–600.
- [28] NICE. UK Database of Uncertainties about the Effects of Treatments (UK DUETs): a resource to make uncertainties explicit and to help prioritise new research.
- [29] Initiative C. Core outcome measures in effectiveness trials.
- [30] Garrido MM, Harrington ST, Prigerson HG. End-of-life treatment preferences: a key to reducing ethnic/racial disparities in advance care planning? *Cancer* 2014;120:3981–6.
- [31] Balshem H, Helfand M, Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64:401–6.
- [32] Ranganathan M, Bhopal R. Exclusion and inclusion of nonwhite ethnic minority groups in 72 North American and European cardiovascular cohort studies. *PLoS Med* 2006;3:e44.
- [33] Malta M, M M, Mello MB, Pascom AR, Linhares Y, Bastos FI. HIV prevalence among female sex workers, drug users and men who have sex with men in Brazil: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Public Health* 2010;10:317.
- [34] Eikemo TA, Hoffmann R, Kulik MC, Kulhanova I, Toch-Marquardt M, Menvielle G, et al. How can inequalities in mortality be reduced? A quantitative analysis of 6 risk factors in 21 European populations. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e110952.
- [35] Ogilvie D, Hamilton V, Egan M, Petticrew M. Systematic reviews of health effects of social interventions: 1. Finding the evidence: how far should you go? *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2005;59:804–8.
- [36] Welch VPM, Tugwell P, Moher D, O'Neill J, Waters E, White H, the PRISMA- Equity Bellagio group. PRISMA-equity 2012 extension: reporting guidelines for systematic reviews with a focus on health equity. *PLoS Med* 2012;9:e1001333.
- [37] Cooper C, Levay P, Lorenc T, Craig GM. A population search filter for hard-to-reach populations increased search efficiency for a systematic review. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014;67:554–9.
- [38] Tugwell P, Petticrew M, Kristjansson E, Welch V, Ueffing E, Waters E, et al. Assessing equity in systematic reviews: realising the recommendations of the Commission on Social Determinants of Health. *BMJ* 2010;341:c4739.
- [39] Andrews J, Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Alderson P, Dahm P, Falck-Ytter Y, et al. GRADE guidelines: 14. Going from evidence to recommendations: the significance and presentation of recommendations. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;66:719–25.
- [40] Organization WH. The use of bedaquiline in the treatment of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis - Interim policy guidance.
- [41] Domecq JP, Prutsky G, Elraiyah T, Wang Z, Nabhan M, Shippee N, et al. Patient engagement in research: a systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2014;14:89.